

Method for estimating the future annual mass of decommissioned wind turbine blade material in Denmark

Asger Bech Abrahamsen^{1*} | Justine Beauson^{1†} |
Kristine Wilhelm Lund^{2‡} | Erik Skov Madsen^{2‡} | David
Philipp Rudolph^{1‡} | Jonas Pagh Jensen^{3†}

¹Department of Wind Energy and Energy Systems, Technical University of Denmark, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark

²SDU Engineering Operations Management, Department of Technology and Innovation, University of Southern Denmark, DK-5230 Odense, Denmark

³Siemens Gamesa Renewable Energy A/S, DK-9220 Aalborg, Denmark

Correspondence

Department of Wind Energy and Energy Systems, Technical University of Denmark, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark
Email: asab@dtu.com

Funding information

DecomBlades is funded by Innovation Fund Denmark grant 0177-00006B. This work is also related to IEA WIND TCP Task 42 Wind Turbine Lifetime Extension and IEA WIND TCP Task 45 Recycling wind turbine blades.

A model of the evolution of the onshore wind turbine blade mass installed in Denmark is proposed described by a Weibull distribution and the age of the blades is estimated from decommissioning data to $t_{50\%,onshore} = 29$ years when half of the blade mass of an installation year has been decommissioned. This is considerable longer than the 20 year design life time of onshore turbines, which is often assumed to be an estimate of the End-of-Life of turbine blades. Thus blade waste predictions using the simple assumption may predict that installed blade masses are entering recycling processes about 9 years sooner than what is observed in Denmark. The blade mass for decommissioning in Denmark is estimated to peak at 2000 ton/year and 5000 ton/year in 2028 and 2045 using the Weibull model.

KEYWORDS

Wind turbine blade mass, decommissioning, blade recycling, operation life time, design life time

Abbreviations: EOL : End-Of-Life

* ABA : Scoping work, data analysis and model formulation

† ** JB and JPJ : Scoping work, literature review and paper review

‡ KWL, ESM and DPR : literature review and paper review

1 | INTRODUCTION

Wind turbine blades are mainly made of glass fiber reinforced polymer composite with a thermoset resin, such as epoxy or polyester. These composite materials with directional optimized mechanical properties provide sufficient stiffness at a relatively low weight and cost. The superior properties of glass fiber composite do however turn into a challenge when the turbine reaches end-of-life and needs to be taken apart in the recycling process. As reported in multiple research publications recycling wind turbine blade is challenging, due to various factors such as the material composition of blades, the diversity in blades in terms of geometry, dimension and material content or the difficulty to transform blade into valuable recycled materials [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. To find solutions, part of the research has been dedicated to the development of recycling processes, such as re-purposing blades into new structural applications, recycling using mechanical, thermal or chemical processes [6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. However, in recent years, it has become clear that along recycling processes, estimating the amount of waste available is essential to establish reliable recycling solutions. A number of publications have suggested methods to determine future amounts of waste and their location [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. These predictions are generally based on a combination of available information such as the wind turbine capacity installed in a given region and assumptions, as for example the time, at which blades will be recycled. One central assumption used across the literature is to consider wind turbines available for recycling immediately after decommissioning. This assumption does not take into consideration the cases where wind turbines are sold and reused in new locations or when wind turbine blades are kept as spare parts. Assuming that wind turbine blades enter the waste stream immediately after decommissioning might overestimate predictions of the amount of blade material available for blade recycling processed in the next 10 years. Thus business plans for recycling companies might turn out to be too optimistic in terms of blade mass volumes to process. To predict the future amount of wind turbine blade waste, it is therefore necessary to establish clear definitions for the end-of-life of wind turbines. Bank et al., (2021) suggest several definitions to clarify and differentiate the different stages during the end-of-life of wind turbines. The life cycle stages of a turbine or component can be described by the following events: installation at operation site 1, decommissioning from operation site 1 (end-of-location-life), reselling/refurbishing, installation at operation site 2, decommissioning at operation site 2 (end-of-functional-life) and recycling (end-of-life). In this paper, the definition of a wind turbine or a component End-Of-Life age is the time at which the turbine or component can no longer be reused and must be scrapped in a process recycling the materials. As mentioned above, in general, the time of end-of-location-life has been used as the time at which wind turbines are entering the waste stream. However, this is not considering that turbines or components might still hold second-hand value and can be installed in a different country for site 2.

Another central assumption when predicting future amount of wind turbine blade waste is to estimate the time at which decommissioning takes place. In the literature, it is sometimes assumed to be the design life time t_{DLT} or the design life time plus or minus a few year. The time of decommissioning is governed by several parameters including regulations, technical aspect and economic consideration. Determining the time of decommissioning is therefore complex. Wind turbines are designed to have a design life time $t_{DLT, onshore} = 20$ year for onshore turbines and $t_{DLT, offshore} = 25$ year as required by IEC 61400 standards [19] [20]. The meaning of the design life time $t_{DLT, onshore}$ is that the probability of major failures of the turbines is limited by the manufacturer to $5 \cdot 10^{-4}$ when exposing the turbine to the loads of the environment (ex. wind and waves) and faulty operation (ex. yaw errors and controller issues) in the duration of the design life time [21]. This condition is put in place to guarantee that if the investment payback time of the turbine is assumed shorter than the design life time then there is a high probability of returning the investment of the asset. When the age of the turbine exceeds the investment payback time then the turbine owner only has expenses for the operation and maintenance (O&M) and eventually the decommissioning. As long

as the O&M expenses are lower than the income of selling the produced electricity then the owner is likely to keep operating the turbine. Thus when the age of a turbine is exceeding the design life time, the owner of the turbine may continue the operation, if it is still a possibility to generate a profit. There are however different rules regarding continued operation beyond the design life time in different countries ranging from a demand for annual inspections of the structural parts (Denmark) and to third party estimation if the structural integrity of the turbine allow further operation (Germany) [22]. The relation between the time of decommissioning and the design life time is that the chance of decommissioning is increasing as the turbine age is increasing beyond the design life time. Therefore to assume that turbines are decommissioned on the date, where the turbine age is reaching the design life time is a simplification. Finally, political incentives such as support for re-powering in a specific country can change the pace of decommissioning.

