**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Lidar assisted wake redirection in wind farms: A data driven approach

Dhiman, H. S., Deb, D., & Foley, A. M. (2020). Lidar assisted wake redirection in wind farms: A data driven approach. *Renewable Energy*, 152, 484-493. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2020.01.027>

Published in:
Renewable Energy

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

Copyright 2020 Elsevier.

This manuscript is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits distribution and reproduction for non-commercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Manuscript Number: RENE-D-19-02722R1

Title: Lidar assisted wake redirection in wind farms: A data driven approach

Article Type: Research Paper

Keywords: Center of Wake; Lidar; Transfer function; Velocity deficit; Yaw angle; Wake effect

Corresponding Author: Professor Dipankar Deb, PhD

Corresponding Author's Institution: Institute of Infrastructure Technology Research and Management

First Author: Harsh S Dhiman, M. Tech

Order of Authors: Harsh S Dhiman, M. Tech; Dipankar Deb; Aoife Foley, PhD

Abstract: Lidar based wind measurement is an integral part of wind farm control. The major issues and challenges in power maximization include the potential losses due to wake effect observed among wind turbines. This manuscript presents a wake management technique that utilizes lidar simulations for wake redirection. The proposed methodology is validated for 2-turbine and 15-turbine wind farm layouts involving a PI control based yaw angle correction. Yaw angle misalignment using wake center tracking of the upstream turbines is used to increase the power generation levels. Results of wake center estimation are compared with a Kalman filter based method. Further, the velocity deficit and overall farm power improvement by yaw angle correction is calculated. Results reveal a 1.7% and 0.675% increase in total wind farm power for two different wind speed cases.

Title:
Lidar assisted wake redirection in wind farms: A data driven approach

Harsh S. Dhiman
Department of Electrical Engineering,
Institute of Infrastructure Technology Research and Management,
Ahmedabad, India 380026.
Email: harsh.dhiman.17pe@iitram.ac.in

Dipankar Deb (Corresponding author)*
Department of Electrical Engineering,
Institute of Infrastructure Technology Research and Management,
Ahmedabad, India 380026.
Email: dipankardeb@iitram.ac.in

Aoife M. Foley
School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering,
Queen's University,
Belfast, Northern Ireland, United Kingdom BT9 5AH
Email: a.foley@qub.ac.uk

From:

Dr. Dipankar Deb

Department of Electrical Engineering,

Institute of Infrastructure Technology Research and Management,

Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India- 380026.

October 23, 2019

To,

Editor-in-chief,

Renewable Energy.

Dear Dr. Soteris Kalogirou,

We would like to submit this revised manuscript by Harsh S. Dhiman, Dr. Dipankar Deb and Dr. Aoife M. Foley entitled “Lidar assisted wake redirection in wind farms: A data driven approach” to Renewable Energy for possible publication. This paper highlights the wake management in wind farms by accurately controlling the wake center for increased power output in different wake scenarios. It may be of interest to the readers of your journal.

We have meticulously gone through each and every comment from the reviewers. The comments from the reviewers have been addressed thoroughly and are highlighted in **blue text** in the revised manuscript. We thank the reviewers for their comments that has helped to improve the manuscript quality.

We confirm that there is no conflict of interest and affirm that this manuscript is original, has not been published before and is not currently being considered for publication in other journal.

Thank you very much for your attention to our paper.

Correspondence related to the paper may please be directed to Dr. Dipankar Deb, at the following address, telephone and fax number, and e-mail address:

Dr. Dipankar Deb

Department of Electrical Engineering

Institute of Infrastructure Technology Research and Management

Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India 380026

Tel: - (+91)-7203954452

Email: - dipankardeb@iitram.ac.in

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Dipankar Deb

Response to Reviewer #1

The comments are addressed in blue highlighted text in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer #1: The paper RENE-D-19-02722 paper proposes a wake management technique based on transfer function methodology obtained after lidar simulations for wake redirection. The proposed methodology is validated for 2-turbine and 15-turbine wind farm layouts involving a PI control based yaw angle correction. Yaw angle misalignment based on tracking wake center of the upstream turbines is used to increase the power generation levels. Results of wake center estimation are compared with a Kalman filter based method.

Further, the velocity deficit and total wind farm power improvement by yaw angle correction is calculated. Results reveal a 1.7% increase in total wind farm power.

In my opinion, the submitted manuscript is very good written, it has a clear aim and the potential reader understand the target of the scientific effort. There is define and robust methodology and well-presented scientific clear analysis based on real data and certain conclusions.

From the scientific point of view authors give clearly the followed methodology and an analytical scientific review has done.

Also, the manuscript under evaluation needs some corrections because is not so clear the extract of 1.7% of increase in power. Moreover the validation is probably only for 15 wind turbines windfarm, with wind speed range of 8-10m/s. So, it will more acceptable if there is study for speeds from 4 to 25 m/s.

In addition, at figure 7 the windfarm power is W? Which the nominal capacity of the windfarm. Please change the word power, to capacity.

Recapitulating, and taking into consideration the above-mentioned indicative comments, I believe that the quality of this paper is acceptable and clear to the final reader, but needs minor revision so it can be accepted for publication in the Renewable Energy Journal.

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The power improvement study for 15-turbine wind farm layout for wind speed range 4-25 m/sec is present in lines 272-287 on page 16-17, Section 5 of the revised manuscript. The power improvement for each wind turbine in the yawed mode is tabulated in Table 2 on Page 18 of the revised manuscript.***
- ***We have also changed the y-axis label of Figure 7 to "Farm Capacity".***

Once again we thank the reviewer for appreciating our work.

Response to Reviewer #2

The comments are addressed in blue highlighted text in the revised manuscript.

GENERAL COMMENTS: The paper is well written and some minor changes should be considered for the final version. The paper presents an interesting study with useful results that are accurately framed into the literature. The manuscript merits publication. I would like to congratulate the authors on the clear and easy to follow manuscript, with almost no typos or errors.

The paper is recommended for publication as it presents an interesting contribution for wind turbines' planning and windfarms' design, towards a more efficient infrastructure. I wonder how this study could be extended to offshore structures, in which not only the wind flow affects the power generation of the turbines, but the wave-current flow and the turbines alignment or misalignment can influence the natural frequency of each foundation, including the severity of scour phenomena for example. Maybe these ideas could be looked into as a future works developed by this team.

ABSTRACT

Seems well-written and straight the point, nothing to add here.

HIGHLIGHTS

Nothing to add here

1 - INTRODUCTION

Line 30: "models, which" (comma missing)

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The comma is now inserted at the appropriate place in line 25 on page 2 of the revised manuscript.***

Line 32-33: what is the acceptable range? Please specify.

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for raising the concern with the range. The range of the wake losses is in between 10-20%. The same is now corrected in lines 27-28 on page 2 of the revised manuscript.***

Line 49: first time an abbreviation appears please put it in the format "extended form (abbreviation)".

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The abbreviation is now put into its correct form as suggested. The same is updated in line 45 on page 3 of the revised manuscript.***

Line 59: the same as in 49 for PI. Correct this aspect throughout the paper

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The abbreviation for PI is corrected in line 51 on page 3 of the revised manuscript.***

Line 85: "wind farms, which" (comma missing)

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The missing comma is now put into its required place in line 57 on page 3 of the revised manuscript.***

Line 138: Kalmer instead of kalmer

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The punctuation error is corrected in line 94 on page 5 of the revised manuscript.***

Comment: The introduction is well-written and the authors made an effort to raise works and summarize them in terms of the results and highlight the important aspects for the remaining sections of the paper. However, the intro is way too lengthy and definitely needs be cut down, maybe into 2/3 or half of its current size.

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. We have reduced the introduction and made it more appropriate for the readers.***

2 - Multi-model Wake center estimation and control of Wind Farms

Equation 1: the letter D formerly designates the rotor diameter. I think a different symbol should be used for the damping factor here, or in the rotor case, to avoid redundancy of the nomenclature.

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. Symbol for damping factor is changed to ζ in line 121 on page 6 of the revised manuscript.***

Line 167: missing a comma again before the word which the same has been corrected before, please correct this throughout the paper when appropriate.

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The missing comma is now inserted at its appropriate place in line 123 on page 6 of the revised manuscript.***

Equation 5: now the rotor diameter has the symbol D_0 please make sure your symbols are consistent in the manuscript.

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The Symbol for rotor diameter is updated as D_0 throughout the manuscript.***

line 177: The model parameter k_d is selected as 0.15 - ok, but why? the value came out of the blue.

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The parameter k_d is a model parameter that defines wake recovery. For a neutral atmospheric boundary layer it is taken as 0.15 and a suitable reference is cited in lines 134-135 on page 7 of the revised manuscript.***

Equation 9: C_T has already appeared before, please define it in the Equation 6

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The symbol C_T is defined in line 130-131 on page 6 of the revised manuscript.***

Line 291-220: The empirical relationship between effective wake center and effective velocity deficit has been estimated using curve fitting toolbox in MATLAB. - How was it fitted? Regression? more details should be given here, or else other authors will find it very difficult to reproduce your work and results...this type of sentences does not benefit the paper, as it may give the appearance that Matlab was used as a "black-box" where little to no knowledge is needed for its application. As it seems, by the way the previous sections are written that this is not the case, thus I recommend the authors to provide more information every now and then when the Matlab software (or similar) is referred to. The same is valid for example in line 223 for the SIT package...

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The details about the curve fitting toolbox and system identification toolbox are provided in lines 177-182 on page 10 and lines 195-200 on page 11 of the revised manuscript.***

Comment: The section is well-written and there are no major comments here, sometimes the authors just make a ref to Matlab packages etc, which could be eventually avoided or at least minimised.

3 - Performance parameters for waked wind farms

Nothing to add here.

4 - Numerical Simulations for Proposed Methodology Line 278: avoid the use of personal pronouns such as "we"...please use a more formal language. correct this in this and next sections.

- ***Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. The language is now more formal and the corrections are made at suitable places such as line 244 on page 13 of the revised manuscript.***

Nothing much to add.

5 - Discussion

As in some parts of section 4, but definitely in section 5, I enjoyed the authors effort in making sure their results were framed into the previously made studies. This made it easy to ensure that the results can be understood in terms of their contribution to the topic.

We thank the reviewer for appreciating the work.

Highlights

- Lidar assisted wake control is studied.
- Transfer function-based methodology for wake center control is proposed.
- Wake center control for multiple wind turbines is presented.
- Methodology is validated for two wind speed scenarios for a 15-turbine farm layout.
- Power improvement in non-yawed and yawed mode is studied.

Lidar assisted wake redirection in wind farms: A data driven approach

Harsh S. Dhiman^a, Dipankar Deb^a, Aoife M. Foley^b

^a*Department of Electrical Engineering,
Institute of Infrastructure Technology Research and Management, Ahmedabad, India
380026.*

^b*School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering,
Queens University, Belfast, Northern Ireland, United Kingdom BT9 5AH*

Abstract

Lidar based wind measurement is an integral part of wind farm control. The major issues and challenges in power maximization include the potential losses due to wake effect observed among wind turbines. This manuscript presents a wake management technique that utilizes lidar simulations for wake redirection. The proposed methodology is validated for 2-turbine and 15-turbine wind farm layouts involving a PI control based yaw angle correction. Yaw angle misalignment using wake center tracking of the upstream turbines is used to increase the power generation levels. Results of wake center estimation are compared with a Kalman filter based method. Further, the velocity deficit and overall farm power improvement by yaw angle correction is calculated. Results reveal a 1.7% and 0.675% increase in total wind farm power for two different wind speed cases.

