ECOS 2023: A state-of-the-art review of Geographic Information System applications, the main criteria of selection, and available data that may be used in the process

Krzysztof Szczepaniec[a], Fergal O'Rourke[b], Peter Ryan[c]

[a]Centre for Renewables and Energy at Dundalk Institute of Technology, School of Engineering, Dundalk, Ireland, krzysztof.szczepaniec@dkit.ie, CA
[b]Centre for Renewables and Energy at Dundalk Institute of Technology, School of Engineering, Dundalk, Ireland, fergal.orourke@dkit.ie
[c]Centre for Renewables and Energy at Dundalk Institute of Technology, School of Engineering, Dundalk, Ireland, peter.ryan@dkit.ie

Abstract:

The energy crisis, global warming, and rising energy consumption have positioned renewable energy as a priority from national and international planning perspectives. Not only to reach the goals of the renewable energy mix, but also as part of overall energy security strategy. Rising energy prices and supply concerns have made the need for energy changes that are tangible for society and have increased public awareness of renewable energy. In order to achieve its renewable energy targets, Ireland has placed a focus on the development of offshore wind energy project, due to its massive potential. Other regions have already commenced the deployment of large-scale offshore wind farms and the technology is now competitive with fossil fuels. This work presents a comparison of Geographic Information System (GIS) applications and Multi-Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM) methods applied in the process of multicriteria site selection for Floating Offshore Wind Farms (FOWF). This work presents a reflection on current trends of FOWF site selection, the most suitable and efficient methods, and outlines critical limitations. Finally, the work attempts to map the next steps that shall be taken to improve the methodology.

Keywords:

Geographic Information System (GIS), Floating Offshore Wind Farm (FOWF), Multi-Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM), Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process (FAHP), Monte Carlo Analytic Hierarchy Process (MAHP), Evidence Reasoning (ER), Multiple Attribute Decision Analysis (MADA), ECOS Conference;

1. Introduction

The energy crisis, global warming, and rising energy consumption have prioritised renewable energy from national and international planning perspectives. Not only to reach the goals of the renewable energy mix but also as part of the overall energy security strategy. Rising energy prices and supply concerns have made the need for changes tangible for society and have increased public awareness of renewable energy. In order to achieve its renewable energy targets, Ireland has begun to shift its attention to offshore wind developments, for a number of reasons. The government has introduced the new Maritime Area Planning Act [1] that streamlines the planning process. Other regions have already begun to deploy large-scale offshore wind energy projects. In January 2023, the Crown Estate signed Lease Agreements for six offshore wind projects, with a total capacity of 8.0 GW located in the waters around England and Wales [2]. The Scottish Government has even more progressive plans. The Net-Zero target has been set to 2045, five years before the consensus reached under the Paris Agreement [3]. To reach this ambitious target, in 2022 the Crown Estate Scotland conducted the ScotWind Leasing auction of 17 offshore projects with a total capacity of 24.8 GW, ten of those projects involve floating technology with a total capacity of 14.6 GW [4].

The energy crisis has accelerated the legislation and set new objectives dictating the pace of offshore wind development. In May of 2022, The European Commission defined the steps leading to independence from Russian fossil fuels before 2030. The Esbjerg Offshore Wind Declaration [5] signed in May of 2022 by representatives of Denmark, Belgium, Netherlands and Germany set out new targets of at least 65 GW by 2030 and 150 GW by 2050. The European region is not the only one to put offshore wind energy in the spotlight, ambitious objectives have been set out by the USA, China, South Korea, Vietnam, India and Brazil [6].

https://doi.org/10.52202/069564-0155

In 2021, 21.1 GW of offshore wind energy was connected globally to the grid [6] setting a new record. However, according to [7] to achieve Net-Zero before 2050, annual installations should increase to 28 GW by 2030 and then to 45 GW by 2050. The unprecedented shift towards offshore wind technology as one of the main renewable energy sources in the energy mix, and the new technology that must be implemented on a commercial scale to reach the targets, will bring new challenges that must be addressed. The vast majority of wind resources, estimated at about 80%, are located in waters deeper than 60 m [9]. From a technological development perspective, the fixed-bottom offshore wind turbine deployment is constrained to a water depth of approximately 60 m [7,8]. Hence to unlock the offshore wind potential and reach the ambitious objectives, the deployment of floating wind turbines on a commercial scale is inevitable.