The objective for this paper is to predict the yearly amount of decommissioned wind turbine blade materials available in Denmark until 2060. The prediction is therefore not taking into consideration that blades might be resold after the decommissioning and used as spare parts or installed in other countries. The decommissioning of the Danish wind turbine fleet is described mathematically by the depletion of a wind turbine fleet as function of time as given by a Weibull function. This is similar to the framework used in several other studies in the literature [11, 14]. The input parameters for the model are obtained by characterizing the evolution of the Danish onshore wind turbine fleet from 1977 to 2021. The model is then fitted to describe the onshore wind turbine decommissioning from 1977 to 2021. By assuming a similar depletion of all types of onshore turbines and all years a prediction of the expected decommissioning rate for the onshore fleet in the period from 2022 to 2060 is obtained. The decommissioning of the offshore fleet in Denmark has only started in 2017, where the Vindeby offshore wind farm was decommissioned. This wind farm consisted of 11 turbines of a power rating of 450 kW and contained 32 tons of blades. Since the total installed Danish offshore blade mass is of about 29000 tons, this means that only 0.1 % of the offshore fleet has been decommissioned so far. There is therefore not enough data for fitting a depletion model for the offshore turbines. A proposal on adjusting the onshore model to provide an initial guess of the offshore fleet depletion is presented and used to predict the amount of decommissioned blade mass of Denmark if the current on- and offshore fleet are depleted without any installation of new turbines. The amount of decommissioned blade material is compared to the actual decommissioning rates observed in Denmark and also compared to the literature.

2 | LITERATURE ON MODELS TO PREDICT END-OF-LIFE BLADE MASS

A literature review has been performed to provide an overview of the previous predictions of blade mass waste for different parts of world. The list of articles is presented in Table 1. The articles are categorized by their modelling approach for estimating the time of decommissioning and the geographical dispersion considered in the study. There are two main methods used in the literature to set the time of decommissioning. The first one is named in the following the simple methods and assumes that the decommissioning time t_{Decom} is fixed. The second method describes the decommissioning time t_{Decom} by a distribution function $f(t, t_0, \delta t)$ with a certain time t_0 for the largest decommissioning activity and a spread in time of the decommissioning activity δt , where t is the time. Throughout the literature different tools are used to predict future amount of wind turbine blade waste such as material flow analysis (Tazi et al. (2019) [13], Lefeuvre et al. (2019) [23] and Chen et al., 2021 [15]), mathematical regression models (Andersen et al. (2016) [24], Lichtenegger et al. (2020) [14], Liu and Barlow (2017) [11]), stochastic modelling (Sommer et al. (2020) [25]) and life cycle assessment (Heng et al. (2021) [18]).

TABLE 1 Overview of the literature dedicated to the prediction of end-of-life wind turbine blade material. The simple method have a fixed age for decommissioning t_{decom} and if a distribution $f(t, t_0, \delta t)$ is used then the time and spread of largest decommissioning activity is indicated by the time t_0 and δt .

Authors	Method for time of decommissioning	Geographical dispersion
Andersen et al. (2016) [24]	Simple $t_{Decom}=20$ year	Sweden and Denmark (Onshore)
Liu and Barlow (2017) [11]	Simple $t_{Decom}=18, 21, 26$ year	Europe + world (Onshore)
Sultan et al. (2018) [12]	Distribution $t_0 = 25$ year	Great Britan (On- and Offshore)
Tazi et al. (2019) [13]	Simple $t_{Decom}=15$ year	France (Onshore)
Lichtenegger et al. (2020) [14]	Distribution $t_0 = 18$ year	Europe (On- and Offshore)
Tota-Maharaj et al. (2021) [26]	Simple $t_{Decom}=20$ year	Great Britain (On- and Offshore)
Chen et al. (2021) [15]	Distribution $t_0 = 14, 18$ and 21 year	China (on- and Offshore)
Coopermann et al. (2021) [16]	Simple $t_{Decom}=20$ year	United States (Onshore)
Heng et al. (2021) [18]	Simple $t_{Decom}=20, 25$ and 30 year	Canada (On- and offshore)
Delanney et. al. (2021) [17]	Distribution $t_0 = 20$ year	Ireland (Onshore)
Sommer et al. (2020) [25]	Distribution $t_0 = 15$ year	Europe (On-and Offshore)
Lefevure et al. (2019) [23]	Simple $t_{Decom}=25$ year	World (On-and Offshore)

2.1 | Time of decommissioning

As mentioned in the introduction, the time of decommissioning of wind turbine is one of the key assumption in predicting future amount of wind turbine blade waste. Since it is generally assumed that the time of decommissioning corresponds to the time at which wind turbine blade are entering the waste stream, the time of decommissioning has a significant impact in the prediction of future amount of wind turbine blade waste. In the reviewed studies the time of decommissioning ranges from 14 years at the lowest (Chen et al., 2021 [15]) and up to 30 years at the highest (Heng et al., 2021 [18]). Some studies use the design life time from the manufacturer to estimate the time of decommissioning (Cooperman et al., 2021 [16], Lefevure et al., 2019 [23]) while other studies analyze historical data on wind turbine park commissioning and decommissioning dates (Chen et al., 2021 [15], Lichtenegger et al., 2020 [14], Sommer et al., 2020 [25]). Andersen et al. (2016) [24] adopts the 20-year design life, but complements with a comparison between actual and expected decommissioning's in early adopting countries (Denmark, Germany and Sweden) resulting in a validation of 20 years as the expected life. Yet, the data included was from 2015 and prior. For instance, Andersen et al. (2016) [24] state that "As the wind power technology is still relatively young, few countries have markets that have been well developed for more than 20 years, and hence there is not yet much empirical data on turbine life time". This argument is supported by Cooperman et al. (2021) [16] who addresses the issue by assuming a 20-year life time and introducing a sensitivity analysis of this assumption using a Weibull distribution. Sommer et al. (2020) [25] presents a lifetime for wind turbines of 17 years by applying a stochastic distribution function on two datasets covering Europe and Germany until 2016. This is close to the results of Lichtenegger et al. (2020) [14] of 18 years. Even though Chen et al. (2021) [15] studies the geographical area of Guangdong province of China, they apply a Weibull distribution to the data from the Danish wind energy database to model the average life time of wind turbines in the province of Guangdong. This results in an expected lifetime and time of decommissioning of 18 years, similar expected lifetime estimate by Sommer et al., (2020) [25] and Lichtenegger et al., (2020) [14]. Common for