Keywords: Center of Wake, Lidar, Transfer function, Velocity deficit, Yaw angle, Wake effect

¹ Abbreviations

² HAWT Horizontal Axis Wind Turbine

Email addresses: harsh.dhiman.17pe@iiitram.ac.in (Harsh S. Dhiman),
dipankardeb@iiitram.ac.in (Dipankar Deb), a.foley@qub.ac.uk (Aoife M. Foley)

3	IPC	Individual Pitch Control
4	LIDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
5	PI	Proportional Integral Control

6 1. Introduction

7 Growing energy demands are rapidly facilitating the wind turbine installa-
8 tions globally in the form of large wind parks to convert the energy available
9 from moving air to electrical energy. Due to constrained land area and cost of
10 equipment one has to design a proper wind farm layout for energy generation [1].
11 Wind power capture by wind turbine is affected by many factors like wind direc-
12 tion, speed and optimal turbine spacing [2]. For a given terrain, wind turbines
13 must be placed at an optimal operating distance from each other to avoid poten-
14 tial derating caused by wind wakes which are aerodynamic phenomena leading
15 to (a) reduction in wind speed magnitude at the downstream turbine, and (b)
16 increased air turbulence causing mechanical loading on the turbine structure [3].
17 Sethi et al. presented the modelling of wind farms considering wake interactions
18 [4]. The wake effect is studied in terms of effective wind speed for wind farm
19 layouts. Wind wakes typically are dominant over near wake and far wake region
20 that extend up to $4D_0$ and $8D_0$ respectively, where D_0 is the rotor diameter.
21 Wind wakes causing power loss for an individual wind turbine, has led to the
22 development of many analytical and field models to study the same [5].

23 Among analytical models, Jensen's [6], Frandsen's [7] and Ainslie's [8] wake
24 model form kinematic wake [models](#), which commonly use algebraic equations
25 to characterize wake deficit. Jensen's wake model is validated and tested for
26 accommodating the power losses due to wake effect and [are found in an accept-](#)
27 [able range of 10-20% \[9, 10, 11, 12\]](#). A new two dimensional Jensen wake model
28 is proposed by Tian et al. that incorporates a variable wake decay rate rather
29 than a constant one. Numerical simulations are performed for computing the
30 wake deficit and are compared with field measurements. Results reveal that

such a wake model underestimates for near-wake regions [13]. Ishihara et al. have presented an analytical model that encapsulates the effect of thrust coefficient and air turbulence on the wake deficit [14]. The numerical simulations are compared with a test carried out in wind tunnel and results of the proposed analytical model are in good agreement with experimental analysis. In terms of Large-eddy simulation (LES), the wake flow is studied in neutral atmospheric boundary layer, where the aerodynamic effects on the rotor body and blade element are modeled separately in order to assess power losses [15, 16, 17].

Experimental results from a wind turbine with rotor diameter 0.9 m placed 4 rotor diameters from the wind inlet section and wake velocity distribution, and measured at a downstream distance of $0.6D_0$ and $3D_0$ have shown up to 40% power loss and 80% increased dynamic loading on the turbine structure [18]. Wake study is also important in [Wind farm layout optimization \(WFLOP\)](#) where optimal placement of the wind turbines leads to to minimum wake effect and maximum power capture [19]. Gonzalez et al. have further discussed an evolution based algorithm for optimal wind farm layout [20] to determine net power produced considering the losses occurred due to wake effects. Pitch and yaw angle control techniques are two common ways of increasing power capture. Schlipf et al. demonstrated a [Proportional-Integral \(PI\)](#) control based pitch controller that mitigates dynamic load variations in rotor speed caused due to severe conditions up to 80% [21]. The performance of a traditional feedback control is tested against feed-forward blade pitch control to achieve dynamic load mitigation along with improved life. Results reveal that the feed-forward controller performs better [22].

Vali et al. have utilized a MPAC method for [wind farms](#), to minimize the reference error in wind farm [23]. A methodology based on adjoint MPC is implemented for 6-turbine wind farm where the time-varying signal is tracked against a reference power. Experimental analysis for power improvement using yaw control is studied in [24] for longitudinal distances of $3D_0$ and $6D_0$. In terms of power optimization, a yaw angle based approach is adopted, for single column

61 wind farm layout where axial induction factor for downstream turbines is kept
 62 fixed [25]. An experimental study for a small-scale turbine with wake structure
 63 and turbine parameters such as yaw angle, pitch angle and tip speed ratio are
 64 monitored for a favorable operating performance [26]. In [27], Lidar assisted
 65 measurements along with a look-ahead controller is adopted to curb dynamic
 66 load through fatigue analysis. A concept of an equivalent load generated given
 67 the load is subjected to exact load for its entire lifetime is utilized. In [28], for
 68 generator speed regulation, a wind-scheduled control is analysed where for the
 69 conditions above rated value, Lidar based control suppresses the irregularities
 70 in an accurate wind speed measurement. In [29], Lidar is leveraged to trace the
 71 flow caused due wake effect and a desired yaw angle set point is achieved.

72 In a wind farm where the power losses are incurred due to wake, velocity
 73 deficit can be used as a standardized parameter to characterize losses. Given
 74 the spatial coordinates (a, b, c) representing the position in the wake field repre-
 75 senting maximum power loss, the region is termed as the wake center. Cacciola
 76 et al. have used the hub loads and sensors at the downwind turbine to acquire
 77 wind velocity deficit data and horizontal shear via an optimization approach for
 78 wake center detection without considering yaw misalignment [30]. In [31], au-
 79 thors have discussed an autonomous wake characterization approach to identify
 80 wake center position for nonidentical atmospheric conditions. A Doppler lidar
 81 is used to scan from January 2017 to June 2017 and results indicate that the
 82 wake center position shifts when stable atmospheric conditions exist. Raach et
 83 al. explored the possibility of implementing a H_∞ controller for wake redirec-
 84 tion based on yaw angle control and a closed-loop performance for the system is
 85 analysed [32]. In [33], a wake management strategy is presented using adaptive
 86 control technique for wind farms where uncertainties are dominant. Further in
 87 [34], decision making and control aspect for a hybrid wind farm are discussed.

88 The prime contribution of this manuscript is LIDAR based simulation for
 89 closed-loop wake center control. The wind turbine and wake are modeled as
 90 transfer functions and the estimated wake center is made to follow a desired

reference yaw angle trajectory. The proposed methodology is validated for a 15 turbine wind farm layout and the power improvement for each turbine is assessed when upstream turbine(s) are yawed. The wake center estimation are compared with Kalman filter estimations. The subsequent sections are organized as follows. Section 2 entails wake center estimation for multi-model and multiple wake scenario based on proposed transfer function based methodology and Kalman filter. Section 3 highlights performance parameters like farm power production and air turbulence whereas Section 4 discusses the simulation results for proposed methodology and Kalman filter method for a 15-turbine farm configuration. Section 5 highlights discussions, and is followed by Conclusions.

2. Multi-model Wake center estimation and control of Wind Farms

Closed-loop control methodology, as applied to wind farms, primarily built around two main tasks: (i) measures the estimated wind field and, (ii) controls the wake center position. Wind field measurement using lidar accurately processes the controller requirements. LIDAR (Light Detection and Ranging System) sensor utilizes laser based detection and ranging to measure an upstream turbine's effective wind speed at d_{lidar} , the lidar distance. The yaw angle modification potentially reduces the power delivered by an upstream turbine and causes the reverse effect on the downstream turbine. The calculation of the wind speed is done prior to the interaction of the incident wind with the turbine, so as to provide sufficient time for real-time control action [35]. Subsystems related to closed-loop control based on PI control of wake center estimation are described next for desired yaw angle, in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Block diagram for the system under study

114 *2.1. Wind turbine model and wake center estimation*

115 Using actuator disk theory, the power delivered from i^{th} turbine is given as

$$P_i = \frac{1}{2} \rho A_0 C_p u_i^3, \quad (1)$$

116 for density of air ρ , swept area A_0 , power coefficient C_p , and wind speed u_i
 117 for i^{th} turbine [36]. However, for wind turbines in yawed condition, the output
 118 obtained from an upstream turbine is modified by $\cos^q \gamma$, with q being a tunable
 119 parameter in the range (1.4, 2.2) as reported by Fleming et al. [37]. The yaw
 120 dynamics for an upstream turbine is expressed as

$$\ddot{\gamma} + 2\zeta\omega\dot{\gamma} = \omega^2 (\gamma_{ref} - \gamma), \quad (2)$$

121 for undamped eigen frequency ω , **damping factor ζ** , desired yaw angle γ_{ref} .

122 The transfer function is estimated with an accuracy of 99.99% using system
 123 identification toolbox with γ_{ref} as input and γ as the actual yaw angle, **which**
 124 is varied from $(-25^\circ, 25^\circ)$, with $n_p = 2$ poles and $n_z = 1$ zero, determined as

$$G_1(s) = \frac{0.533s + 0.01094}{s^2 + 0.1538s + 0.002736}. \quad (3)$$

125 Optimized output in yawed condition of a turbine as formulated by Qian et al.
 126 [38] is expressed as

$$P_i = \frac{1}{2} \rho A_0 C_p u_i^3 \cos^2(\gamma_i). \quad (4)$$

127 The deflection in wake flow caused due to yaw position for a given upstream
 128 turbine, as postulated by Jimnez et al. [39], is

$$\delta(d) = \frac{\xi_{init} \left(15 \left(\frac{2k_d d}{D_0} + 1 \right)^4 + \xi_{init}^2 \right)}{\frac{30k_d}{D_0} \left(\frac{2k_d d}{D_0} + 1 \right)^5} - \frac{\xi_{init} D_0 (15 + \xi_{init}^2)}{30k_d}, \quad (5)$$

$$\xi_{init}(\gamma, C_T) = \frac{1}{2} \cos^2(\gamma) \sin(\gamma) C_T, \quad (6)$$

129 where ξ_{init} is the initial wake angle, d is the scanning or preview distance used
 130 by lidar, D_0 is the rotor diameter, k_d is the uncertain model parameter and **C_T**
 131 **is the thrust coefficient.**

For computation of wake center deflection with changing yaw angles, appropriate lidar distance d_{lidar} is chosen for accurate calculation of the transfer function [40]. A suitable value of the model parameter k_d is selected as 0.15 owing to the turbine operation in neutral boundary layer [41]. The transfer function with 93.76% accuracy for $n_p = 2$ poles and $n_z = 0$ zeros, is of the form

$$G_2(s) = \frac{-0.158}{s^2 + 2.56 \times 10^{-12}s + 0.2404}. \quad (7)$$

The wake center needs to be controlled to ultimately maximize the wind farm power generated. A simple PI controller is tuned using tuning feature of MATLAB/Simulink, is described as

$$f = K_p \left(\delta(\gamma) + \frac{1}{T_i} \int \delta(\gamma) dt \right), \quad (8)$$

where $\delta(\gamma)$ is the estimated wake center, K_p, T_i are the proportional gain and time constant.

2.2. Multi-model Wake center control

The accuracy of the estimation of wake center relies on aspects such as ξ_{init} , d , rotor diameter (D_0) and k_d as in (5). Multi-model wake center estimation is studied with constant k_d , and the scanning distance, d_{lidar} is modified in multiples of D_0 . Table 1 highlights the estimation accuracies of the transfer function models. Using system identification toolbox and different lidar scanning distances, the best fit models are obtained.

