

Development of International Standards and Certification schemes for Marine Energy Technologies

Deliverable D1.2.1

Report on workshop in Nantes at Ocean Energy Europe



Authors

NAME	ORGANISATION
Martijn Geertzen	Nederlands Elektrotechnisch Comité (NEC)
Anna Southall	European Marine Energy Centre

Table of contents

1.		Atte	ndance	4
2.		Mee	ting location	6
3.		Ager	nda	6
4.		Intro	oduction & motivation	6
5.		MET	-Certified Presentations	6
	5.1		MET-CERTIFIED Project, Peter Scheijgrond, DMEC	6
	5.2		Technical Specifications for marine energy convertors under IEC TC 114, Anna Southall, EMEC	6
	5.3		Certification schemes under IEC RE ME OMC, Olivier Benyessaad, Bureau Veritas	6
6.		Disc	ussion on involvement	7
7.		Eval	uation	9

1. Attendance

Interreg 2 Seas Mers Zeeën MET-CERTIFIED European Regional Development Fund

MET-CERTIFIED

Transnational workshop | 24 October 2017 | Nantes Attendance list

1.80	First name	Last name	Company	Signature
1	Piet	Ackermans	Antea Group	
2	Olivier	Benyessaad	Bureau Veritas	
3	Luca	Castellini	Umbra Cuscinetti S.p.A.	telli'
4	Luis	Chiva	Empresarios Agrupados International. S.A.	(partial)
5	Thomas	Creach	CEA	, //
6	David	Dieffenthaler	Sabella	A
7	Marina	Garcia Abril		Marine
8	Martijn	Geertzen	NEN	with
9	Xavier	Guillou	European Commission - DG MARE	9
10	Raja	Guthi	IMT Atlantique	,
11	Johannes	Hüffmeier	RISE Research Institutes of Sweden	Mini
12	Nicolas	Lariviere-Gillet	Bureau Veritas	1 A
13	Izan	Le Crom	Centrale Nantes	Æ

MaREI Lewis 14 Tony 07 McPherson 15 Gavin Nova Innovation Cesar Nicolas Rodriguez IMT Atlantique 16 Patrice Nkeng Tjega Agence de regulation du secteur de 17 l'electricité Piriou Loïc Sabella 18 Mathieu Priser Naval Energies 19 20 Peter Scheijgrond Dutch Marine Energy Centre Southall EMEC 21 Anna Teillant R&D project engineer 22 Boris 23 Sergey Temeev Applied Technologies Company Ltd. Woznicki 24 Maxime GEORGINA FOLEY LIF NATIONAL OCEAN TEST FACILITY, UCC. Catcale Nates BOURDIER alloun Heriot Walt University lexandro. ICI VILLOV WILLEMEZ ACix Bornemann (Jonis Reckert 157 Mariel Bezenne BZB SEBASTION YBERT 2 CONTRACT DATA Name Layers Register Ifremer

MET-CERTIFIED - Transnational workshop | 24 October 2017 | Nantes - Attendance list

2. Meeting location

Ocean Energy Europe 2017, La Cité des Congrès de Nantes, France Meeting Schedule Start: 9:30 - 12:30

3. Agenda

12:00 -13:00 Lunch and registration				
13:00	Welcome and participation engagement, Dominique Dhondt, University of Ghent			
13:15	Background to the MET-Certified project, Peter Scheijgrond, DMEC			
13:30	Developments of standards under IEC TC114, Anna Southall, European Marine Energy Centre			
14:15	Certification under IEC RE marine energy section, Olivier Benyessaad, Bureau Veritas			
15:00	Coffee break			
15:20	Discussion on market needs and gaps for standards and certification, Peter Scheijgrond, DMEC			
16:40	Wrap up and summary, Martijn Geertzen, Netherlands Standardisation Institute (NEC).			
16:55	Feedback, Dominique Dhondt, University of Ghent			
17:30	Drinks reception (location tbc)			

4. Introduction & motivation

The workshop started with a roll call and short introductions.

5. MET-Certified Presentations

See EU Workshop at OEE2017 Nantes

5.1. MET-CERTIFIED Project, Peter Scheijgrond, DMEC

See presentation

5.2. Technical Specifications for marine energy convertors under IEC TC 114, Anna Southall, EMEC

See presentation

TSs are not set in stone. They are up for regular maintenance cycles and will include feedback from this project Suggestions were made on linking projects like Marinet and to avoid double efforts.

5.3. Certification schemes under IEC RE ME OMC, Olivier Benyessaad, Bureau Veritas

See presentation

6. Discussion on involvement

Comments made:

Use the reputation of other companies: for example Ifremer

Use Marinet II for certification.