these approaches is that only parks that are already decommissioned are included in the analysis, leaving out parks that are yet to be decommissioned. Delaney et al. (2021) [17] utilize a 20-year design life in their modelling. Their results show that wind farms that should have been decommissioned by the expected lifetime in 2020 were still in operations, because these wind turbines were still profitable to operate. The lifetime and time of decommissioning varies significantly depending on the modelling approach, assumptions, and data input. These differences results in large variances in the waste flow peaks predicted, thus affecting the business case of possible recycling facilities. Thus there is a need to address the matter of assumed lifetime and time of decommissioning.

2.2 | Geographical dispersion

The largest geographical area of analysis, being worldwide, is studied by Liu and Barlow (2017) [11] and by Lefevre et al. (2019) [23]. Lichtenegger et al. (2020) [14] and Sommer et al. (2020) [25] studies the geographical area of Europe and several studies concentrate on a single country i.e. the United States (Cooperman et al., 2021 [16]), Canada (Heng et al., 2021 [18]), Ireland (Delaney et al., 2021 [17]), Sweden (Andersen et al., 2016 [24]) and United Kingdom (Sultan et al., 2018 [12]). Liu and Barlow (2017) [11] find that until year 2050 43 million tons of blades waste must be handled worldwide. 25 % of this quantity will be in Europe. Also modelling the global waste stream, Sommer et al. (2020) [25] find that 570.000 tons of glass fibre reinforced composite and 18.000 tons of carbon fibre reinforced composite material must be handled between 2020 and 2030. By focusing on Europe, Lichtenegger et al. (2020) [14] concludes that by 2050, 325.000 tons of material must be handled yearly, with a mix of 24 % from offshore and 76 % from onshore turbines. The afore mentioned studies are all targeting the waste streams on a multinational level, but Delaney et al. (2021) [17] argues that to develop sustainable solutions at national levels, more national studies must be conducted. As emphasized by Lichtenegger et al. (2020) [14], Denmark is a pioneering country in Wind energy where approx. 40 % of the country's electricity is covered by wind energy. This makes Denmark a very interesting case to study since the early adoption of wind energy also include several parks and single turbines to be decommissioned.

3 | METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this paper is to investigate the decommissioning history of the Danish wind turbine fleet and to describe the decommissioning as a depletion process of the different installation years with one general distribution as function of time. A general relation between the length of the turbine blades and the mass of the blades is established using literature data and additional information about the blade mass of smaller blades. The blade mass relation is applied to the public available data of decommissioning of turbine in Denmark. The depletion of the fleet is determined as the ratio between the decommissioned turbine blade mass by 2021 and the installed blade mass of a certain installation year. The depletion distribution is determined only for the onshore fleet, since the decommissioning of the offshore fleet has only started and too little data is available for determine an offshore distribution. A transfer of the onshore to a guess of the offshore distribution is provided and finally an estimate of future decommissioning blade mass of the Danish on-and offshore fleet is provided. This is compared to the prediction for Denmark provided by Lichtenegger et. al. [14] and the differences are discussed.

Master data register for wind turbines in Denmark Since 1977 there has been a registration of all the Danish Wind turbines with power rating larger than about 6 kW in the database called "Master data register for wind turbines" or "Stamdataregister for vindkraftanlæg" (Danish name) [27]. This database is holding a unique turbine ID number,




FIGURE 1 Illustration of the position of the Danish wind turbines as registered in the Master data register of wind turbines of the Danish Energy Agency [27]. The figure has been produced using the ArcGIS web-tool provided by the Danish Energy Agency and the legends to indicate the power range of the turbines. Green: $P = 26 - 500$ kW, Dark green $P = 501-1000$ kW, Light blue : $P = 1001-2000$ kW and Blue: $P > 2000$ kW.

installation date, the type of turbine and the main properties such as rotor diameter, hub height and power rating. The owner and the position in Denmark is also registered and finally the annual energy production during the different years of operation is noted. A second sheet of the database is holding similar information about the wind turbines decommissioned in Denmark. Interactive maps of the position of the turbines in Denmark are provided by the Danish Energy Agency [27] and Figure 1 is showing the current operational turbines with different power ratings.

1) Depletion model of installed turbine blade mass The basic model used for the prediction of the future decommissioned blade mass is to describe that the time to decommissioning of a number of turbines installed at the same time is given by a cumulative Weibull distribution [28]. The fraction of the turbine fleet or the blade mass that has been decommissioned as function of time is therefore given as

$$F(t, \lambda, k) = 1 - \exp\left(-\left(\frac{t}{\lambda}\right)^k\right) \quad (1)$$

where t is the time variable, λ is the time constant of the depletion of the turbine fleet characterized by the scale parameter of the Weibull distribution and the exponent k is called the shape parameter.

The corresponding Weibull distribution function specifying the amount of blade material decommissioned per year is then given as

$$f(t, \lambda, k) = \frac{k}{\lambda} \left(\frac{t}{\lambda}\right)^{k-1} \cdot \exp\left(-\left(\frac{t}{\lambda}\right)^k\right) \quad (2)$$

with similar parameters as given for eq. (1).