Table 1: Estimation accuracies for different lidar scanning distances

Scanning distance, d_{lidar}	Estimation Accuracy (%)
$1D_0$	93.76
$1.5D_0$	95.08
$2D_0$	94.94
$2.5D_0$	94.82
$3D_0$	94.71

Figure 2: Multi-model wake center estimation

Figure 2 illustrates wake center estimation for a multi-model scenario. Bastankhah and Porte-Agel [42] describe a wake model which follows a Gaussian profile for wind speed deficit. Mathematically, it is expressed as a function of thrust coefficient C_T , radial distance r , and wake width x .

$$v = v_0 \left(1 - A(x) e^{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}} \right), \quad (9)$$

$$A(x) = 1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{C_T}{8(\sigma/D_0)^2}}, \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{\sigma}{D_0} = k \frac{x}{D_0} + \epsilon, \quad (11)$$

where $A(x)$ denotes the maximum normalized velocity deficit for a distance x , and wake width σ which is a function of k representing wake entrainment constant. According to linear superposition principle, the wake deficit due to upstream turbine(s) is expressed as

$$\Delta v_i = \sum_{j=1}^N \left(1 - \frac{v_j}{v_0} \right), \quad (12)$$

for j^{th} upstream turbine, overall velocity deficit Δu_i at i^{th} downstream turbine, and total upstream turbines N . In [43], a quadratic superposition is presented and is expressed as

$$\Delta v_i = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N (\Delta v_j)^2}. \quad (13)$$

160 In non-yawed conditions, power generated at the downstream turbine dwindles
 161 because of shadow effect of upstream turbines, and requires effective wake man-
 162 agement. Yawing the upstream turbine effectively controls the wake center,
 163 and to account for multiple wakes on a downstream turbine from a multiple of
 164 upstream turbines, the transformed thrust coefficient $C_T \cos^3(\gamma_{w,j})$, where $\gamma_{w,j}$
 165 denotes the yaw angle for the j^{th} upwind turbine. Further, modified velocity
 166 deficit for i^{th} downstream turbine is expressed as

$$v_i = v_0 \left(1 - A_{ij}(x) e^{\frac{-r^2}{2\sigma_{ij}^2}} \right), \quad (14)$$

$$A_{ij}(x) = 1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{C_T \cos^3(\gamma_{w,j})}{8(\sigma_{ij}/D_0)^2}}, \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{\sigma_{ij}}{D_0} = k \frac{x_{ij}}{D_0} + \epsilon, \quad (16)$$

$$\beta_w = 0.5 \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - C_T}}{\sqrt{1 - C_T}} \right), \quad (17)$$

167 where $\epsilon = 0.25\sqrt{\beta_w}$, σ_{ij} represents wake width at downstream distance x_{ij}
 168 between j^{th} upstream and i^{th} downstream turbine. The velocity deficit for each
 169 upstream turbine is computed using (14) for yaw angle $\gamma_{w,j}$ and for N upstream
 170 turbines, the overall velocity deficit at i^{th} downstream turbine is calculated
 171 based on the principle of quadratic superposition in (13). Figure 3 illustrates
 172 the proposed methodology for wake redirection for multiple upstream turbines.

Figure 3: Multiple wake scenario based wake center estimation

173 Transfer function models with Multiple-Input Single Output (MISO) config-

174 uration are evaluated for best estimation accuracy, and is expressed as

$$g(y_c) = v_m e^{\frac{-(y_c - \mu_y)^2}{2\sigma_{lidar}^2}}, \quad (18)$$

$$\sigma_{lidar} = kd_{lidar} + \epsilon D_0, \quad (19)$$

175 where y_c , μ_y represent the height of hub and position of the wake center re-
 176 spectively given an overall velocity deficit of $g(y_c)$ for a lidar scanning distance
 177 d_{lidar} and v_m denotes the maximum velocity deficit. The empirical relationship
 178 between effective velocity deficit and effective wake center is estimated using
 179 curve fitting toolbox in MATLAB [44]. In the curve fitting toolbox, the input
 180 quantity is considered as velocity deficit and output quantity as effective wake
 181 center deflection. Using these quantities the curve fitting toolbox utilized for
 182 appropriate fitting.

183 Developed in 1960, Kalman filter is being actively used to estimate the states
 184 in the noisy or disturbed environments. State estimation as perceived by a
 185 Kalman filter is based on a recursive process of a noisy data [45], and is expressed
 186 mathematically as

$$\hat{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{A}x_t + \mathbf{B}u_t + w_t, \quad (20)$$

$$\hat{y}_t = \mathbf{C}x_t + \mathbf{D}u_t + v_t, \quad (21)$$

187 where $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}$ represent the state-space matrices of the plant, w_t, v_t are pro-
 188 cess and measurement noise at time step t respectively and $\hat{x}_{t+1}$ is the updated
 189 state vector at time step $t + 1$. For the current scenario, Kalman filter tech-
 190 nique is implemented to derive an estimate of the wake center trajectory for a
 191 set of upwind and downwind turbines. Using system identification toolbox, the
 192 transfer function models are computed with yaw angle as input and wake center
 193 deflection as output. In Figure 4, a schematic representation for Kalman filter
 194 based wake center is illustrated.

195 The state-space model can be estimated using system identification toolbox
 196 available in MATLAB [46]. In this toolbox, the input and output data are fed
 197 with a ‘double’ variable which represents a time-varying quantity. The model
 198 simulations can be run for different system orders in order to obtain maximum

Figure 4: Kalman filter technique based wake center estimation

estimation accuracy. From here, the state-space model can be exported and can be used according to the user need.

3. Performance parameters for waked wind farms

Power maximization and optimization of the land available are the two prime objectives for wind farm operators. In case of wake effect, the reduction in power capture is compensated by either changing yaw alignment or changing lateral position of downstream turbine. Since micro-siting is done in priori, yaw misalignment is the preferred choice. Power capture and air turbulence are the two main parameters that affect the performance of a wind farm. Jensen's wake model computes wind speed at distance h and a distance r radially from the wake center line is expressed as

$$v(h, r) = v_0 \left[1 - 2a \left(\frac{r_0}{r_0 + kh} \right)^2 \right], \quad (22)$$

where v_0 is the freestream wind velocity, r_0 denotes rotor radius and k represents wake entrainment factor. The flow behind upwind turbine is deflected by Ω_j when yaw angle is aligned at $\gamma_{w,j}$ and wind direction θ_j expressed as

$$\Omega_j = (0.6a_j + 1)\gamma_{w,j} + \theta_j, \quad (23)$$

213 where a_j is the axial induction factor for turbine $j \in H$ (upstream turbines).

214 Velocity profile for a downwind turbine with yaw misalignment is given as

$$v_i(x, r) = \begin{cases} v_0 \left[1 - 2a_j \left(\frac{1}{1 + 2kT \cos(\Omega_j)} \right)^2 \times \cos^2(4.5\Omega_j) \right], & \Omega_j \leq 20^\circ \\ v_0, & \Omega_j > 20^\circ, \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

215 where $T = \frac{h}{D_0} \in [2, \dots, 5]$ denotes the spacing factor which is a multiple of rotor
 216 diameter. A yaw angle of $\gamma_{w,j}$ on the upstream turbine WT_j diverts the wake
 217 flow for a downwind turbine WT_i by an angle of Ω_j arrives at a velocity profile
 218 like (24). A yawed upstream turbine now captures power which is changed by
 219 a factor of $\cos^3 \gamma_w$.

220 Further, dynamic loading on downstream is a challenging issue that causes
 221 catastrophic damage to rotor blades and tower. The resulting air turbulence can
 222 be reduced by changing yaw angle $\gamma_{w,j}$ of upstream turbine. Mathematically,
 223 the overall turbulence intensity is given as

$$E_{eff} = \sqrt{E_a^2 + K^2 \sum_{j=1}^N (1 - \sqrt{1 - C_T \cos \gamma_{w,j}}) h_i^{-2/3}}, \quad (25)$$

224 where E_a denotes the ambient air turbulence whereas E_{eff} being computed for
 225 a downwind distance h_i for N upstream turbines and K is constant with a value
 226 of 0.93 [47].

227 4. Numerical Simulations for Proposed Methodology

228 Next, the proposed methodology for closed-loop control of wake center for 2-
 229 turbine and 15-turbine wind farm layout is presented. For 2-turbine wind farm,
 230 the intent is to track wake center of WT_1 (upwind) and examine the impact on
 231 the performance parameters of WT_2 (downstream).

232 Throughout the simulation, wind turbines with same rotor diameter of 80
 233 meters are considered. WT_1 and WT_2 are placed 400 meters apart. The wake
 234 center is estimated using lidar simulation for desired yaw control based on
 235 methodology discussed in Section 2. Initially, the yaw angle of WT_1 is $\gamma_w = 0^\circ$

Figure 5: 2-turbine layout for wake deflection

and lidar scanning distance is kept $1D_0$. In order to validate the proposed methodology, a 500 second simulation is carried out for 2-turbine layout. Figure 6 illustrates the wake center simulation using proposed methodology.

Figure 6: Desired yaw angle alignment and wake center for 2-turbine layout

The wake center reference is changed at $t=250$ seconds for desired yaw angle setting based on a PI control technique. Based on this, a 1000 second simulation is carried out to evaluate the performance parameters for 2-turbine wind farm layout. The yaw angle setting for WT_1 , γ_w is changed at $t=500$ second where the mean wind speed is changed from 8 m/sec to 10 m/sec.

From Figure 7, it is observed that the total wind power extracted has increased by 7.52%. In a similar study presented by Raach et al. [29] with same rotor diameter of turbines, the total power increase is reported around 4.5%.

Figure 7: Wake deflection and power output with and without redirection

247 The net wind farm power increases due to high fidelity lidar measurements
 248 that accurately measure the deflection caused by yaw misalignment. The yaw
 249 angle misalignment also affects the air turbulence intensity on downstream wind
 250 turbine. For a fixed yaw angle of an upstream turbine, the turbulence decreases
 251 as the longitudinal distance between the turbines is increased. Figure 8 illus-
 252 trates the turbulence acting on WT_2 as a result of varying downstream distance.

Figure 8: Effective air turbulence at WT_2

253 Keeping longitudinal distance fixed, for given yaw misalignment, the effec-
 254 tive turbulence acting on WT_2 is found minimum for $\gamma_w = 30^\circ$. Wake center

control is analyzed for a 15 turbine wind farm with WT_{12} facing wake effect from $WT_2, WT_3, WT_4, WT_5, WT_7, WT_9$ and WT_{10} . In Figure 9, the distances between turbines in terms of rotor diameter are illustrated. Yaw angles of upstream turbines WT_j for $j \in [2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10]$ are chosen as $\gamma_2 = 2^\circ$, $\gamma_3 = 2.5^\circ$, $\gamma_4 = 5^\circ$, $\gamma_5 = 7^\circ$, $\gamma_7 = 9^\circ$, $\gamma_9 = 10^\circ$ and $\gamma_{10} = 15^\circ$ and when yawed, the wake center deflection is controlled by determining effective velocity deficit.

Figure 9: 15 turbine layout in non-yawed (black solid line) and yawed mode (red solid line)

The empirical relationship between overall velocity deficit and wake center deflection (18) is converted into an overall transfer function having multiple-inputs and single output (MISO) topology. LIDAR is mounted at nacelle of WT_{12} that scans the wind flow for all upwind turbines. For estimating the wake width, a scan distance $d_{lidar} = 2D_0$ is considered.

In Figures 10 and 11, the wake center estimation by the proposed transfer function methodology and by Kalman filter based technique is presented.

Figure 10: Wake center estimation by proposed model (blue dotted line) and reference wake center (black solid line) for upwind turbines of WT_{12}

269

Figure 11: Wake center estimation by proposed model (red solid line) and Kalman filter (green dotted line) for upwind turbines of WT_{12}

270

271 5. Discussions

272 The wind turbine power improvement in the 15-turbine farm layout when
 273 operated in yaw mode is tested for a wind profile of 500 seconds illustrated in
 274 Figure 12.

Figure 12: Wind speed profile for the range 4-25 m/sec

275 The wind in this case ranges from 4 m/sec to 25 m/sec. For the first 100
 276 seconds the wind speed is 4 m/sec, the from 100 to 250 seconds wind speed is
 277 15 m/sec and for the last 250 seconds the speed is 25 m/sec. The mean wind
 278 power captured by each wind turbine is calculated for non-yawed (P_{ny}) and
 279 yawed (P_y) scenario. Table 2 depicts the improvement in wind power captured
 280 for each turbine and it is observed that for WT_1 the wind power captured
 281 remains same as it is not yawed. For WT_2 and WT_3 , the wind power decreases
 282 in yawed mode as they are the upstream turbines. For turbines WT_4 to WT_{15} ,
 283 the power captured in yawed mode increases as yawing deflects the wake away
 284 from downstream turbine. Overall, for the wind speed profile illustrated in
 285 Figure 12, the mean power captured by the wind farm in non-yawed mode is
 286 160.3364 MW while in yawed mode it is 161.418 MW thus indicating an increase
 287 of 0.675%.