The rapid growth of installed offshore wind turbines may, however, come at a price. Pressure to act quickly could potentially compromise stakeholders' interests and harm the natural environment, leading to conflicts and negative perceptions of offshore wind by society. In order to mitigate these potential issues, an efficient methodology and toolset to extract the most suitable locations for development projects is crucial. Site selection for the deployment of floating offshore wind farms off the Irish coast requires careful analysis. Careful site selection requires adequate technics that allow data integration with geographical location, analysis of data, and results visualisation. The Geographic Information System (GIS) addresses all of these requirements. Furthermore, it is widely used in spatial environmental studies since it supports the decision-making process by linking it with multicriteria evaluation methods [11]. Environmental and maritime spatial studies are complex and many interests must be considered. Therefore, sufficient criteria prioritisation and alternative comparison methods are highly desirable to implement alongside GIS.

A good example of how critical the preliminary site selection might be is the 400 MW offshore wind farm Anholt, located off the Danish coast on the Baltic Sea. This location was prioritised by authorities in the planning procedure. However, the risk of construction of the wind farm assessed by three potential bidders was so high, that two bidders gave up the race. As a result, only one offer was submitted with the price per kWh twice as high as for other offshore projects at the time [14]. Floating offshore technology is at a relatively early stage of commercialisation, the first commercial-scale floating wind farm, Hywind Scotland has been in operation since 2017; The farm consists of five floating wind turbines with a total capacity of 30 MW [13]. Another project of 3 wind turbines and total capacity of 25 MW called Windfloat Atlantic has operated since 2020 [12]. The largest operating floating wind farm is the Kincardine Offshore Windfarm located off the east coast of Scotland, consisting of five Vestas V164-9.5MW wind turbines and one Vestas V80-2.0MW wind turbine with a total capacity of nearly 50 MW [12].

2. Geographic Information System

2.1. Methods of spatial analysis

The Geographic Information System (GIS) is a data management and processing tool in the spatial domain. Hence, most researchers use GIS as the primary tool because it allows for the convenient organising of data in a spatial grid and its complex processing capability. It is also a flexible tool allowing advanced users to programme new features. Today, because of the large amount of available data, GIS plays an important role in many aspects of the modern economy. In principle, the vector or raster system of data analysis may be used in GIS. The chosen approach depends on the objectives, the results will differ depending on the chosen method [11]. The first common method of vector-based analysis is the conversion of the criteria to true or false values and then using Boolean operators. This approach leads to the results of a crisp spatial mapping of areas that are either included or excluded from a designated set [11]. This method is suitable to process hard constraints as an exclusion area. The second method is based on raster-based analysis where quantitative criteria are processed as continuous variables rather than simplified to a Boolean's true or false approach [11]. Very often two methods are applicable in one study. Examples of vector and raster methods application can be found in [11,17]. The constraints may have a form of exclusion areas like military zones or designated wildlife areas where offshore wind farm development is prohibited. Criteria can also be a continuous factor where development is not prohibited but less or more favourable because of other factors like wind speed, water depth, distance to the port and many others [11,14].

The key to effectively achieving the objectives is a proper definition of criteria that form the attractors and set the boundaries of the study. Criterion is the basis of decision-making; it represents the objectives and methodology and also serves as evidence of the reasoning behind the decision [22]. Hence, diligent criteria selection is a crucial part of the spatial assessment. Furthermore, the selection should also concern the appropriateness and quality of data they are based on.

2.2. State-of-the-art GIS applications

Due to open access to many valuable data sets and GIS tools, the usage of geographical information system in marine spatial planning has gained momentum. The importance of spatial planning is also acknowledged by authorities. In 2014 the European Commission adopted the directive establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning [15]. The main objectives of the directive are to support the sustainable development of the marine sector by consideration of economic, social and environmental aspects and applying the ecosystem-

https://doi.org/10.52202/069564-0155

based approach to ensure the coexistence of various activities and uses. Moreover, the marine spatial plans shall contribute to the sustainable development of the energy sector on the sea, transportation and fisheries with respect to the preservation and protection of the environment.