If the depletion of all turbines are assumed to follow an universal Weibull distribution as characterized by the

λ scale and k shape parameters then one can write the expected amount of decommissioned blade material for a specific year j as given as a sum of contributions from the installations years i

$$m_{decom}(t_j) = \sum_{i=0}^j m_i \cdot f(t_j - t_i, \lambda, k) \quad (3)$$

where m_i is the total installed blade mass in year i , $f(t, \lambda, k)$ is the Weibull distribution function given by eq. 2, t_i is the year of the installation of the blade mass m_i and t_j is the year where the decommissioning blade mass is determined by collecting the contributions from the different installation years.

Once the Weibull distribution has been determined one can ask the questions of how long time t_p it will take before a certain fraction p of the fleet has been depleted.

$$F(t_p, \lambda, k) = 1 - \exp\left(-\left(\frac{t_p}{\lambda}\right)^k\right) = p \longrightarrow t_p = \lambda \left(\ln(1-p)^{-1}\right)^{1/k} \quad (4)$$

This can be used to define median of the distribution corresponding to the time $t_{50\%}$ it will take before half of the fleet has been decommissioned as well as the $t_{10\%}$ and $t_{90\%}$ corresponding to 10 % and 90 % has been decommissioned.

$$t_{10\%} = \lambda \left(\ln(1-0.1)^{-1}\right)^{1/k} = \lambda (0.1054)^{1/k} \quad (5)$$

$$t_{50\%} = \lambda (\ln 2)^{1/k} = \lambda (0.6931)^{1/k} \quad (6)$$

$$t_{90\%} = \lambda \left(\ln(1-0.9)^{-1}\right)^{1/k} = \lambda (2.303)^{1/k} \quad (7)$$

where λ and k are the Weibull scale and shape parameters.

From the definition of $t_{50\%}$ one observe that $t_{50\%}$ is scaling directly with the scale parameter λ and if the shape parameter k is larger than 5 then the $t_{50\%} \approx \lambda$ with less than 10 % error.

In order to understand how the Weibull parameters will describe the decommissioning one can also define the duration Δt of the main depletion corresponding to removing 10 % to 90 % of the fleet by using [5].

$$\Delta t = t_{90\%} - t_{10\%} = \lambda \left(2.303^{1/k} - 0.1054^{1/k}\right) \Rightarrow \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{\Delta t}{\lambda} = 2.303^{1/k} - 0.1054^{1/k} \quad (9)$$

It is seen that the transition duration time scaled by the scale parameter $\frac{\Delta t}{\lambda}$ only depend on the shape parameter k and that a slow transition result from a small shape parameter k , whereas a fast transition is seen for a large shape parameter k .

In the case where the Weibull distribution can not be considered universal for all the turbines of the fleet then one might need a more general formulation, where an individual Weibull distribution is assigned to each installation year. An argument for using individual Weibull distributions is that the turbine size of the Danish turbines have changed dramatically as shown in figure 5 and that the marked conditions over time has also changed.

$$m_{decomadvanced}(t_j) = \sum_{i=0}^j m_i \cdot f(t_j - t_i, \lambda_{ij}, k_{ij}) \quad (10)$$

where λ_{ij} and k_{ij} specify a different Weibull distribution for each installation year i and also a possible change with time t_j .


2) Determination of the mass of wind turbine blade material currently installed in Denmark In this article, the mass of wind turbine blade material as function of the blade length as proposed by Liu and Barlow (2017) [11] is used for determining the blade mass of the turbines registered in Master data register of Danish turbines. The data from Liu and Barlow is presented in Figure 2, where the blade mass is shown as a function of the blade length. Additional blade masses on the blades LM37.3 P2 of LM Wind Power [29], V-47 of Vestas [30] and B45 of Siemens Gamesa Renewable Energy [31] as provided by the Blade Material Passports of the DecomBlades project has been added to the dataset [32]. Secondly some blade masses from small rotor diameter turbines has been added as found in old turbine specification data sheets (Vestas V-17 and V-27 as well as the LM-17 HHT blade used for the decommissioned Vindeby offshore wind farm in Denmark). The smaller blades were added in order to determine a scaling function extending down to blade lengths of about 10 m, since these are present in the Master data register of Danish turbines.

A blade mass scaling relation was fitted to the blade masses shown in 2 using a power-law function

$$m = a \cdot \left(\frac{L}{L_0} \right)^b \quad (11)$$

where L is the blade length in the unit of m, $L_0 = 1$ m, the pre-factor is $a = 1.29 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ ton} \pm 2 \cdot 10^{-4}$ metric ton and the exponent is $b = 2.32 \pm 0.03$.

3) Determination of the time of decommissioning In order to obtain a model for the decommissioning age of the Danish turbines then the age of the turbines in the Master database of the decommissioned turbines was calculated as the difference between the installation date and the decommissioning date. Figure 3 is showing the distributions of age of decommissioned turbines in the period from 1977-2021 in Denmark. It is observed that most turbines were decommissioned at an operation age of 18 years, which is about 2 year before reaching the design life time of 20 years for onshore turbines. This could be explained by a wish to resell the decommissioned turbine, because the reselling price is probably higher if the turbine has not yet reached the Design Life time. The inset of Figure 3 is showing the histogram of the turbine age as used by Lichtenegger et al. [14] to describe the stochastic process of decommissioning the Danish fleet. The two curves are seen to be quite similar. The age of the operating turbine of Denmark was determined and figure 4 is showing the age distribution of the operating fleet by January 2022. It should be mentioned that all turbines in the Master turbine database are included in figure 4. Thus both small scale farmer turbines with a size < 25 kW, all regular onshore as well as all offshore turbines are shown. There has been no attempt to clean the Master database of turbines for the not so well specified turbines, which is sometimes seen where the rotor diameter seems very small compared to the power rating. This inconsistency is only observed for very old turbines and is not considered as a source of large differences in determining the blade mass of the Danish turbine fleet. Figure 4 is showing that more than 2000 of the Danish turbines have an age higher than the design life time, which illustrates that decommissioning is not taking place immediately after the design life time is exceeded. Figure



Abrahamsen, DTU, DecomBlades, 22/4-22

FIGURE 2 Wind turbine blade mass as a function of the blade length as reproduced from [11] and by adding additional blade masses [31], [29] and [30]. The fitting of a power-law function result in the parameters $a = 1.29 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ ton} \pm 2 \cdot 10^{-4}$ metric ton and the exponent is $b = 2.32 \pm 0.03$.