Table 2: Mean turbine power in non-yawed and yawed condition for wind profile in the range 4-25 m/sec

Turbine	Upwind Turbine	Power (P_{ny}) (MW)	Power (P_y) (MW)	% change
WT_1	NA	14.3044	14.3044	0.00
WT_2	NA	14.3044	14.2782	-0.183
WT_3	NA	14.3044	14.2636	-0.285
WT_4	1,2	10.9830	10.9890	+0.0546
WT_5	2,3	11.704	11.709	+0.0427
WT_6	1,4	12.215	12.219	+0.0327
WT_7	2,4,5	9.4873	9.4918	+0.047
WT_8	3,5	10.0182	10.188	+1.690
WT_9	1,4,6,7	9.2660	9.2704	+0.0475
WT_{10}	2,5,7,9	9.2478	9.2519	+0.0440
WT_{11}	1,2,4,6,9	8.9314	9.09320	+1.811
WT_{12}	2,3,4,5,7,9,10	8.9126	9.09261	+1.2734
WT_{13}	3,5,8	8.8956	9.0942	+2.2320
WT_{14}	2,3,4,5,7,9,10,12	8.8831	9.0988	+2.3130
WT_{15}	2,5,7,8,10,12,13,14	8.8792	9.0987	+2.3511
$\sum P_{ny} = 160.3364 \quad \sum P_y = 161.418$				

Table 3: Wind turbine power captured for non-yawed and yawed scenario with wind speed range 8-10 m/sec

Turbine	Upwind Turbine	Power (P_{ny}) (MW)	Power (P_y) (MW)	% change
WT_1	NA	2.8274	2.8274	0.00
WT_2	NA	2.8274	2.8223	-0.1800
WT_3	NA	2.8274	2.8223	-0.1800
WT_4	1,2	1.5074	1.5116	+0.2786
WT_5	2,3	2.6816	2.6916	+0.3729
WT_6	1,4	2.0666	2.0891	+1.0887
WT_7	2,4,5	2.0561	2.1541	+4.7663
WT_8	3,5	2.0162	2.1130	+4.8011
WT_9	1,4,6,7	2.0053	2.1016	+4.8022
WT_{10}	2,5,7,9	2.0001	2.0884	+4.4414
WT_{11}	1,2,4,6,9	2.0761	2.0962	+0.9681
WT_{12}	2,3,4,5,7,9,10	1.9821	1.9959	+0.6962
WT_{13}	3,5,8	2.0752	2.0965	+0.9782
WT_{14}	2,3,4,5,7,9,10,12	1.9701	1.9862	+0.8172
WT_{15}	2,5,7,8,10,12,13,14	1.9970	2.0866	+4.4867
$\sum P_{ny} = 32.916 \quad \sum P_y = 33.483$				

Results from Figures 10 and 11 indicate that Kalman filter based technique fails to track the wake center deflection accurately due to nonlinear nature and stochastic of wind speed. Contrary to Kalman filter, the proposed transfer function based technique tracks the reference wake center with accuracy. The velocity deficit caused due to each upwind turbine for this layout is computed both in yawed and non-yawed conditions using the Gaussian wake profile (13). In Figure 13, the overall velocity deficit in yawed mode the deficit is 6.15% less than that in non-yawed mode.

Figure 13: Non-yawed and yawed scenarios for overall velocity deficit

Further, Figure 14 illustrates the normalized velocity at WT_{12} for different upwind turbines.

Figure 14: Normalized velocity for WT_{12} for non-yawed (black) and yawed (blue) scenario

Velocity for WT_2 and WT_3 renders the fact that the due to the large longitudinal distance ($6D_0$) to WT_{12} , the velocity deficit with yaw misaligned is not pronounced. Further, for WT_7, WT_9 and WT_{10} power capture is found to be notable when the upwind turbines are yawed. At $y/D_0 = 0$, the turbine power is minimum as it indicates the wake center position. Table 3 highlights the wind power tapped by respective turbines with reference to the layout shown in Figure 9. The powers for non-yawed (P_{ny}) and yawed (P_y) scenario are calculated with a freestream wind speed of $v_0 = 10$ m/sec, and the power capture with yawed upwind turbines outperforms that in non-yawed scenario for each turbine. A 1.7% rise in the overall farm power is observed with operation in the yawed scenario. In other related analyses for power maximization with yaw correction, Adaramola et al. carried a wind tunnel experiment to study the outcome of yawing the upwind turbine on the downwind turbine [24] and observed a noteworthy increase in the power coefficient of downstream turbine at $3D_0$ downstream distance away. Since the proposed methodology is solely based on the transfer function blocks, the computational complexity for analyzing the wind farm performance does not arise. Dynamic scenarios in the atmospheric boundary layer pose significant challenges to wake center estimation in form of turbulent eddies that arise due to Coriolis forces. With availability of accurate wind measurement devices like Lidar, wind farm controllers can take appropriate actions to cope with time periods of power sags. Further, experimental investigation carried out by General Electric suggests that managing turbulent wakes increases the plant energy output in the range of 0.5-2% [48].

6. Conclusions and Future scope

A novel closed loop control methodology aimed at effective tracking of the wake center of the upwind turbine, that is based on transfer function formulation is proposed in the present work. Taking leverage of a data drive approach, a transfer function model relating yaw angle and wake center for a multiple

328 wake case is estimated. To determine the effective wake center for a given
 329 upwind turbine WT_{12} , the overall velocity deficit as seen by WT_{12} is used.
 330 Utilizing advanced controllers, wake management integrates scenarios that deal
 331 with stochastic wind environment along with micro-siting related issues. In the
 332 present case, lidar based measurement methodology outperforms Kalman filter
 333 technique in a more accurate wake center estimation. Scenarios with different
 334 wind conditions in the range of 8-10 m/sec and 4-25 m/sec are tested and
 335 results indicate an increase of 1.7% and 0.675% respectively. This study can be
 336 extended in future for offshore wind platform where the dominant wave-current
 337 will have a significant influence on the dynamic loading of the turbine structure.

338 **Acknowledgements**

339 Dr Foley's research is funded by the Northern Ireland Department for Eco-
 340 nomics, the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) and
 341 NSFC jointly funded iGIVE project (EP/L001063/1), the Collaborative RE-
 342 search of Decentralization, Electrification, Communications and Economics (CRE-
 343 DENCE) project, which is funded by a US-Ireland Department for the Economy
 344 (DfE), Science Foundation Ireland (SFI), National Science Foundation (NSF)
 345 and Research and Development Partnership Program (Centre to Centre) award
 346 (grant number USI 110) and the SPIRE2 (Storage Platform for the Integration
 347 of Renewable Energy 2) project, funded by the Special European Programmes
 348 Body (SEUPB) under the European Unions INTERREG VA programme.

349 **References**

- 350 [1] S. Chowdhury, J. Zhang, A. Messac, L. Castillo, Unrestricted wind farm
 351 layout optimization (UWFLO): Investigating key factors influencing the
 352 maximum power generation, Renewable Energy 38 (1) (2012) 16-30.
- 353 [2] J. F. Manwell, Wind energy explained : theory, design and application,
 354 Wiley, Chichester, U.K, 2009.

- 355 [3] C. L. Archer, A. Vassel-Be-Hagh, C. Yan, S. Wu, Y. Pan, J. F. Brodie,
356 A. E. Maguire, Review and evaluation of wake loss models for wind energy
357 applications, *Applied Energy* 226 (2018) 1187–1207.
- 358 [4] J. K. Sethi, D. Deb, M. Malakar, Modeling of a wind turbine farm in
359 presence of wake interactions, in: 2011 International Conference on Energy,
360 Automation and Signal, IEEE, 2011.
- 361 [5] T. Göçmen, P. van der Laan, P.-E. Réthoré, A. P. Diaz, G. C. Larsen,
362 S. Ott, Wind turbine wake models developed at the technical university of
363 denmark: A review, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 60 (2016)
364 752–769.
- 365 [6] N. Jensen, A note on wind generator interaction, 1983.
- 366 [7] S. Frandsen, R. Barthelmie, S. Pryor, O. Rathmann, S. Larsen, J. Højstrup,
367 M. Thøgersen, Analytical modelling of wind speed deficit in large offshore
368 wind farms, *Wind Energy* 9 (1-2) (2006) 39–53.
- 369 [8] J. Ainslie, Calculating the flowfield in the wake of wind turbines, *Journal of*
370 *Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics* 27 (1-3) (1988) 213–224.
- 371 [9] A. Crespo, J. Hernandez, S. Frandsen, Survey of modelling methods for wind
372 turbine wakes and wind farms, *Wind Energy* 2 (1) (1999) 1–24.
- 373 [10] R. J. Barthelmie, K. Hansen, S. T. Frandsen, O. Rathmann, J. G. Schep-
374 ers, W. Schlez, J. Phillips, K. Rados, A. Zervos, E. S. Politis, P. K.
375 Chaviaropoulos, Modelling and measuring flow and wind turbine wakes
376 in large wind farms offshore, *Wind Energy* 12 (5) (2009) 431–444.
- 377 [11] F. Porté-Agel, Y.-T. Wu, C.-H. Chen, A numerical study of the effects of
378 wind direction on turbine wakes and power losses in a large wind farm,
379 *Energies* 6 (10) (2013) 5297–5313.
- 380 [12] Y.-K. Wu, Y.-S. Su, Z. Lee, T.-Y. Wu, Estimation of wake losses in an
381 offshore wind farm by WAsP - a real project case study in taiwan, in: 10th

- 382 International Conference on Advances in Power System Control, Operation
383 & Management (APSCOM 2015), Institution of Engineering and Technol-
384 ogy, 2015. doi:10.1049/ic.2015.0264.
- 385 [13] L. Tian, W. Zhu, W. Shen, N. Zhao, Z. Shen, Development and validation
386 of a new two-dimensional wake model for wind turbine wakes, *Journal of*
387 *Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics* 137 (2015) 90–99.
- 388 [14] T. Ishihara, G.-W. Qian, A new gaussian-based analytical wake model for
389 wind turbines considering ambient turbulence intensities and thrust coef-
390 ficient effects, *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*
391 177 (2018) 275–292.
- 392 [15] R. J. Stevens, L. A. Martínez-Tossas, C. Meneveau, Comparison of wind
393 farm large eddy simulations using actuator disk and actuator line models
394 with wind tunnel experiments, *Renewable Energy* 116 (2018) 470–478.
- 395 [16] F. Porté-Agel, Y.-T. Wu, H. Lu, R. J. Conzemius, Large-eddy simulation
396 of atmospheric boundary layer flow through wind turbines and wind farms,
397 *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics* 99 (4) (2011)
398 154–168.
- 399 [17] Y.-T. Wu, F. Porté-Agel, Modeling turbine wakes and power losses within
400 a wind farm using LES: An application to the horns rev offshore wind farm,
401 *Renewable Energy* 75 (2015) 945–955.
- 402 [18] H. Schümann, F. Pierella, L. Sætran, Experimental investigation of wind
403 turbine wakes in the wind tunnel, *Energy Procedia* 35 (2013) 285–296.
- 404 [19] J. Park, K. H. Law, Layout optimization for maximizing wind farm power
405 production using sequential convex programming, *Applied Energy* 151
406 (2015) 320–334.
- 407 [20] J. S. González, A. G. G. Rodriguez, J. C. Mora, J. R. Santos, M. B. Payan,
408 Optimization of wind farm turbines layout using an evolutive algorithm,
409 *Renewable Energy* 35 (8) (2010) 1671–1681.

- 410 [21] D. Schlipf, M. Kühn, Prospects of a collective pitch control by means of
 411 predictive disturbance compensation assisted by wind speed measurements,
 412 Proceedings of the 9th German Wind Energy Conference DEWEK, 26th
 413 to 27th November, Bremen, Germany, 2008.
- 414 [22] F. Dunne, L. Pao, A. Wright, B. Jonkman, N. Kelley, Combining standard
 415 feedback controllers with feedforward blade pitch control for load mitigation
 416 in wind turbines, in: 48th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting Including
 417 the New Horizons Forum and Aerospace Exposition, American Institute of
 418 Aeronautics and Astronautics, 2010.
- 419 [23] M. Vali, V. Petrovic, S. Boersma, J.-W. van Wingerden, L. Y. Pao,
 420 M. Kuhn, Model predictive active power control of waked wind farms, in:
 421 2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC), IEEE, 2018.
- 422 [24] M. Adaramola, P.-Å. Krogstad, Experimental investigation of wake effects
 423 on wind turbine performance, *Renewable Energy* 36 (8) (2011) 2078–2086.
- 424 [25] Z. Dar, K. Kar, O. Sahni, J. H. Chow, Windfarm power optimization using
 425 yaw angle control, *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy* 8 (1) (2017)
 426 104–116.
- 427 [26] B. Dou, M. Guala, L. Lei, P. Zeng, Experimental investigation of the per-
 428 formance and wake effect of a small-scale wind turbine in a wind tunnel,
 429 *Energy* 166 (2019) 819–833.
- 430 [27] D. Schlipf, T. Fischer, C. E. Carcangiu, M. Rossetti, E. Bossanyi, Load
 431 analysis of look-ahead collective pitch control using lidar, Proceedings of
 432 the 10th German Wind Energy Conference DEWEK, 2010.
- 433 [28] V. Rezaei, LIDAR-based robust wind-scheduled control of wind turbines,
 434 in: 2014 American Control Conference, IEEE, 2014.
- 435 [29] S. Raach, D. Schlipf, P. W. Cheng, Lidar-based wake tracking for closed-
 436 loop wind farm control, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 753 (2016)
 437 052009.