For the region of the Celtic Sea off the southwest coast of England and Wales, [16,17] have conducted an extensive GIS spatial analysis to identify project development areas to be offered on tender for Floating Offshore Wind Farm (FOWF) deployment. The central axis of the study was the engagement of the stakeholders at an early stage of the study to participate in the process. The study has a discrete structure that could be divided into five steps. In the first step, the authors defined the area of study and defined main assumptions that were implemented in GIS and visualised. In the second step, the hard constraints were defined. The hard constraints consist of nineteen criteria where only nine of them effectively influence the analysed area, and ten of them don't contribute to the model. Despite not ultimately contributing to the model it is important to acknowledge that they were considered in the study. Step three is the restriction model, based on soft constraints. It includes twenty-six criteria with only two of them not affecting the analysed area. Soft and hard constraints have been listed in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1 Hard constraints, exclusion zones

Study	[16, 17]		[18, 19]		[20]		[21]	
Criterion	Applied	Exclusion	Applied	Exclusion	Applied	Exclusion	Applied	Exclusion
Exclusive Economic Zone	Yes	-	Yes	-	No	-	No	-
Distance	Yes	>200 km from grid connection	Yes	>200 NM from shore	No	-	No	-
Protected Wrecks / Heritage	Yes	-	Yes	-	No	-	Yes	-
Environmental protected areas	No	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-
Nuclear Power Stations	Yes	Buffer 1NM	No	-	No	-	No	-
Navigational Dredging	Yes	-	No	-	No	-	No	-
Cables agreements	Yes	-	No	-	No	-	No	-
Infrastructure Oil and Gas Agreements	Yes	-	No	-	No	-	No	-
Meteorological Equipment Agreements	Yes	-	No	-	No	-	No	-
Minerals and Aggregates Agreements	Yes	-	Yes	-	No	-	No	-
Minerals Capital and Navigation Agreements	Yes	-	Yes	-	No	-	No	-
Natural Gas Storage Agreements	Yes	-	No	-	No	-	No	-
Pipelines Agreements	Yes	-	Yes	-	No	-	No	-
Tidal stream, wave, wind agreements	Yes	-	Yes	-	No	-	No	-
Aquaculture agreements	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-
Outfall leases	Yes	Buffer 250 m	No	-	No	-	No	-
Active cables Infrastructure	Yes	Buffer of 250 m	Yes	Buffer 500 m	No	-	No	-
Active Pipelines Infrastructure	Yes	-	Yes	Buffer 500 m	No	-	No	-
Traffic Separations Schemes	Yes	Buffer 1.77 NM	Yes	Buffer 500 m	Yes	-	Yes	-
Platform Helicopter Safety Zones	Yes	-	No	-	No	-	No	-
Military areas	No	-	Yes	-	No	-	No	-

 https://doi.org/10.52202/069564-0155

Wind Velocity	Yes	<9.5 m/s @ hh	Yes	Excluded <4 m/s @ 10 m	No	-	Yes	<4 m/s and >25 m/s
Water Depth	Yes	<50 m >250 m	Yes	<50 m >1000 m	Yes	<62 m >1000 m	Yes	<100 m
Significant wave height	Yes	Not excluded but 2 groups identified: <14 m >14 m	No	-	No	-	Yes	>8 m
Islands / Rocks	No	-	No	Unkonwn	Yes	-	Yes	-
Seismic fault lines	No	-	No	-	Yes	-	No	-

Table 2 Soft constraints, evaluation criteria

Ref.	General Criteria Tier 1	Weight	Basic Criteria Tier 2	Weight	Basic Criteria Tier 3
[17]	Economic	0.5	Navigation	0.1	AIS density (Tier 4)
					Harbor authorities
					Anchorage areas
					Open disposal sites
			Sub-surface infrastructure	0.225	Evaporites agreements
					CCUS agreements
					O&G Fields
					O&G awarded blocks
			Infrastructure	0.175	Out of service pipelines
					Out of service cables
					Wells
			Fisheries	AIS data, linear weight	AIS density (Tier4)
	Environmental	0.2	Environmental designations	0.11	SACs
					SPAs
					Ramsar
					MCZ & NNRs
					SSSIs
			Environmental features	AIS data, linear weight	Fish spawning & nursery areas (Tier 4)
			Contamination	0.09	Closed disposal sites
	Social	0.3	Leisure	0.045	AIS density (Tier 4)
					Recreational Yachting Training Areas
					Marinas
			Visual	0.075	Visibility
			Historic	0.075	Wrecks (unprotected)
					World Heritage Sites
			Bathing	0.09	Bathing beaches
[18]	General Criteria	Weight	Basic Criteria		Weight
	Met-ocean	0.295	Wind velocity		0.073
			Wind potential		0.094
			Water depth		0.038
			Wave conditions		0.051
			Marine currents		0.028