5 is showing the observed rotor diameter of the operating fleet as function of the turbine age. Thus by comparing figure 4 and figure 5 it is observed that the turbines with an operation age above the design life time of 20 years will have rotor diameters below 80 meters and turbines with operation age higher than 30 years will have rotor diameters below 40 meters.

In order to obtain an overview of the in-operation and decommissioned blade mass of Denmark one can sort the Master turbine database by either the installation year of the blades or by the year that the blades were decommissioned. In the first case then the decommissioned turbines were sorted by the installation year and the total amount of blade mass decommissioned for a specific installation year was summed up until the end of the data registration period which is 1 January 2022 and as given as $m_{\text{decommissioned from year } i \text{ by 2022}}$ in eq. (12). This blade mass then represents all the blades decommissioned over time from the installation year of example 1985 and until 2022. This blade mass is important to determine, since this must be added to the blade mass in operation of a specific years $m_{\text{in-operation from year } i}$ in order to determine the installed blade mass of the different years as given in eq. (12). The depletion of an installation year can then be defined as the ratio between the decommissioned and installed blade mass as given by eq. (13)

$$m_{\text{installed in year } i} = m_{\text{in-operation from year } i} + m_{\text{decommissioned from year } i \text{ by 2022}} \quad (12)$$

$$\text{Depletion}_{\text{year } i} = \frac{m_{\text{decommissioned from year } i \text{ by 2022}}}{m_{\text{installed in year } i}} \quad (13)$$




FIGURE 3 Age distribution at decommissioning of wind turbines in Denmark by 2022. Inset: - Age distribution reported for Denmark by Lichtenegger et. al. as reproduced from [14].

Figure 6 is showing the installed blade mass of the on- and offshore turbine blades in operation from 1978, which is the installation year of the first turbine registered in the Master turbine database. The onshore curve is showing that 3 main peaks of capacity was added in 1990, 2000 and 2015 as well as the pause of installation between 2003-2007. The decommissioned onshore blade mass is seen to reach the installed blade mass for turbines older than 1988 reflecting that for these years then all the installed capacity has been decommissioned. For the turbines installed later than 1988 then one can see that the installed blade mass is much higher than the decommissioned blade mass showing that most of the turbine are still operating. The actual decommissioning mass shows that the decommissioning of onshore turbines in Denmark first started in 1999, peaked in 2017 with about 1000 tons of blades handled and that the amount of blade mass removed in 2021 was about 200 tons.

Similarly the offshore curve in Figure 6 is showing peaks corresponding to offshore wind farms being added to the Danish fleet. The decommissioning of the offshore wind farms first started in 2017 with the removal of the Vindeby offshore wind farm holding about 32 tons of blades. However this is the only farm removed and a reliable dataset for investigating the distribution of offshore wind decommissioning does not exist yet.

4 | RESULTS

The results is organized into three sections. First, the depletion of the onshore wind turbine fleet installed in Denmark is quantified and characterised. It is then suggested how the onshore distribution can be transferred to a guess of how the offshore distribution will look like. Finally the obtained distributions are used to estimate the future decommissioning blade mass of Denmark.




FIGURE 4 Age of the turbines in operation by 2022 in Denmark.

4.1 | Analyzing the Danish wind turbine fleet

From figure 6 one can see that the decommissioned blade mass is reaching the installed blade mass for turbines older than 1995. Figure 7 shows the ratio between the decommissioned blade mass for the different installation years and the total installed blade mass of those year in order to quantify the depletion of the onshore fleet as defined by eq. (13). By assuming that all the wind turbines of Denmark obey the same decommissioning probability function as given by the Weibull distribution of eq. 1 then one can roughly fit the Weibull depletion function to the graph as shown by the red line. The obtained Weibull parameters are a scale of $\lambda = 30$ years and a shape of $k = 10$. This means that it takes $t_{50\%} = \lambda (\ln 2)^{1/k} = 28.9$ years before half of the onshore fleet is decommissioned and respectively $t_{10\%} = 24.0$ years and $t_{90\%} = 32.6$ years before 10 % and 90 % of the fleet is decommissioned by using eq. 5. Secondly the time span of the depletion is $\Delta t = t_{90\%} - t_{10\%} = 8.6$ years using eq. 8. This onshore depletion must be compared to the design life time of onshore turbines being 20 years. In Figure 7 the design life time of onshore turbines is illustrated by a Weibull distribution having $\lambda = 20$ years and $k = 70$ resulting in a $\Delta t = 0.9$ year. This design life time depletion is representing a scenario, where the entire fleet would be decommissioned when the age of the turbines are reaching the design life time and then removed within a year. It is seen that the observed depletion is much slower and more widely distributed in time. There is a large peak in the depletion curve in Figure 7 for blades ages of 17-19 years, which is deviating from the Weibull distribution. This peak is caused by a very low installation volume in the years 2003-2007 as seen in figure 6 and also by the fact that the national test center for large turbine Høvsøre was starting to decommission demonstration turbines, which are only tested for a few years. Thus the peak is considered an artifact not representing the main turbine fleet. It is however interesting to note that there seems to be an initial depletion level of about 5 % for all blade years and this is believed to be caused by the increasing testing of demonstration turbines in Denmark as performed at the Høvsøre and Østerild national test sites. A more advanced Weibull distribution function can be constructed by adding this initial decommissioning




FIGURE 5 Rotor diameter of the turbines in operation in Denmark by 2022 shown as function of the blade operation age.

$$F(t, \lambda, k) = 1 - c_1 \exp\left(-\left(\frac{t}{\lambda_1}\right)^{k_1}\right) - c_2 \exp\left(-\left(\frac{t}{\lambda_2}\right)^{k_2}\right) \quad (14)$$

Where the constants c_1 and c_2 represent that fraction of the fleet being removed as demonstration and production turbines with corresponding Weibull parameters λ_1, k_1 and λ_2, k_2 .