- 438 [30] S. Cacciola, M. Bertelè, J. Schreiber, C. Bottasso, Wake center position
439 tracking using downstream wind turbine hub loads, *Journal of Physics:*
440 *Conference Series* 753 (2016) 032036.
- 441 [31] R. J. Barthelmie, S. C. Pryor, Automated wind turbine wake characteriza-
442 tion in complex terrain, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques Discussions*
443 (2019) 1–31.
- 444 [32] S. Raach, D. Schlipf, F. Borisade, P. W. Cheng, Wake redirecting using
445 feedback control to improve the power output of wind farms, in: 2016
446 American Control Conference (ACC), IEEE, 2016.
- 447 [33] H. S. Dhiman, D. Deb, V. Muresan, V. E. Balas, Wake management in
448 wind farms: An adaptive control approach, *Energies* 12 (7). doi:10.3390/
449 en12071247.
- 450 [34] H. S. Dhiman, D. Deb, Decision and Control in Hybrid Wind Farms,
451 Springer Singapore, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-981-15-0275-0.
- 452 [35] E. Simley, L. Pao, R. Frehlich, B. Jonkman, N. Kelley, Analysis of wind
453 speed measurements using continuous wave LIDAR for wind turbine con-
454 trol, in: 49th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting including the New Hori-
455 zons Forum and Aerospace Exposition, American Institute of Aeronautics
456 and Astronautics, 2011.
- 457 [36] The wind and wind turbines, in: *Wind Turbine Control Systems*, Springer
458 London, 2007, pp. 7–28.
- 459 [37] P. Fleming, J. Annoni, J. J. Shah, L. Wang, S. Ananthan, Z. Zhang,
460 K. Hutchings, P. Wang, W. Chen, L. Chen, Field test of wake steering
461 at an offshore wind farm, *Wind Energy Science* 2 (1) (2017) 229–239.
- 462 [38] G.-W. Qian, T. Ishihara, A new analytical wake model for yawed wind
463 turbines, *Energies* 11 (3) (2018) 665.

- [39] Á. Jiménez, A. Crespo, E. Migoya, Application of a LES technique to characterize the wake deflection of a wind turbine in yaw, *Wind Energy* 13 (6) (2009) 559–572.
- [40] E. Machefaux, G. C. Larsen, N. Troldborg, M. Gaunaa, A. Rettenmeier, Empirical modeling of single-wake advection and expansion using full-scale pulsed lidar-based measurements, *Wind Energy* 18 (12) (2014) 2085–2103.
- [41] L. Vollmer, G. Steinfeld, D. Heinemann, M. Kühn, Estimating the wake deflection downstream of a wind turbine in different atmospheric stabilities: an LES study, *Wind Energy Science* 1 (2) (2016) 129–141.
- [42] M. Bastankhah, F. Porté-Agel, A new analytical model for wind-turbine wakes, *Renewable Energy* 70 (2014) 116–123.
- [43] I. Katic, J. Højstrup, N. Jensen, A Simple Model for Cluster Efficiency, A. Raguzzi, 1987, pp. 407–410.
- [44] MathWorks, Curve fitting toolbox - matlab, <https://in.mathworks.com/products/curvefitting.html>, (Accessed on 10/21/2019) (2019).
- [45] S. H. Shahalami, D. Farsi, Analysis of load frequency control in a restructured multi-area power system with the kalman filter and the LQR controller, *AEU - International Journal of Electronics and Communications* 86 (2018) 25–46.
- [46] MathWorks, [https://in.mathworks.com/products/sysid.html?requesteddomain=, https://in.mathworks.com/products/sysid.html?requestedDomain=,](https://in.mathworks.com/products/sysid.html?requesteddomain=,https://in.mathworks.com/products/sysid.html?requestedDomain=,) (Accessed on 10/21/2019) (2019).
- [47] K. Thomsen, P. Sørensen, Fatigue loads for wind turbines operating in wakes, *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics* 80 (1-2) (1999) 121–136.
- [48] R. Burra, A. Ambekar, H. Narang, E. Liu, C. Mehendale, L. Thirer, K. Longtin, M. Shah, N. Miller, GE brilliant wind farms, in: 2014 IEEE

491 Symposium on Power Electronics and Machines for Wind and Water Ap-
492 plications, IEEE, 2014.

Lidar assisted wake redirection in wind farms: A data driven approach

Harsh S. Dhiman^a, Dipankar Deb^a, Aoife M. Foley^b

^a*Department of Electrical Engineering,
Institute of Infrastructure Technology Research and Management, Ahmedabad, India
380026.*

^b*School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering,
Queens University, Belfast, Northern Ireland, United Kingdom BT9 5AH*

Abstract

Lidar based wind measurement is an integral part of wind farm control. The major issues and challenges in power maximization include the potential losses due to wake effect observed among wind turbines. This manuscript presents a wake management technique that utilizes lidar simulations for wake redirection. The proposed methodology is validated for 2-turbine and 15-turbine wind farm layouts involving a PI control based yaw angle correction. Yaw angle misalignment using wake center tracking of the upstream turbines is used to increase the power generation levels. Results of wake center estimation are compared with a Kalman filter based method. Further, the velocity deficit and overall farm power improvement by yaw angle correction is calculated. Results reveal a 1.7% and 0.675% increase in total wind farm power for two different wind speed cases.

Keywords: Center of Wake, Lidar, Transfer function, Velocity deficit, Yaw angle, Wake effect

1 Abbreviations

2 HAWT Horizontal Axis Wind Turbine

Email addresses: harsh.dhiman.17pe@iitram.ac.in (Harsh S. Dhiman),
dipankardeb@iitram.ac.in (Dipankar Deb), a.foley@qub.ac.uk (Aoife M. Foley)

3	IPC	Individual Pitch Control
4	LIDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
5	PI	Proportional Integral Control

6 1. Introduction

7 Growing energy demands are rapidly facilitating the wind turbine installa-
8 tions globally in the form of large wind parks to convert the energy available
9 from moving air to electrical energy. Due to constrained land area and cost of
10 equipment one has to design a proper wind farm layout for energy generation [1].
11 Wind power capture by wind turbine is affected by many factors like wind direc-
12 tion, speed and optimal turbine spacing [2]. For a given terrain, wind turbines
13 must be placed at an optimal operating distance from each other to avoid poten-
14 tial derating caused by wind wakes which are aerodynamic phenomena leading
15 to (a) reduction in wind speed magnitude at the downstream turbine, and (b)
16 increased air turbulence causing mechanical loading on the turbine structure [3].
17 Sethi et al. presented the modelling of wind farms considering wake interactions
18 [4]. The wake effect is studied in terms of effective wind speed for wind farm
19 layouts. Wind wakes typically are dominant over near wake and far wake region
20 that extend up to $4D_0$ and $8D_0$ respectively, where D_0 is the rotor diameter.
21 Wind wakes causing power loss for an individual wind turbine, has led to the
22 development of many analytical and field models to study the same [5].

23 Among analytical models, Jensen's [6], Frandsen's [7] and Ainslie's [8] wake
24 model form kinematic wake models, which commonly use algebraic equations
25 to characterize wake deficit. Jensen's wake model is validated and tested for
26 accommodating the power losses due to wake effect and are found in an accept-
27 able range of 10-20% [9, 10, 11, 12]. A new two dimensional Jensen wake model
28 is proposed by Tian et al. that incorporates a variable wake decay rate rather
29 than a constant one. Numerical simulations are performed for computing the
30 wake deficit and are compared with field measurements. Results reveal that

such a wake model underestimates for near-wake regions [13]. Ishihara et al. have presented an analytical model that encapsulates the effect of thrust coefficient and air turbulence on the wake deficit [14]. The numerical simulations are compared with a test carried out in wind tunnel and results of the proposed analytical model are in good agreement with experimental analysis. In terms of Large-eddy simulation (LES), the wake flow is studied in neutral atmospheric boundary layer, where the aerodynamic effects on the rotor body and blade element are modeled separately in order to assess power losses [15, 16, 17].

Experimental results from a wind turbine with rotor diameter 0.9 m placed 4 rotor diameters from the wind inlet section and wake velocity distribution, and measured at a downstream distance of $0.6D_0$ and $3D_0$ have shown up to 40% power loss and 80% increased dynamic loading on the turbine structure [18]. Wake study is also important in Wind farm layout optimization (WFLOP) where optimal placement of the wind turbines leads to to minimum wake effect and maximum power capture [19]. Gonzalez et al. have further discussed an evolution based algorithm for optimal wind farm layout [20] to determine net power produced considering the losses occurred due to wake effects. Pitch and yaw angle control techniques are two common ways of increasing power capture. Schlipf et al. demonstrated a Proportional-Integral (PI) control based pitch controller that mitigates dynamic load variations in rotor speed caused due to severe conditions up to 80% [21]. The performance of a traditional feedback control is tested against feed-forward blade pitch control to achieve dynamic load mitigation along with improved life. Results reveal that the feed-forward controller performs better [22].

Vali et al. have utilized a MPAC method for wind farms, to minimize the reference error in wind farm [23]. A methodology based on adjoint MPC is implemented for 6-turbine wind farm where the time-varying signal is tracked against a reference power. Experimental analysis for power improvement using yaw control is studied in [24] for longitudinal distances of $3D_0$ and $6D_0$. In terms of power optimization, a yaw angle based approach is adopted, for single column

61 wind farm layout where axial induction factor for downstream turbines is kept
 62 fixed [25]. An experimental study for a small-scale turbine with wake structure
 63 and turbine parameters such as yaw angle, pitch angle and tip speed ratio are
 64 monitored for a favorable operating performance [26]. In [27], Lidar assisted
 65 measurements along with a look-ahead controller is adopted to curb dynamic
 66 load through fatigue analysis. A concept of an equivalent load generated given
 67 the load is subjected to exact load for its entire lifetime is utilized. In [28], for
 68 generator speed regulation, a wind-scheduled control is analysed where for the
 69 conditions above rated value, Lidar based control suppresses the irregularities
 70 in an accurate wind speed measurement. In [29], Lidar is leveraged to trace the
 71 flow caused due wake effect and a desired yaw angle set point is achieved.

72 In a wind farm where the power losses are incurred due to wake, velocity
 73 deficit can be used as a standardized parameter to characterize losses. Given
 74 the spatial coordinates (a, b, c) representing the position in the wake field repre-
 75 senting maximum power loss, the region is termed as the wake center. Cacciola
 76 et al. have used the hub loads and sensors at the downwind turbine to acquire
 77 wind velocity deficit data and horizontal shear via an optimization approach for
 78 wake center detection without considering yaw misalignment [30]. In [31], au-
 79 thors have discussed an autonomous wake characterization approach to identify
 80 wake center position for nonidentical atmospheric conditions. A Doppler lidar
 81 is used to scan from January 2017 to June 2017 and results indicate that the
 82 wake center position shifts when stable atmospheric conditions exist. Raach et
 83 al. explored the possibility of implementing a H_∞ controller for wake redirec-
 84 tion based on yaw angle control and a closed-loop performance for the system is
 85 analysed [32]. In [33], a wake management strategy is presented using adaptive
 86 control technique for wind farms where uncertainties are dominant. Further in
 87 [34], decision making and control aspect for a hybrid wind farm are discussed.