https://doi.org/10.52202/069564-0155

			Temperature	0.01
	Viability	0.104	Technical feasibility	0.066
			Sufficient study times	0.038
	Logistics	0.102	Distance to local electrical grid	0.053
			Distance from coastal facilities	0.048
	Facilities	0.237	Distance from shore	0.033
			Distance from residential areas	0.032
			Distance from the maritime routes	0.03
			Distance from underwater lines	0.042
			Distance to marine recreational activities	0.035
			Distance from airport	0.065
	Marine environment	0.148	Distance from protected areas	0.064
			Proximity to migratory bird paths	0.043
			Proximity to migratory marine life paths	0.041
	Techno-economic	0.114	Area of the territory	0.035
			Proximity to the area of electric demand	0.031
			Population served	0.017
			Multiple resources	0.031
[21]	Met-ocean	0.515	Wind velocity	0.3697
			Potential power output	0.3344
			Significant wave height	0.2441
			Tidal range	0.0518
	Logistics	0.1756	Vicinity to ports maintenance	0.3212
			Sub-station vicinity	0.2384
			Depth range	0.4404
	Facilities and environment	0.3094	Minimum distance to land	0.0669
			Proximity to fisheries	0.0688
			Proximity to shipping lanes	0.2722
			Proximity to shipwrecks	0.0424
			Proximity to MPAs	0.2774
			Proximity to aquatic habitats	0.2722

AIS - Automatic Identification System, CCUS - Carbon Capture Utilisation and Storage, O&G - Oli and Gas, SACs - Special Areas of Conservation, SPAs - Special Protection Areas, MCZ - Marine Conservation Zone, NNRs - National Nature Reserves, SSSIs - Sites of Special Scientific Interest

Step four is based on the application and processing data applied to models in previous steps. As a result of running the exclusion and restriction models in the GIS, the map presenting more or less favourable to FOWFs deployment locations was created. The soft constraints criteria were organised into groups and subgroups and then pairwise compared. The analytic hierarchy process (AHP) was used to assess their relative importance and to calculate the weights of soft constraints. Finally, the weights were applied to the soft constraints model. The combined output has been normalised from 0 to 100 to reflect the percentage of constraints. Then the considered area has been divided into equal cells of the seabed. The constraints have been organised into ten groups ranging from the least constraints of 10% to the most constraint 90% and 100%. Cells constrained in 50% or less were chosen for further proceedings. Then neighbouring cells were organised forming five large areas representing 11,000 km^2, of potential FOWF sites, which will be a subject of a detailed study in step five which has not been completed yet. The selection of the project development areas (PDAs) is based on the assessment of technical risks, cost of energy and environmental and social impact. This step will identify smaller areas of the PDAs that will be offered on public auctions for particular FOWF projects. Therefore, a detailed study of technical risks and the cost of energy is required. To fully understand the technical challenges and cost of the energy the authors are aiming to:

 https://doi.org/10.52202/069564-0155

- study wake effect to shape project parameters and forecast energy yield;
- recognise the relationship between the energy density, turbine layout and mechanical fatigue loading;
- analyse mooring and anchoring systems and their limitation in terms of geotechnical and met-ocean site characteristics;
- recognise energy export options and related costs as well as onshore grid reinforcement.

Finally, based on the information above fine tune Levelised Cost of Energy (LCOE) layer will be used in the final PDAs ranking.