In Figure 7 the advanced Weibull distribution is shown for the fractions $c_1 = 0.05$ and $c_2 = 0.95$ and the Weibull parameters given as $\lambda_1 = 3$ years, $k_1 = 3$ and $\lambda_2 = 30$ years, $k_2 = 10$. The latter distribution is similar to the red model curve in the figure.

4.2 | Proposal on depletion distribution for offshore turbine fleet

Since the decommissioning distribution of the offshore turbines is basically unknown as shown in figure 6 then one will need a qualified guess on the distribution in order to estimate the future decommissioned blade mass. In this paper it is proposed to use the same shift of the $t_{50\%}$ with respect to the design life time as observed for the onshore turbine onto the offshore turbines as well.




FIGURE 6 Installed and decommissioned blade mass of a) onshore and b) offshore wind turbine of Denmark as function of time from 1978 and until January 2022. The decommissioned blade mass has been sorted either by the installation year (red) or by the actual year of the decommissioning (green). Thus the decommissioned blade mass (red) for the year 1985 is the sum of all blades decommissioned between 1985 and January 2022, but all installed in 1985.

$$t_{50\%,offshore} = t_{DLT,offshore} + (t_{50\%,onshore} - t_{DLT,onshore}) \quad (15)$$

$$= 25\text{years} + (28.9\text{years} - 20\text{years}) = 33.9\text{years} \quad (16)$$

The time spread of the decommissioning of the offshore wind farms is however not believed to be as smeared out as for onshore, because decommissioning of the offshore farms will most likely be entire farms and not individual turbines. Thus the time spread $\Delta t = 2$ years is assumed limited for offshore reflecting that a decommissioning campaign might span two summers of good weather conditions. This result in Weibull parameters of $\lambda_{offshore} = 33.9$ years and $k_{offshore} = 50$. The proposed offshore Weibull distribution is shown in figure 7 for comparison to the onshore distributions.

4.3 | Predicting decommissioned blade mass as function of time

By using the Weibull distribution parameters obtained from the fit to the depletion plot in Figure 7 and combining that with the installed blade masses of the different installation years as shown in figure 6 one can apply the model for predicting the decommissioned onshore and offshore blade mass as given by eq. 3. The result is shown in figure 8 for the period between 1978-2022 and also for the future until 2065, where the current installed wind turbine fleet of Denmark is expected to be completely depleted.

5 | DISCUSSION

The assumption that two universal Weibull distribution function can describe the decommissioning processes of all the on- and offshore wind turbine of Denmark from 1978 to 2022 may look as an oversimplification that might lead to inaccurate conclusions. This is indeed true, since the turbine size and technology has evolved dramatically in the




FIGURE 7 Depletion of the Danish onshore wind turbine fleet shown by the ratio between decommissioned blade mass and installed blade mass for the different installation years as by 1 January 2022. A Weibull depletion function as given by eq. 1 is shown by the red line and the resulting Weibull parameters are : scale $\lambda = 30$ years and shape $k = 10$. The corresponding time when 10, 50 and 90 % of the fleet has been depleted are shown as $t_{10\%}$, $t_{50\%}$ and $t_{90\%}$. The duration of the depletion is characterized by the time spam Δt . The peak of depletion from year 17-19 with a depletion value of 85 % is an artifact of the very low installation rate in the period from year 15 to 18 shown in figure 4 corresponding to the year 2003-2007 in figure 6. Thus these points are neglected in the analysis and the turbine older than 35 years are also neglected since they are very small with rotor diameters lower than 20 m as seen in figure 5. Finally the depletion curve seems to have an offset of about 5 % even for the new turbines (purple) and this is caused by the relative high number of demonstration turbines tested in Denmark, which are decommissioned after a few years of initial testing.

period and because the market conditions have changed from a period of subsidies for erecting wind turbines and then to the current situation, where onshore turbines must compete on market terms.

On the other hand most of the turbines have been designed according to the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) standard for onshore turbines IEC 61400-1 specifying a design life time of 20 years [19] and the offshore standard IEC 61400-3 specifying a design life time of 25 years [20]. Since the demand of the IEC standard is a probability of major failures of $5 \cdot 10^{-4}$, then one would expect most of the turbines to function even after the age of the turbines has surpassed the design life time. This is indeed that case for the Danish onshore turbines and one can determine the decommissioning fraction when the age is equal to the design life time as equation (17) below

$$F(t_{design}, \lambda, k) = 1 - \exp\left(-\left(\frac{t_{design}}{\lambda}\right)^k\right) = 1 - \exp\left(-\left(\frac{20 \text{ years}}{30 \text{ years}}\right)^{10}\right) = 0.017 \quad (17)$$

This is indicating that based on the Weibull distribution describing the Danish onshore wind turbine fleet depletion




FIGURE 8 Predicted wind turbine decommissioned blade mass per year as function of time from 1978 when the first wind turbine was installed in Denmark. The model contribution from the onshore turbines (blue) is added to the offshore contribution (red), whereby the total blade mass is obtained (black). For comparison then the actual decommissioning blade mass of Denmark is shown (light blue) as well as the decommissioning blade mass prediction for Denmark of Lichtenegger et. al. 2020 [14] (green). The predicted decommissioned blade mass of this paper is reaching about 2000 tons/year in 2028 and then it is increasing to about 5000 tons/year in 2045, when contributions from the offshore turbines are expected to increase.

then one should only expect about 1.7% of the installed turbine blade mass has been decommissioned when the turbines reach their design life time as specified in the IEC 61400-1 standard [19]. Thus half of the wind turbine fleet is expected to operate about 9 years longer than their design life time and time where 90 % of the fleet is decommissioned is expected to happen about 13 years later than the design life time.