88 The prime contribution of this manuscript is LIDAR based simulation for
 89 closed-loop wake center control. The wind turbine and wake are modeled as
 90 transfer functions and the estimated wake center is made to follow a desired

reference yaw angle trajectory. The proposed methodology is validated for a 15 turbine wind farm layout and the power improvement for each turbine is assessed when upstream turbine(s) are yawed. The wake center estimation are compared with Kalman filter estimations. The subsequent sections are organized as follows. Section 2 entails wake center estimation for multi-model and multiple wake scenario based on proposed transfer function based methodology and Kalman filter. Section 3 highlights performance parameters like farm power production and air turbulence whereas Section 4 discusses the simulation results for proposed methodology and Kalman filter method for a 15-turbine farm configuration. Section 5 highlights discussions, and is followed by Conclusions.

2. Multi-model Wake center estimation and control of Wind Farms

Closed-loop control methodology, as applied to wind farms, primarily built around two main tasks: (i) measures the estimated wind field and, (ii) controls the wake center position. Wind field measurement using lidar accurately processes the controller requirements. LIDAR (Light Detection and Ranging System) sensor utilizes laser based detection and ranging to measure an upstream turbine's effective wind speed at d_{lidar} , the lidar distance. The yaw angle modification potentially reduces the power delivered by an upstream turbine and causes the reverse effect on the downstream turbine. The calculation of the wind speed is done prior to the interaction of the incident wind with the turbine, so as to provide sufficient time for real-time control action [35]. Subsystems related to closed-loop control based on PI control of wake center estimation are described next for desired yaw angle, in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Block diagram for the system under study

114 *2.1. Wind turbine model and wake center estimation*

115 Using actuator disk theory, the power delivered from i^{th} turbine is given as

$$P_i = \frac{1}{2} \rho A_0 C_p u_i^3, \quad (1)$$

116 for density of air ρ , swept area A_0 , power coefficient C_p , and wind speed u_i
 117 for i^{th} turbine [36]. However, for wind turbines in yawed condition, the output
 118 obtained from an upstream turbine is modified by $\cos^q \gamma$, with q being a tunable
 119 parameter in the range (1.4, 2.2) as reported by Fleming et al. [37]. The yaw
 120 dynamics for an upstream turbine is expressed as

$$\ddot{\gamma} + 2\zeta\omega\dot{\gamma} = \omega^2 (\gamma_{ref} - \gamma), \quad (2)$$

121 for undamped eigen frequency ω , damping factor ζ , desired yaw angle γ_{ref} .

122 The transfer function is estimated with an accuracy of 99.99% using system
 123 identification toolbox with γ_{ref} as input and γ as the actual yaw angle, which
 124 is varied from $(-25^\circ, 25^\circ)$, with $n_p = 2$ poles and $n_z = 1$ zero, determined as

$$G_1(s) = \frac{0.533s + 0.01094}{s^2 + 0.1538s + 0.002736}. \quad (3)$$

125 Optimized output in yawed condition of a turbine as formulated by Qian et al.
 126 [38] is expressed as

$$P_i = \frac{1}{2} \rho A_0 C_p u_i^3 \cos^2(\gamma_i). \quad (4)$$

127 The deflection in wake flow caused due to yaw position for a given upstream
 128 turbine, as postulated by Jimnez et al. [39], is

$$\delta(d) = \frac{\xi_{init} \left(15 \left(\frac{2k_d d}{D_0} + 1 \right)^4 + \xi_{init}^2 \right)}{\frac{30k_d}{D_0} \left(\frac{2k_d d}{D_0} + 1 \right)^5} - \frac{\xi_{init} D_0 (15 + \xi_{init}^2)}{30k_d}, \quad (5)$$

$$\xi_{init}(\gamma, C_T) = \frac{1}{2} \cos^2(\gamma) \sin(\gamma) C_T, \quad (6)$$

129 where ξ_{init} is the initial wake angle, d is the scanning or preview distance used
 130 by lidar, D_0 is the rotor diameter, k_d is the uncertain model parameter and C_T
 131 is the thrust coefficient.

For computation of wake center deflection with changing yaw angles, appropriate lidar distance d_{lidar} is chosen for accurate calculation of the transfer function [40]. A suitable value of the model parameter k_d is selected as 0.15 owing to the turbine operation in neutral boundary layer [41]. The transfer function with 93.76% accuracy for $n_p = 2$ poles and $n_z = 0$ zeros, is of the form

$$G_2(s) = \frac{-0.158}{s^2 + 2.56 \times 10^{-12}s + 0.2404}. \quad (7)$$

The wake center needs to be controlled to ultimately maximize the wind farm power generated. A simple PI controller is tuned using tuning feature of MATLAB/Simulink, is described as

$$f = K_p \left(\delta(\gamma) + \frac{1}{T_i} \int \delta(\gamma) dt \right), \quad (8)$$

where $\delta(\gamma)$ is the estimated wake center, K_p, T_i are the proportional gain and time constant.

2.2. Multi-model Wake center control

The accuracy of the estimation of wake center relies on aspects such as ξ_{init} , d , rotor diameter (D_0) and k_d as in (5). Multi-model wake center estimation is studied with constant k_d , and the scanning distance, d_{lidar} is modified in multiples of D_0 . Table 1 highlights the estimation accuracies of the transfer function models. Using system identification toolbox and different lidar scanning distances, the best fit models are obtained.

Table 1: Estimation accuracies for different lidar scanning distances

Scanning distance, d_{lidar}	Estimation Accuracy (%)
$1D_0$	93.76
$1.5D_0$	95.08
$2D_0$	94.94
$2.5D_0$	94.82
$3D_0$	94.71

Figure 2: Multi-model wake center estimation

Figure 2 illustrates wake center estimation for a multi-model scenario. Bastankhah and Porte-Agel [42] describe a wake model which follows a Gaussian profile for wind speed deficit. Mathematically, it is expressed as a function of thrust coefficient C_T , radial distance r , and wake width x .

$$v = v_0 \left(1 - A(x) e^{-\frac{r^2}{2\sigma^2}} \right), \quad (9)$$

$$A(x) = 1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{C_T}{8(\sigma/D_0)^2}}, \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{\sigma}{D_0} = k \frac{x}{D_0} + \epsilon, \quad (11)$$

where $A(x)$ denotes the maximum normalized velocity deficit for a distance x , and wake width σ which is a function of k representing wake entrainment constant. According to linear superposition principle, the wake deficit due to upstream turbine(s) is expressed as

$$\Delta v_i = \sum_{j=1}^N \left(1 - \frac{v_j}{v_0} \right), \quad (12)$$

for j^{th} upstream turbine, overall velocity deficit Δv_i at i^{th} downstream turbine, and total upstream turbines N . In [43], a quadratic superposition is presented and is expressed as

$$\Delta v_i = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N (\Delta v_j)^2}. \quad (13)$$

160 In non-yawed conditions, power generated at the downstream turbine dwindles
 161 because of shadow effect of upstream turbines, and requires effective wake man-
 162 agement. Yawing the upstream turbine effectively controls the wake center,
 163 and to account for multiple wakes on a downstream turbine from a multiple of
 164 upstream turbines, the transformed thrust coefficient $C_T \cos^3(\gamma_{w,j})$, where $\gamma_{w,j}$
 165 denotes the yaw angle for the j^{th} upwind turbine. Further, modified velocity
 166 deficit for i^{th} downstream turbine is expressed as

$$v_i = v_0 \left(1 - A_{ij}(x) e^{\frac{-r^2}{2\sigma_{ij}^2}} \right), \quad (14)$$

$$A_{ij}(x) = 1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{C_T \cos^3(\gamma_{w,j})}{8(\sigma_{ij}/D_0)^2}}, \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{\sigma_{ij}}{D_0} = k \frac{x_{ij}}{D_0} + \epsilon, \quad (16)$$

$$\beta_w = 0.5 \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - C_T}}{\sqrt{1 - C_T}} \right), \quad (17)$$

167 where $\epsilon = 0.25\sqrt{\beta_w}$, σ_{ij} represents wake width at downstream distance x_{ij}
 168 between j^{th} upstream and i^{th} downstream turbine. The velocity deficit for each
 169 upstream turbine is computed using (14) for yaw angle $\gamma_{w,j}$ and for N upstream
 170 turbines, the overall velocity deficit at i^{th} downstream turbine is calculated
 171 based on the principle of quadratic superposition in (13). Figure 3 illustrates
 172 the proposed methodology for wake redirection for multiple upstream turbines.

Figure 3: Multiple wake scenario based wake center estimation

173 Transfer function models with Multiple-Input Single Output (MISO) config-

174 uration are evaluated for best estimation accuracy, and is expressed as

$$g(y_c) = v_m e^{\frac{-(y_c - \mu_y)^2}{2\sigma_{lidar}^2}}, \quad (18)$$

$$\sigma_{lidar} = kd_{lidar} + \epsilon D_0, \quad (19)$$

175 where y_c , μ_y represent the height of hub and position of the wake center re-
 176 spectively given an overall velocity deficit of $g(y_c)$ for a lidar scanning distance
 177 d_{lidar} and v_m denotes the maximum velocity deficit. The empirical relationship
 178 between effective velocity deficit and effective wake center is estimated using
 179 curve fitting toolbox in MATLAB [44]. In the curve fitting toolbox, the input
 180 quantity is considered as velocity deficit and output quantity as effective wake
 181 center deflection. Using these quantities the curve fitting toolbox utilized for
 182 appropriate fitting.

183 Developed in 1960, Kalman filter is being actively used to estimate the states
 184 in the noisy or disturbed environments. State estimation as perceived by a
 185 Kalman filter is based on a recursive process of a noisy data [45], and is expressed
 186 mathematically as

$$\hat{x}_{t+1} = \mathbf{A}x_t + \mathbf{B}u_t + w_t, \quad (20)$$

$$\hat{y}_t = \mathbf{C}x_t + \mathbf{D}u_t + v_t, \quad (21)$$

187 where $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}$ represent the state-space matrices of the plant, w_t, v_t are pro-
 188 cess and measurement noise at time step t respectively and $\hat{x}_{t+1}$ is the updated
 189 state vector at time step $t + 1$. For the current scenario, Kalman filter tech-
 190 nique is implemented to derive an estimate of the wake center trajectory for a
 191 set of upwind and downwind turbines. Using system identification toolbox, the
 192 transfer function models are computed with yaw angle as input and wake center
 193 deflection as output. In Figure 4, a schematic representation for Kalman filter
 194 based wake center is illustrated.

195 The state-space model can be estimated using system identification toolbox
 196 available in MATLAB [46]. In this toolbox, the input and output data are fed
 197 with a ‘double’ variable which represents a time-varying quantity. The model
 198 simulations can be run for different system orders in order to obtain maximum

Figure 4: Kalman filter technique based wake center estimation

estimation accuracy. From here, the state-space model can be exported and can be used according to the user need.

3. Performance parameters for waked wind farms

Power maximization and optimization of the land available are the two prime objectives for wind farm operators. In case of wake effect, the reduction in power capture is compensated by either changing yaw alignment or changing lateral position of downstream turbine. Since micro-siting is done in priori, yaw misalignment is the preferred choice. Power capture and air turbulence are the two main parameters that affect the performance of a wind farm. Jensen's wake model computes wind speed at distance h and a distance r radially from the wake center line is expressed as

$$v(h, r) = v_0 \left[1 - 2a \left(\frac{r_0}{r_0 + kh} \right)^2 \right], \quad (22)$$

where v_0 is the freestream wind velocity, r_0 denotes rotor radius and k represents wake entrainment factor. The flow behind upwind turbine is deflected by Ω_j when yaw angle is aligned at $\gamma_{w,j}$ and wind direction θ_j expressed as

$$\Omega_j = (0.6a_j + 1)\gamma_{w,j} + \theta_j, \quad (23)$$

213 where a_j is the axial induction factor for turbine $j \in H$ (upstream turbines).

