

## **Drivers for Wind**

Wind Energy Denmark

30 October 2018





#### **Overview**

- State of the wind markets, both onshore and offshore;
- State of the climate: new IPCC report SR15
- Drivers for wind energy
- What needs to be done
- Conclusions





Source: GWEC



17 yr avg. growth: 19%



% Share

No. of Concession, name







Country	MW	% Share
PR China	19,660	37
USA	7,017	13
Germany	6,581	12
United Kingdom	4,270	8
India	4,148	8
Brazil	2,022	4
France	1,694	3
Turkey	766	1
South Africa	618	1
Finland	535	1
Rest of the world	5,182	10
Total TOP 10	47,310	90
World Total	52,492	100
	54 mm - 11	Source: GWEC

#### ANNUAL INSTALLED CAPACITY BY REGION 2009-2017





#### MARKET FORECAST 2018-2022



Source: GWEC



#### PROJECTIONS FOR OFFSHORE WIND DEVELOPMENT GLOBALLY OUT TO 2030



Source: BVG Associates



Strong growth in established and new offshore wind power markets

- Europe continues to grow, in more countries
- Asia expands rapidly, especially

China

Total investment to 2030 of \$500bn



Source: Bloomberg New Energy Finance









#### **Offshore Development Targets/expectations to 2020 (GW)**

	<u>2015</u> *	2017**	<u>2020</u> * <u>Current</u>
• Europe:	9-10	15.78	24 (25)
• China:	5 (2)	2.788	30 (10) (5)
• Japan	-	0.065	1-2 (0.2)
• Korea	-	0.038	2-4 (0.4)
• USA	-	0.03	0.5-3.0 (0.03)
Others		0.008	0.6-2.0 (0.5?)
• Total	~14-15 (12.1)		58-65 (31.13)

\* The view from end 2013\*\* Actual 2017



Drivers for wind energy development

Economics

Climate

Business/corporates/consumers

Air pollution/Water

Job creation/industrial development

Demographics – keep rural people on the land



## We've won the price war

Figure 2.16 Global levelised cost of electricity and auction price trends for solar PV, CSP, onshore and offshore wind from project and auction data, 2010-2022



Source: IRENA Renewable Cost Database and Auctions Database.

We can look forward to a thriving business in the future...up to a point.

...because the market alone does not get us where we need to go. See <u>https://eto.dnvgl.com/2018/</u>

Without a decarbonization/climate policy signal we are all in trouble.



Paris Agreement

Article 2

1. This Agreement, in enhancing the implementation of the Convention, including its objective, aims to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change, in the context of sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty, including by:

(a) Holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2 °C above pre-industrial levels and pursuing efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels, recognizing that this would significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change;

(b) Increasing the ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development, in a manner that does not threaten food production; and



#### Global greenhouse gas emissions, per type of gas and source, including LULUCF



Source: EDGAR v4.3.2 (EC-JRC/PBL 2017); Houghton and Nassikas (2017); GFED 4.1s (2017)

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

#### Global Warming of 1.5°C

An IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty





#### Key Findings

1. Is there a (big) difference between 1.5 ° and 2.0° of anthropogenic warming?

In a word, YES. Quite apart from the extra damages, we run real risks of crossing 'tipping points' from which there is no return, particularly in relation to ecosystem transformation and sea-level rise.

2. Is it technically and economically feasible to reach the lower target?

YES, although it's not easy to meet either of them. But the timing is critical, as each passing decade (we've already wasted two...) makes the job that much harder.

3. Is it politically feasible to meet the target?

You tell me. I have to operate as if the answer is yes.



## Carbon Budget = 550-750 GT (some say less)

- 4. Key imperatives:
  - There is no future for coal
  - There is not much of a future for gas, i.e., the 'bridge' we hear so much bout is neither very long nor very high
  - We need to electrify everything that can be electrified, quickly
  - We need decarbonizing strategies for industry *now* which will take decades to achieve
  - Emissions need to basically halve each decade from now on, reaching zero somewhere around 2050
  - The extent and timing of the reduction will determine the extent to which carbon removal strategies (CDR) will need to be deployed
  - We need to clearly distinguish between biological and fossil carbon







#### Total primary energy supply (EJ)



#### Figure 1. Global total primary energy supply and annual $CO_2$ emissions in our decarbonisation scenario

*Ecofys: Energy Transition within* 1.5°*C* 

#### Annual $CO_2$ emissions (Gt $CO_2$ )







Figure 12. Left: annual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per sector. Right: cumulative emissions per energy carrier

*Ecofys: Energy Transition within* 1.5°*C* 



Global corporate PPA volumes, by region



Source: Bloomberg NEF. Note: Data is through July 2018. Onsite PPAs not included. APAC number is an estimate. Pre-market reform Mexico PPAs are not included. These figures are subject to change and may be updated as more information is made available.





First WHO Global Conference on Air Pollution and Health, 30 October – 1 November 2018

Air pollution kills 600,000 children each year: WHO

Air pollution causes 1 in 9 deaths worldwide

Dr. T.A. Ghebeyesus, WHO DG:

"Air pollution is the new tobacco"

Call to action to target reducing the 7 million deaths per year due to air pollution by 2030, as a contribution to achieving the SDGS.



Key Trends

- Onshore wind, solar PV, and now offshore wind fully competitive and almost universally cheapest sources of new power. CSP, Geothermal and others catching up quickly.
- 'Electrification' of just about everything that can be electrified
- Rate of change is extraordinary, and will only increase with digitalisation
- Virtually all scenarios show wind and solar dominating the energy systems of the future.
- Continued rapid technological change happening with materials, siting, plant management and integration.



#### **Coherent and flexible energy systems**





# Key Trends (2)

- Transformation happening at all scales:
  - Large Increasingly interconnected grids and larger balancing areas
  - Medium scale hybrids, more offshore (incl. floating)
  - Small scale mini and microgrids to managing prosumers
- Remaining problems:
  - steel, cement, ships and planes
  - Batteries? Hydrogen/ammonia? Biofuels?





## **Central Issue**

- economically driven change is not fast enough to protect the climate. How to increase the rate of change?
  - Shut down old power plants
  - Price on carbon
  - Subsidy removal
- Need new drivers:
  - Consumers
  - Corporates
  - National/regional targets
  - Something useful out of Paris



## Conclusions

- 100% renewable energy system is inevitable, simply because everything else isn't. The remaining question is whether we do it in time to save the climate.
- Unlike 30, 20, or even 10 years ago, we have the technology, and it's cheap! But we have to use it, make it work together, and fast.
- Focus on key remaining problems: steel, cement, ships, planes
- Massive disruption underway now in power sector, and it's coming in ground transport...more on the way. If we could plan it, it could be better...unlikely, but we live in hope!





# Thank you!

For more information: *Steve Sawyer, GWEC* <u>Steve.Sawyer@gwec.net</u> <u>www.gwec.net</u>