The Weibull distribution function found in this paper is also in reasonable agreement with an analysis of the evolution of the numbers of onshore turbine in Denmark as provided by the Danish Energy Agency in 2020 [33] and [34]. The analysis of the Danish Energy Agency predict that all current onshore turbines in Denmark will be decommissioned by 2043-2048 depending on the electricity price and the cost of maintenance. Secondly the Danish onshore wind turbine life time is stated to be 28 years by the Danish Energy Agency, which is also in reasonable agreement with the $t_{50\%} = 29$ years found in this paper.

The analysis of this paper is suggesting that there is a substantial delay between the wind turbine design lifetime and the decommissioning time of almost 9-13 years and this is in large contrast to several of the previous End-Of-Life blade mass predictions outlined in the literature review. The paper of Liu and Barlow [11] is using a fixed decommissioning time of 18, 21 and 26 years in their prediction of the blade waste amount for the world. If the Danish conditions can be transferred to the rest of the world then one would only expect 21 % of the fleet to be decommis-

sioned after the 26 years using eq. 17. This is indicating that the predicted blade waste amount of Liu and Barlow [11] is about 5 times higher in 2020 than the decommissioned blade mass determined using the model of this paper. The paper of Lichtenegger 2020 [14] is using a distribution function to describe the decommissioning of turbines in Denmark and Germany as illustrated as the inset of figure 3. This function is seen to peak at a turbine age of about 18 year and if this is applied as the expected decommissioning age for all the onshore turbines of Denmark, then one will most likely estimate the amount of blade mass for decommissioning to happen about 10-15 earlier compared to the model of this paper. The prediction of the Danish decommissioning blade mass from the paper of Lichtenegger [14] has been included in Figure 8 and it is seen that the estimate around 2020 is about 10 times higher than the model prediction of this paper as well as the observed decommissioning masses of Denmark. A reason for the discrepancy is that only the decommissioning turbine data from the Danish master database has been used for fitting a distribution function as shown in figure 3, whereby the turbines still in operation are neglected in the description of the depletion of the fleet.

In 2015 Danish owners of older turbines experienced an electricity payment as low as 22 €/MWh, which was approaching the cost of maintenance of the turbines at 17 €/MWh [22], but this situation has changed with the current situation of shortage of natural gas in the European market and very high electricity prices. Thus revenue from old turbines is expected to be positive and large enough to pay for the maintenance and also repairs needed to keep the turbines operating. Based on this one can argue that the old turbines will keep operating as long as the electricity prices remain high and that the Weibull distribution shown in figure 7 will have to be shifted to the right towards longer depletion times. On the other hand one can argue that if the revenue of the old turbines get high enough then it might become feasible to remove the old turbine blades and upgrade the turbine with a new and longer set of blades in order to ensure another 20 years of operation and a higher revenue. The latter argument is suggesting an adjustment of the Weibull distribution of figure 7 to the left toward faster depletion. It is suggested that further investigation of changes to the turbine fleet depletion rate must be investigated, but both a slow down as well as a speed up of the depletion is possible depending on the energy policies implemented in Denmark in the next decade. Thus the decommissioned estimate presented by the simple model is seen as a compromise between these two considerations.

Finally it should be mentioned that the development of wind turbine blade recycling value chains will need a certain amount of blade material to process in order to make a profitable business case. As explained in the introduction then one can not claim that decommissioning is guaranteeing that the blade is sent for End-Of-Life processing. This paper will therefore only report on the predicted decommissioning blade mass and not the expected amount of blade waste. One can however claim that the predicted decommissioned blade mass of this paper is providing an upper limit on the blade mass that should be expected for recycling facilities in Denmark.

6 | CONCLUSION

The decommissioning of the onshore wind turbines in Denmark as has been described by a Weibull distribution function and the time when half of the fleet is decommissioned has been found to be $t_{50\%} = 29$ years, which is considerable longer than the 20 year design life time of onshore wind turbines. Many previous studies have used the design lifetime as an estimate of the End-Of-Life of wind turbine blades, but this will result in an underestimation of the real End-Of-Life time for wind turbine blades and secondly it is not known how large a fraction of the decommissioned turbines that are resold for a second operation period before End-Of-Life is reached. Thus the amount of wind turbine blade material than can be expected for recycling in Denmark will be shifted about 9 years further into the future compared

to previous estimates. This is beneficial for lowering the environmental footprint of the turbines, but on the other hand is a challenge for the recycling industry, because the large inflow of wind turbine blade material for recycling is most likely delayed by 9 years.

By assuming an on- and offshore distribution can be applied to all turbines of Denmark then an estimate of the blade decommissioning rate of 2000 tons/year is predicted for 2028 and a maximum of 5000 tons/year is predicted at 2045. Further studies are suggested to investigate if turbine fleet depletion will be slowed down by increasing electricity prices or if it will be accelerated due to replacement of blades as part of turbine upgrades.