214 Velocity profile for a downwind turbine with yaw misalignment is given as

$$v_i(x, r) = \begin{cases} v_0 \left[1 - 2a_j \left(\frac{1}{1 + 2kT \cos(\Omega_j)} \right)^2 \times \cos^2(4.5\Omega_j) \right], & \Omega_j \leq 20^\circ \\ v_0, & \Omega_j > 20^\circ, \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

215 where $T = \frac{h}{D_0} \in [2, \dots, 5]$ denotes the spacing factor which is a multiple of rotor
 216 diameter. A yaw angle of $\gamma_{w,j}$ on the upstream turbine WT_j diverts the wake
 217 flow for a downwind turbine WT_i by an angle of Ω_j arrives at a velocity profile
 218 like (24). A yawed upstream turbine now captures power which is changed by
 219 a factor of $\cos^3 \gamma_w$.

220 Further, dynamic loading on downstream is a challenging issue that causes
 221 catastrophic damage to rotor blades and tower. The resulting air turbulence can
 222 be reduced by changing yaw angle $\gamma_{w,j}$ of upstream turbine. Mathematically,
 223 the overall turbulence intensity is given as

$$E_{eff} = \sqrt{E_a^2 + K^2 \sum_{j=1}^N (1 - \sqrt{1 - C_T \cos \gamma_{w,j}}) h_i^{-2/3}}, \quad (25)$$

224 where E_a denotes the ambient air turbulence whereas E_{eff} being computed for
 225 a downwind distance h_i for N upstream turbines and K is constant with a value
 226 of 0.93 [47].

227 4. Numerical Simulations for Proposed Methodology

228 Next, the proposed methodology for closed-loop control of wake center for 2-
 229 turbine and 15-turbine wind farm layout is presented. For 2-turbine wind farm,
 230 the intent is to track wake center of WT_1 (upwind) and examine the impact on
 231 the performance parameters of WT_2 (downstream).

232 Throughout the simulation, wind turbines with same rotor diameter of 80
 233 meters are considered. WT_1 and WT_2 are placed 400 meters apart. The wake
 234 center is estimated using lidar simulation for desired yaw control based on
 235 methodology discussed in Section 2. Initially, the yaw angle of WT_1 is $\gamma_w = 0^\circ$

Figure 5: 2-turbine layout for wake deflection

and lidar scanning distance is kept $1D_0$. In order to validate the proposed methodology, a 500 second simulation is carried out for 2-turbine layout. Figure 6 illustrates the wake center simulation using proposed methodology.

Figure 6: Desired yaw angle alignment and wake center for 2-turbine layout

The wake center reference is changed at $t=250$ seconds for desired yaw angle setting based on a PI control technique. Based on this, a 1000 second simulation is carried out to evaluate the performance parameters for 2-turbine wind farm layout. The yaw angle setting for WT_1 , γ_w is changed at $t=500$ second where the mean wind speed is changed from 8 m/sec to 10 m/sec.

From Figure 7, it is observed that the total wind power extracted has increased by 7.52%. In a similar study presented by Raach et al. [29] with same rotor diameter of turbines, the total power increase is reported around 4.5%.

Figure 7: Wake deflection and power output with and without redirection

247 The net wind farm power increases due to high fidelity lidar measurements
 248 that accurately measure the deflection caused by yaw misalignment. The yaw
 249 angle misalignment also affects the air turbulence intensity on downstream wind
 250 turbine. For a fixed yaw angle of an upstream turbine, the turbulence decreases
 251 as the longitudinal distance between the turbines is increased. Figure 8 illus-
 252 trates the turbulence acting on WT_2 as a result of varying downstream distance.

Figure 8: Effective air turbulence at WT_2

253 Keeping longitudinal distance fixed, for given yaw misalignment, the effec-
 254 tive turbulence acting on WT_2 is found minimum for $\gamma_w = 30^\circ$. Wake center

control is analyzed for a 15 turbine wind farm with WT_{12} facing wake effect from $WT_2, WT_3, WT_4, WT_5, WT_7, WT_9$ and WT_{10} . In Figure 9, the distances between turbines in terms of rotor diameter are illustrated. Yaw angles of upstream turbines WT_j for $j \in [2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10]$ are chosen as $\gamma_2 = 2^\circ$, $\gamma_3 = 2.5^\circ$, $\gamma_4 = 5^\circ$, $\gamma_5 = 7^\circ$, $\gamma_7 = 9^\circ$, $\gamma_9 = 10^\circ$ and $\gamma_{10} = 15^\circ$ and when yawed, the wake center deflection is controlled by determining effective velocity deficit.

Figure 9: 15 turbine layout in non-yawed (black solid line) and yawed mode (red solid line)

The empirical relationship between overall velocity deficit and wake center deflection (18) is converted into an overall transfer function having multiple-inputs and single output (MISO) topology. LIDAR is mounted at nacelle of WT_{12} that scans the wind flow for all upwind turbines. For estimating the wake width, a scan distance $d_{lidar} = 2D_0$ is considered.

In Figures 10 and 11, the wake center estimation by the proposed transfer function methodology and by Kalman filter based technique is presented.

Figure 10: Wake center estimation by proposed model (blue dotted line) and reference wake center (black solid line) for upwind turbines of WT_{12}

269

Figure 11: Wake center estimation by proposed model (red solid line) and Kalman filter (green dotted line) for upwind turbines of WT_{12}

270

271 5. Discussions

272 The wind turbine power improvement in the 15-turbine farm layout when
 273 operated in yaw mode is tested for a wind profile of 500 seconds illustrated in
 274 Figure 12.

Figure 12: Wind speed profile for the range 4-25 m/sec

275 The wind in this case ranges from 4 m/sec to 25 m/sec. For the first 100
 276 seconds the wind speed is 4 m/sec, the from 100 to 250 seconds wind speed is
 277 15 m/sec and for the last 250 seconds the speed is 25 m/sec. The mean wind
 278 power captured by each wind turbine is calculated for non-yawed (P_{ny}) and
 279 yawed (P_y) scenario. Table 2 depicts the improvement in wind power captured
 280 for each turbine and it is observed that for WT_1 the wind power captured
 281 remains same as it is not yawed. For WT_2 and WT_3 , the wind power decreases
 282 in yawed mode as they are the upstream turbines. For turbines WT_4 to WT_{15} ,
 283 the power captured in yawed mode increases as yawing deflects the wake away
 284 from downstream turbine. Overall, for the wind speed profile illustrated in
 285 Figure 12, the mean power captured by the wind farm in non-yawed mode is
 286 160.3364 MW while in yawed mode it is 161.418 MW thus indicating an increase
 287 of 0.675%.

Table 2: Mean turbine power in non-yawed and yawed condition for wind profile in the range 4-25 m/sec

Turbine	Upwind Turbine	Power (P_{ny}) (MW)	Power (P_y) (MW)	% change
WT_1	NA	14.3044	14.3044	0.00
WT_2	NA	14.3044	14.2782	-0.183
WT_3	NA	14.3044	14.2636	-0.285
WT_4	1,2	10.9830	10.9890	+0.0546
WT_5	2,3	11.704	11.709	+0.0427
WT_6	1,4	12.215	12.219	+0.0327
WT_7	2,4,5	9.4873	9.4918	+0.047
WT_8	3,5	10.0182	10.188	+1.690
WT_9	1,4,6,7	9.2660	9.2704	+0.0475
WT_{10}	2,5,7,9	9.2478	9.2519	+0.0440
WT_{11}	1,2,4,6,9	8.9314	9.09320	+1.811
WT_{12}	2,3,4,5,7,9,10	8.9126	9.09261	+1.2734
WT_{13}	3,5,8	8.8956	9.0942	+2.2320
WT_{14}	2,3,4,5,7,9,10,12	8.8831	9.0988	+2.3130
WT_{15}	2,5,7,8,10,12,13,14	8.8792	9.0987	+2.3511
$\sum P_{ny} = 160.3364 \quad \sum P_y = 161.418$				

Table 3: Wind turbine power captured for non-yawed and yawed scenario with wind speed range 8-10 m/sec

Turbine	Upwind Turbine	Power (P_{ny}) (MW)	Power (P_y) (MW)	% change
WT_1	NA	2.8274	2.8274	0.00
WT_2	NA	2.8274	2.8223	-0.1800
WT_3	NA	2.8274	2.8223	-0.1800
WT_4	1,2	1.5074	1.5116	+0.2786
WT_5	2,3	2.6816	2.6916	+0.3729
WT_6	1,4	2.0666	2.0891	+1.0887
WT_7	2,4,5	2.0561	2.1541	+4.7663
WT_8	3,5	2.0162	2.1130	+4.8011
WT_9	1,4,6,7	2.0053	2.1016	+4.8022
WT_{10}	2,5,7,9	2.0001	2.0884	+4.4414
WT_{11}	1,2,4,6,9	2.0761	2.0962	+0.9681
WT_{12}	2,3,4,5,7,9,10	1.9821	1.9959	+0.6962
WT_{13}	3,5,8	2.0752	2.0965	+0.9782
WT_{14}	2,3,4,5,7,9,10,12	1.9701	1.9862	+0.8172
WT_{15}	2,5,7,8,10,12,13,14	1.9970	2.0866	+4.4867
$\sum P_{ny} = 32.916 \quad \sum P_y = 33.483$				

Results from Figures 10 and 11 indicate that Kalman filter based technique fails to track the wake center deflection accurately due to nonlinear nature and stochastic of wind speed. Contrary to Kalman filter, the proposed transfer function based technique tracks the reference wake center with accuracy. The velocity deficit caused due to each upwind turbine for this layout is computed both in yawed and non-yawed conditions using the Gaussian wake profile (13). In Figure 13, the overall velocity deficit in yawed mode the deficit is 6.15% less than that in non-yawed mode.

Figure 13: Non-yawed and yawed scenarios for overall velocity deficit

Further, Figure 14 illustrates the normalized velocity at WT_{12} for different upwind turbines.

Figure 14: Normalized velocity for WT_{12} for non-yawed (black) and yawed (blue) scenario

Velocity for WT_2 and WT_3 renders the fact that the due to the large longitudinal distance ($6D_0$) to WT_{12} , the velocity deficit with yaw misaligned is not pronounced. Further, for WT_7, WT_9 and WT_{10} power capture is found to be notable when the upwind turbines are yawed. At $y/D_0 = 0$, the turbine power is minimum as it indicates the wake center position. Table 3 highlights the wind power tapped by respective turbines with reference to the layout shown in Figure 9. The powers for non-yawed (P_{ny}) and yawed (P_y) scenario are calculated with a freestream wind speed of $v_0 = 10$ m/sec, and the power capture with yawed upwind turbines outperforms that in non-yawed scenario for each turbine. A 1.7% rise in the overall farm power is observed with operation in the yawed scenario. In other related analyses for power maximization with yaw correction, Adaramola et al. carried a wind tunnel experiment to study the outcome of yawing the upwind turbine on the downwind turbine [24] and observed a noteworthy increase in the power coefficient of downstream turbine at $3D_0$ downstream distance away. Since the proposed methodology is solely based on the transfer function blocks, the computational complexity for analyzing the wind farm performance does not arise. Dynamic scenarios in the atmospheric boundary layer pose significant challenges to wake center estimation in form of turbulent eddies that arise due to Coriolis forces. With availability of accurate wind measurement devices like Lidar, wind farm controllers can take appropriate actions to cope with time periods of power sags. Further, experimental investigation carried out by General Electric suggests that managing turbulent wakes increases the plant energy output in the range of 0.5-2% [48].

6. Conclusions and Future scope

A novel closed loop control methodology aimed at effective tracking of the wake center of the upwind turbine, that is based on transfer function formulation is proposed in the present work. Taking leverage of a data drive approach, a transfer function model relating yaw angle and wake center for a multiple

328 wake case is estimated. To determine the effective wake center for a given
 329 upwind turbine WT_{12} , the overall velocity deficit as seen by WT_{12} is used.
 330 Utilizing advanced controllers, wake management integrates scenarios that deal
 331 with stochastic wind environment along with micro-siting related issues. In the
 332 present case, lidar based measurement methodology outperforms Kalman filter
 333 technique in a more accurate wake center estimation. Scenarios with different
 334 wind conditions in the range of 8-10 m/sec and 4-25 m/sec are tested and
 335 results indicate an increase of 1.7% and 0.675% respectively. This study can be
 336 extended in future for offshore wind platform where the dominant wave-current
 337 will have a significant influence on the dynamic loading of the turbine structure.