Revolving subsidies: subsidise, but let successful projects pay back their subsidies when the can/are succesful

Consider real-time software vs design predictions.

Certification makes the technology much too expensive.

Standards and certification make it easier to get insurance and finance

One person representing more partners. Pay per company not by person.

Participate in mirror committees and meet more often.

Certification of standards studies dialogue with suppliers.

Participation means early access to future data.

Barriers

It's not always clear what will be involved and the level of commitment required.

It can be hard to justify the time and expense to seniors if the output isn't clear. At the moment the output isn't a certificate to a standard so it's harder to explain the benefit/justify. Also the TS don't feed into one another, the resource assessment does not give specific outputs such as the AEP or load cases for the design calculations.

At the moment it's not clear which TS and specifications to use. There are industry standards, IEC MEC technical specifications and standards from other industries. Researching all three takes time. They potentially aren't consistent. When borrowing standards from other industries its time consuming, and it isn't always clear to establish the limitations/risks.

Time-consuming

Time-consuming how to participate and find the right people and right committees.

Needs

Turbulence is not covered by the existing standards. This clearly has an impact on both the performance and design and needs to be included. Aspects of turbulence the standards should comment on include definitions and metrics to be captured during resourced assessment and performance assessment. Their impact on the device performance and how to account for it in design calculations. Also scaling of turbulence for tank testing.

Experience, the industry at the now is at the stage of beginning to gain experience and ensure a repeatable approach. We are still working in a novel environment so there is a need for a technology qualification. The approach needs to be simplified, with less documents and confusion, that is clear on what to use and when. This would encourage growth and enable learnings.

At the moment not all nations are represented. What routes are there for the Italian supply chain get involved and have a voice?

Focus: Insurers need standards for certification:

- Technology
- Resource

Government funding is needed to get things going (launching customer: proof of concept)

Less documents

Simplify processes and documents

Clarify how to get involved.

Clarity on timeframes

Get updates from bureaus.

Lobby for the same national certification processes.

Insurers and banks need certificates.

Bring the process down to small steps principle to prototype.

Expectations

At the moment it's not clear what the time frame is for these TSs to become standards. What should the expectation be?

The expectation is that using standards will improve quality and make it easier and cheaper to find insurance and finance.

The expectation is the more the specifications are used, the more they will improve so continuous development is import. The feedback routes need to be clear.

7. Evaluation

MET-Certified EU Workshop

Tuesday 24 October 2017

Event Feedback overview

Feedback of 13 people was received.

Organisations: unspecified, B2Bsure, Heriott Watt University ICIT, Ecole Centrale de Nantes, BT Projects, IMT Atlantique, Sabella, Ifremer, MaREI OceanEnergy, Bornemann Conseils.

1. Please rate the following aspect of the workshop:

Session	1 Poor	2 Average	3 Good	4 Excellent	N/A
Opening and Engagement				3.8	
MET-CERTIFIED			3.3		
Standardisation			2.5		
Certification			2.7		
Workshop				3.5	

Any comments:

No real outcomes of the discussions (session 5).

Maybe the possibility to join the effort in a project providing certification at low rate (working principle of Marinet II)

I liked the "Activity", as long as we had to push ourselves in order to fulfil the need of a certification, which is not an issue you had to have thought before (depending on background).

2. Please rate the organisation and hospitality:

Logistics & hospitality	1 Poor	2 Average	3 Good	4 Excellent	N/A
Organisation				3.8	
Venue				3.6	
Catering				3.7	

Any comments:

none

3. What were the two best things about the workshop:

Open discussion

Being able to easily communicate with people from different companies and therefore expertise

Networking

Project perspective

The mix of stakeholders present

The flexibility of the workshop Interaction between participants Illustrative presentations Collaboration with memebrs during the workshop Information gathered about future meetings Have participant from every sectors Split the group to better exchange Good exchange of the various stakeholder groups. Having split in working groups for part of the workshop Slide deck Networking The group project (it was maybe a bit too long) Olivier's presentation (the catering) Case studies, BV presence Groups outputs To interact and network with people from different backgrounds. To learn more about the certification process (Olivier's session)

4. Which two things about the workshop would you change:

Shorter

More to the point

Being able to close the blinds as the PowerPoint was hard to read (too bright).

Have cards with our name in order to better identify different actors.

Wider representation form marine Energy (Wave for example)

As far as people are not coming from a "certification background", I would explain the process with more detail using examples.

5. How would you rate the workshop overall? (please circle)

Rate from 1 to 5, with 5 being the best/highest score



6. Do you have any other feedback you wish to add? Would have been good to have a review of existing standards.