references

- [1] Pickering SJ. Recycling technologies for thermoset composite materials—current status. *Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing* 2006;(37):1206–1215.
- [2] Oliveux G, Dandy LO, Leeke GA. Current status of recycling of fibre reinforced polymers: Review of technologies, reuse and resulting properties. *Progress in Materials Science* 2015;(72):61–99.
- [3] Jensen JP, Skelton K. Wind turbine blade recycling: Experiences, challenges and possibilities in a circular economy. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 2018;(97):165–176.
- [4] Chen J, Wang J, Ni A. Recycling and reuse of composite materials for wind turbine blades: An overview. *Journal of Reinforced Plastics and Composites* 2019;(38):567–577.
- [5] Beauson J, Laurent A, Rudolph DP, Jensen JP. The complex end-of-life of wind turbine blades: A review of the European context. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 2022;(155):111847.
- [6] Palmer J, Ghita OR, Savage L, Evans KE. Successful closed-loop recycling of thermoset composites. *Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing* 2009;(40):490–498.
- [7] Beauson J, Madsen B, Toncelli C, Brøndsted P, Bech JI. Recycling of shredded composites from wind turbine blades in new thermoset polymer composites. *Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing* 2016;(90):390–399.
- [8] Rahimizadeh A, Kalman J, Fayazbakhsh K, Lessard L. Recycling of fiberglass wind turbine blades into reinforced filaments for use in Additive Manufacturing. *Composites Part B: Engineering* 2019;(175):107101.
- [9] Mattsson C, André A, Juntikka M, Tränkle T, Sott R. Chemical recycling of End-of-Life wind turbine blades by solvolysis/HTL. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering* 2020;(942):012013.
- [10] Ruane K, Zhang Z, Nagle A, Huynh A, Alshannaq A, McDonald A, et al. Material and Structural Characterization of a Wind Turbine Blade for Use as a Bridge Girder. *Transportation Research Record* 2022;(In press):1–9.
- [11] Liu P, Barlow CY. Wind turbine blade waste in 2050. *Waste Management* 2017;(62):229–240.
- [12] Sultan AAM, Mativenga PT, Lou E. Managing Supply Chain Complexity: Foresight for Wind Turbine Composite Waste. *Procedia CIRP* 2018;(69):938–943.
- [13] Tazi N, Kim J, Bouzidi Y, Chatelet E, Liu G. Waste and material flow analysis in the end-of-life wind energy system. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 2019;(145):199–207.
- [14] Lichtenegger G, Rentizelas AA, Triviza N, Siegl S. Offshore and onshore wind turbine blade waste material forecast at a regional level in Europe until 2050. *Waste Management* 2020;(106):120–131.
- [15] Chen Y, Cai G, Zheng L, Zhang Y, Qi X, Ke S, et al. Modeling waste generation and end-of-life management of wind power development in Guangdong, China until 2050. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 2021;(169):0921–3449.

- [16] Cooperman A, Eberle A, Lantz E. Wind turbine blade material in the United States: Quantities, costs, and end-of-life options. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 2021;(168):0921–3449.
- [17] Delaney EL, McKinley JM, Megarry W, Graham C, Leahy PG, Bank LC, et al. An integrated geospatial approach for repurposing wind turbine blades. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 2021;(170):105601.
- [18] Heng H, Meng F, McKechnie J. Wind turbine blade wastes and the environmental impacts in Canada. *Waste Management* 2021;(133):59–70.
- [19] International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), "IEC 61400-1:2019 RVL, Wind energy generation systems - Part 1: Design requirements"; 2022. <https://webstore.iec.ch/publication/64648>. Web-site.
- [20] International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), "IEC 61400-3-1:2019 Wind energy generation systems - Part 3-1: Design requirements for fixed offshore wind turbines"; 2022. <https://webstore.iec.ch/publication/29360>. Web-site.
- [21] Nielsen JS, Sørensen JD. Risk-based derivation of target reliability levels for life extension of wind turbine structural components. *Wind Energy* 2021;24(9):939–956. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/we.2610>.
- [22] Ziegler L, Gonzalez E, Rubert T, Smolka U, Melero JJ. Lifetime extension of onshore wind turbines: A review covering Germany, Spain, Denmark, and the UK. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 2018;82:1261–1271. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032117131503>.
- [23] Lefevvre A, Garnier S, Jacquemin L, Pillain B, Sonnemann G. Anticipating in-use stocks of carbon fibre reinforced polymers and related waste generated by the wind power sector until 2050. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 2019;141:30–39. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921344918303732>.
- [24] Andersen N, Eriksson O, Hillman K, Wallhagen M. Wind Turbines' End-of-Life: Quantification and Characterisation of Future Waste Materials on a National Level. *Energies* 2016;9(12). <https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/9/12/999>.
- [25] Sommer V, Stockschröder J, Walther G. Estimation of glass and carbon fiber reinforced plastic waste from end-of-life rotor blades of wind power plants within the European Union. *Waste Management* 2020;115:83–94. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0956053X20303536>.
- [26] Tota-Maharaj K, McMahon A. Resource and waste quantification scenarios for wind turbine decommissioning in the United Kingdom. *Waste Dispos Sustain Energy* 2021;3:117–144.
- [27] Danish Energy Agency, Master data register for wind turbines; 2022. <https://ens.dk/service/statistik-data-noegletal-og-kort/data-oversigt-over-energisektoren>. Web-site and Excel file.
- [28] Woo S. In: *Modern Definitions in Reliability Engineering* Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2017. p. 35–59. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50829-0_3.
- [29] LM Wind Power, Blade Material Passport of blade model: LM 37.3 P2; 2022. <https://decomblades.dk/>. Web-site.
- [30] Vestas, Blade Material Passport of blade model: V47; 2022. <https://decomblades.dk/>. Web-site.
- [31] Siemens Gamesa Renewable Energy, Blade Material Passport of blade model: B45; 2022. <https://decomblades.dk/>. Web-site.
- [32] DecomBlades project; 2022. <https://decomblades.dk/>. Web-site.
- [33] Danish Energy Agency (Energistyrelsen), "Fremskrivning af antal vindmøller på land", Report; 2020. https://ens.dk/sites/ens.dk/files/Analyser/udfasning_af_eksisterende_vindmoeller_paa_land.pdf. Web-site.
- [34] Nielsen P, "Driftsomkostninger for ældre vindmøller", Report EMD International A/S; 2019. https://ens.dk/sites/ens.dk/files/Analyser/bilag_1_-_rapport_fra_emd_international_as.pdf. Web-site.