338 **Acknowledgements**

339 Dr Foley's research is funded by the Northern Ireland Department for Eco-
 340 nomics, the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) and
 341 NSFC jointly funded iGIVE project (EP/L001063/1), the Collaborative RE-
 342 search of Decentralization, Electrification, Communications and Economics (CRE-
 343 DENCE) project, which is funded by a US-Ireland Department for the Economy
 344 (DfE), Science Foundation Ireland (SFI), National Science Foundation (NSF)
 345 and Research and Development Partnership Program (Centre to Centre) award
 346 (grant number USI 110) and the SPIRE2 (Storage Platform for the Integration
 347 of Renewable Energy 2) project, funded by the Special European Programmes
 348 Body (SEUPB) under the European Unions INTERREG VA programme.

349 **References**

- 350 [1] S. Chowdhury, J. Zhang, A. Messac, L. Castillo, Unrestricted wind farm
 351 layout optimization (UWFLO): Investigating key factors influencing the
 352 maximum power generation, Renewable Energy 38 (1) (2012) 16-30.
- 353 [2] J. F. Manwell, Wind energy explained : theory, design and application,
 354 Wiley, Chichester, U.K, 2009.

- [3] C. L. Archer, A. Vassel-Be-Hagh, C. Yan, S. Wu, Y. Pan, J. F. Brodie, A. E. Maguire, Review and evaluation of wake loss models for wind energy applications, *Applied Energy* 226 (2018) 1187–1207.
- [4] J. K. Sethi, D. Deb, M. Malakar, Modeling of a wind turbine farm in presence of wake interactions, in: 2011 International Conference on Energy, Automation and Signal, IEEE, 2011.
- [5] T. Göçmen, P. van der Laan, P.-E. Réthoré, A. P. Diaz, G. C. Larsen, S. Ott, Wind turbine wake models developed at the technical university of denmark: A review, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 60 (2016) 752–769.
- [6] N. Jensen, A note on wind generator interaction, 1983.
- [7] S. Frandsen, R. Barthelmie, S. Pryor, O. Rathmann, S. Larsen, J. Højstrup, M. Thøgersen, Analytical modelling of wind speed deficit in large offshore wind farms, *Wind Energy* 9 (1-2) (2006) 39–53.
- [8] J. Ainslie, Calculating the flowfield in the wake of wind turbines, *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics* 27 (1-3) (1988) 213–224.
- [9] A. Crespo, J. Hernandez, S. Frandsen, Survey of modelling methods for wind turbine wakes and wind farms, *Wind Energy* 2 (1) (1999) 1–24.
- [10] R. J. Barthelmie, K. Hansen, S. T. Frandsen, O. Rathmann, J. G. Schepers, W. Schlez, J. Phillips, K. Rados, A. Zervos, E. S. Politis, P. K. Chaviaropoulos, Modelling and measuring flow and wind turbine wakes in large wind farms offshore, *Wind Energy* 12 (5) (2009) 431–444.
- [11] F. Porté-Agel, Y.-T. Wu, C.-H. Chen, A numerical study of the effects of wind direction on turbine wakes and power losses in a large wind farm, *Energies* 6 (10) (2013) 5297–5313.
- [12] Y.-K. Wu, Y.-S. Su, Z. Lee, T.-Y. Wu, Estimation of wake losses in an offshore wind farm by WAsP - a real project case study in taiwan, in: 10th

382 International Conference on Advances in Power System Control, Operation
383 & Management (APSCOM 2015), Institution of Engineering and Technol-
384 ogy, 2015. doi:10.1049/ic.2015.0264.

385 [13] L. Tian, W. Zhu, W. Shen, N. Zhao, Z. Shen, Development and validation
386 of a new two-dimensional wake model for wind turbine wakes, *Journal of*
387 *Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics* 137 (2015) 90–99.

388 [14] T. Ishihara, G.-W. Qian, A new gaussian-based analytical wake model for
389 wind turbines considering ambient turbulence intensities and thrust coef-
390 ficient effects, *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*
391 177 (2018) 275–292.

392 [15] R. J. Stevens, L. A. Martínez-Tossas, C. Meneveau, Comparison of wind
393 farm large eddy simulations using actuator disk and actuator line models
394 with wind tunnel experiments, *Renewable Energy* 116 (2018) 470–478.

395 [16] F. Porté-Agel, Y.-T. Wu, H. Lu, R. J. Conzemius, Large-eddy simulation
396 of atmospheric boundary layer flow through wind turbines and wind farms,
397 *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics* 99 (4) (2011)
398 154–168.

399 [17] Y.-T. Wu, F. Porté-Agel, Modeling turbine wakes and power losses within
400 a wind farm using LES: An application to the horns rev offshore wind farm,
401 *Renewable Energy* 75 (2015) 945–955.

402 [18] H. Schümann, F. Pierella, L. Sætran, Experimental investigation of wind
403 turbine wakes in the wind tunnel, *Energy Procedia* 35 (2013) 285–296.

404 [19] J. Park, K. H. Law, Layout optimization for maximizing wind farm power
405 production using sequential convex programming, *Applied Energy* 151
406 (2015) 320–334.

407 [20] J. S. González, A. G. G. Rodriguez, J. C. Mora, J. R. Santos, M. B. Payan,
408 Optimization of wind farm turbines layout using an evolutive algorithm,
409 *Renewable Energy* 35 (8) (2010) 1671–1681.

- 410 [21] D. Schlipf, M. Kühn, Prospects of a collective pitch control by means of
 411 predictive disturbance compensation assisted by wind speed measurements,
 412 Proceedings of the 9th German Wind Energy Conference DEWEK, 26th
 413 to 27th November, Bremen, Germany, 2008.
- 414 [22] F. Dunne, L. Pao, A. Wright, B. Jonkman, N. Kelley, Combining standard
 415 feedback controllers with feedforward blade pitch control for load mitigation
 416 in wind turbines, in: 48th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting Including
 417 the New Horizons Forum and Aerospace Exposition, American Institute of
 418 Aeronautics and Astronautics, 2010.
- 419 [23] M. Vali, V. Petrovic, S. Boersma, J.-W. van Wingerden, L. Y. Pao,
 420 M. Kuhn, Model predictive active power control of waked wind farms, in:
 421 2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC), IEEE, 2018.
- 422 [24] M. Adaramola, P.-Å. Krogstad, Experimental investigation of wake effects
 423 on wind turbine performance, *Renewable Energy* 36 (8) (2011) 2078–2086.
- 424 [25] Z. Dar, K. Kar, O. Sahni, J. H. Chow, Windfarm power optimization using
 425 yaw angle control, *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy* 8 (1) (2017)
 426 104–116.
- 427 [26] B. Dou, M. Guala, L. Lei, P. Zeng, Experimental investigation of the per-
 428 formance and wake effect of a small-scale wind turbine in a wind tunnel,
 429 *Energy* 166 (2019) 819–833.
- 430 [27] D. Schlipf, T. Fischer, C. E. Carcangiu, M. Rossetti, E. Bossanyi, Load
 431 analysis of look-ahead collective pitch control using lidar, Proceedings of
 432 the 10th German Wind Energy Conference DEWEK, 2010.
- 433 [28] V. Rezaei, LIDAR-based robust wind-scheduled control of wind turbines,
 434 in: 2014 American Control Conference, IEEE, 2014.
- 435 [29] S. Raach, D. Schlipf, P. W. Cheng, Lidar-based wake tracking for closed-
 436 loop wind farm control, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* 753 (2016)
 437 052009.

- 438 [30] S. Cacciola, M. Bertelè, J. Schreiber, C. Bottasso, Wake center position
439 tracking using downstream wind turbine hub loads, *Journal of Physics:*
440 *Conference Series* 753 (2016) 032036.
- 441 [31] R. J. Barthelmie, S. C. Pryor, Automated wind turbine wake characteriza-
442 tion in complex terrain, *Atmospheric Measurement Techniques Discussions*
443 (2019) 1–31.
- 444 [32] S. Raach, D. Schlipf, F. Borisade, P. W. Cheng, Wake redirecting using
445 feedback control to improve the power output of wind farms, in: 2016
446 American Control Conference (ACC), IEEE, 2016.
- 447 [33] H. S. Dhiman, D. Deb, V. Muresan, V. E. Balas, Wake management in
448 wind farms: An adaptive control approach, *Energies* 12 (7). doi:10.3390/
449 en12071247.
- 450 [34] H. S. Dhiman, D. Deb, Decision and Control in Hybrid Wind Farms,
451 Springer Singapore, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-981-15-0275-0.
- 452 [35] E. Simley, L. Pao, R. Frehlich, B. Jonkman, N. Kelley, Analysis of wind
453 speed measurements using continuous wave LIDAR for wind turbine con-
454 trol, in: 49th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting including the New Hori-
455 zons Forum and Aerospace Exposition, American Institute of Aeronautics
456 and Astronautics, 2011.
- 457 [36] The wind and wind turbines, in: *Wind Turbine Control Systems*, Springer
458 London, 2007, pp. 7–28.
- 459 [37] P. Fleming, J. Annoni, J. J. Shah, L. Wang, S. Ananthan, Z. Zhang,
460 K. Hutchings, P. Wang, W. Chen, L. Chen, Field test of wake steering
461 at an offshore wind farm, *Wind Energy Science* 2 (1) (2017) 229–239.
- 462 [38] G.-W. Qian, T. Ishihara, A new analytical wake model for yawed wind
463 turbines, *Energies* 11 (3) (2018) 665.

- [39] Á. Jiménez, A. Crespo, E. Migoya, Application of a LES technique to characterize the wake deflection of a wind turbine in yaw, *Wind Energy* 13 (6) (2009) 559–572.
- [40] E. Machefaux, G. C. Larsen, N. Troldborg, M. Gaunaa, A. Rettenmeier, Empirical modeling of single-wake advection and expansion using full-scale pulsed lidar-based measurements, *Wind Energy* 18 (12) (2014) 2085–2103.
- [41] L. Vollmer, G. Steinfeld, D. Heinemann, M. Kühn, Estimating the wake deflection downstream of a wind turbine in different atmospheric stabilities: an LES study, *Wind Energy Science* 1 (2) (2016) 129–141.
- [42] M. Bastankhah, F. Porté-Agel, A new analytical model for wind-turbine wakes, *Renewable Energy* 70 (2014) 116–123.
- [43] I. Katic, J. Højstrup, N. Jensen, A Simple Model for Cluster Efficiency, A. Raguzzi, 1987, pp. 407–410.
- [44] MathWorks, Curve fitting toolbox - matlab, <https://in.mathworks.com/products/curvefitting.html>, (Accessed on 10/21/2019) (2019).
- [45] S. H. Shahalami, D. Farsi, Analysis of load frequency control in a restructured multi-area power system with the kalman filter and the LQR controller, *AEU - International Journal of Electronics and Communications* 86 (2018) 25–46.
- [46] MathWorks, <https://in.mathworks.com/products/sysid.html?requesteddomain=,https://in.mathworks.com/products/sysid.html?requestedDomain=>, (Accessed on 10/21/2019) (2019).
- [47] K. Thomsen, P. Sørensen, Fatigue loads for wind turbines operating in wakes, *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics* 80 (1-2) (1999) 121–136.
- [48] R. Burra, A. Ambekar, H. Narang, E. Liu, C. Mehendale, L. Thirer, K. Longtin, M. Shah, N. Miller, GE brilliant wind farms, in: 2014 IEEE

491 Symposium on Power Electronics and Machines for Wind and Water Ap-
492 plications, IEEE, 2014.

LaTeX Source Files

[Click here to download LaTeX Source Files: LaTeX_Sourcefiles.zip](#)

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

The authors of this manuscript titled “**Lidar assisted wake redirection in wind farms: A data driven approach**” hereby confirm that there is no conflicting interest and the work pertaining to this manuscript is original.

Harsh S. Dhiman

Dipankar Deb

Aoife M. Foley