For the region of the European Atlantic coast of Portugal, Spain and France the [18] has proposed an integrated GIS approach of multicriteria site selection for floating offshore wind farms. Researchers conducted the literature review in the field of offshore wind farms site selection based on GIS and Multi-Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM) methods and proposed their proprietary approach of an integrated GIS tool built using the Phyton language. The site selection is performed in three stages. In the first stage data from various regulatory bodies, like national marine spatial plans and issued concessions are collected and processed to feed the GIS model. The second stage is narrowing the area of search by the addition of hard constraints as a result of step one. The hard constraints or in other words exclusion zones can be divided in this study into two main categories. The first is the regulatory, infrastructural and maritime usage while the second is related to social-economic aspects reflected in wind speed, water depth and distance from shore. The locations with an average wind speed below 4 m/s at 10 m height are considered as not suitable therefore form the exclusion zone. As a suitable area to deploy FOWF the water depth range between 50 m to 1000 m has been considered as well as a minimum distance from shore in case of the regions where such regulations are in place. The third step of the study aims to assess the feasible locations defined in the previous step. Each site may have a different characteristic that shall be recognised and represented by the quantitative, objective measure to allow for choice of the best alternative from a technical and socio-economic perspective. To rank sites, a set of evaluation criteria or in other words soft constraints have been proposed by the researchers. With the help of industry experts and as per a review of existing studies, the twenty-three evaluation criteria grouped into six categories have been chosen and applied to the model. Soft and hard constraints have been listed in Table 1 and Table 2. As a result of the study, the forty-two locations suitable for floating offshore farms have been identified and evaluated. The area of potential FOWF development covers 7230 km^2. To ease site comparison, each site has been characterised by the fixed set of evaluation criteria like: average wind speed, wind potential, water depth and others. The researchers have also estimated the number of wind turbines and annual energy yield together with CO_2 and SO_2 reduction as well as direct and indirect job creation. The advantage of the procedure is its flexibility in terms of applied criteria and transparency however since there are just a few examples of operating small-scale floating wind farms, there is no reliable operational data that include the power curve changes and availability factors. Therefore, performance estimates have a large component of uncertainty and shall be treated just as an indication factor. In [18], no MCDM methods have been implemented.

In the follow-up article [19] written by the same authors, the site selection of forty-two potential floating wind sites has been supplemented with the MCDM method to ease and streamline the multi-criteria decision-making process. In that research, scholars utilised the twenty-three evaluation criteria formed in the previous study. The relative importance of each criterion has been estimated in a pairwise comparison process with the AHP methodology. The criteria's weights were assigned based on the opinion of five industry experts representing different fields of the offshore wind industry. The pairwise comparison method was used not only to weight criteria but also to evaluate alternatives which are in this case forty-two locations grouped by region. All feasible locations were compared concerning each criterion therefore with known criterion weight derived in the previous step the most suitable location in each group could be identified.

Castro-Santos et al. [20] have proposed the application of GIS for selecting the site for the floating offshore farm in the North-West of Spain. The GIS method is similar to the above studies and comprises two steps. The first is defining the exclusion zones, and the second step defines the soft constraints. As a hard constraint where development is not permitted or desirable the following restrictions are considered: fishing banks and grounds, navigation areas, Spanish marine development plans, environmental protection areas, underwater rocks and seismic fault lines. Noteworthy is the application of bathymetry as a hard constraint that can be adjusted to the given platform technology addressing different draft requirements. The area of the search will vary depending on the considered technology.

The soft constraints are based on local ports and shipyards' characteristics. The draft, storage area and lifting capability have been considered. In the case study described in [20], the ports and shipyards draft has been set between 3.0 m to 12.5 m which is suitable for installation vessels and tugboats but not for semisubmersible platforms where the draft oscillates around 20 m [10]. Low draft of the shipyards and ports that may not be suitable for towing to site some platform types or preassembled turbines on platforms. A higher draft and study of overhead clearance would contribute to the output of [20].

The final areas of interest are shaped based on hard and soft constraints as per desirable water depth or port and shipyard characteristics. As an output not only feasible areas of development are plotted but also the distance to the suitable port or shipyard and the economic indexes of internal rate of return, levelised cost of energy and others. The economic indexes are presented in the form of a heat map covering only areas that are resultant of the application of exclusion zones and soft constraints. The input parameters that are used to calculate the economic indexes have not been presented in [20]. No MCDM method has been applied in the study, however, the estimation of economic factors and depicture results on maps support decision-making based on economic criteria.

Nonetheless, due to the immaturity of floating wind farm technology, and other factors that have a significant impact on costs and energy yield, it is expected that large uncertainty is assigned to these factors. Therefore, they shall be considered as indications rather than precise values. Nonetheless, it is important to incorporate this information in the study as ultimately, it is one of the key decision drivers. Graphical presentation of economic indexes is a clear advantage of the study [20] and may be used as an input to GIS overlay analysis. However, the lack of clarity on how the indexes were obtained adds extra uncertainty to the results.

For the western part of the Irish coast, [21] has outlined a multiple attribute decision-analysis methodology for selecting the most suitable location to deploy the floating offshore wind farm. In order to limit the search area, researchers conducted a literature review, identified sites that are either developed or in planning procedure, investigated the grid connection possibilities and held meetings and consultations with experts in the renewable and legislation field. This procedure led to the selection of the area of interest of Shannon Foynes Bay off the coast of Galway. Instead of dedicated GIS software typically used in spatial analysis, researchers utilised Microsoft Excel. The Excel cells play the same role as the raster cells in GIS assessments. It allows the assignment of multiple attributes reflecting criteria to each cell and the application of Excel formulas. Usage of Excel where more suitable tools are available may not be the best choice. However, in cases where no high-resolution data are available or the research doesn't require a large spatial precision Excel may serve well. In [21] usage of proper GIS tools would contribute in a positive way to the conducted research. Here also criteria are divided into two main groups of hard and soft constraints. The nine hard constraints and thirteen soft constraints organised into three main groups have been identified. It is unclear if all of the listed constraints have contributed to the final output. After the limitation of the search area by the application of hard constraints the researchers with the help of five experts in the offshore wind industry prioritised soft criteria in the pairwise comparison procedure as a part of the AHP method. Then the MCDM method of Evidence Reasoning (ER) was applied. Soft and hard constraints have been listed in Table 1 and Table 2.

3. Multi-Criteria Decision Making

The Multi-Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) methods are used to support the decision-making aiming to achieve the objective by choosing the best alternative among all alternatives under multiple evaluation criteria. The increase in the number of MCDM methods took place in the 1970s, while the origins of modern MCDM date back to the 1950s [23]. Over one hundred MCDM methods have been developed, moreover, recently hybrid and modular methods are frequently used to eliminate the basic methods' drawbacks. An example is an application of fuzzy set theory to the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), implemented in [29,30]. The MCDM methods are widely used in the financial sector, medical diagnostic, engineering, spatial planning, management and other fields where multiple criteria must be handled in the decision process. The choice of the method depends on the scenario that is analysed. Some of the methods are suitable for certain problem-solving, but there is no single universal method to address all scenarios [24].

3.1. MCDM methods used in site selection

A floating offshore wind farm site selection requires detailed consideration of multiple criteria in order to achieve the objectives. In FOWF site selection one of the most popular methods is the AHP introduced by Saaty in 1971 [25]. Application of AHP requires deconstructing problems in a hierarchical or network structure followed by the Pairwise Comparison (PC) of elements regarding their importance. To score relative importance, Saaty's fundamental scale has been applied as presented in Table 3. In the typical AHP process of site selection, the criteria would be pairwise compared to reaching the goal and separately the alternatives (feasible sites) concerning criteria.

The relative intensity of importance	Name	Explanation
1	Equal importance	Equal contribution
3	Moderate importance	Experience and judgment strongly favour one over another
5	Essential importance	Experience and judgment strongly favour one over another
7	Very strong importance	One is strongly favoured and its dominance is verified in practice
9	Extreme importance	Strong evidence exists in favour of one over another

https://doi.org/10.52202/069564-0155

2,4,6,8	Intermediate values	The comprise solution
Reciprocal	-	If *i* has one of the importance numbers when compared with *j*, then *j* has a reciprocal value of *i*

Table 3 The Saaty's fundamental scale [25]

The AHP is a relatively easy and transparent method, it introduces a structural and logical division of complex problems and a pairwise comparison of its elements step by step. It also allows for group decision-making and evaluation of quantitative and qualitative criteria as well as an application of subjective and objective measures.

Among the weaknesses of the method is a rapid increase in pairwise comparisons with criteria and alternatives to be considered [25]. The number of pairwise comparisons needed for a particular matrix of order *n,* is *n(n-1)/2* because it is reciprocal as well as its diagonal elements are comparisons of the same elements and therefore equal to one [25]. Let the A_1 , A_2 ,…, A_n , be the set of criteria. The comparison of criteria is represented by n-by-n matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, $ij = 1,2, \dots, n$. The quantified pairwise comparison on pairs of $(A_{i,}A_j)$ is represented by numerical entries a_{ij} in matrix A [28]. The entries a_{ij} to (1) follow two general rules:

if $a_{ij} = a$, then $a_{ji} = 1/a$, $a \neq 0$;

and,

if relative importance intensity $A_i = A_j$, then $a_{ij} = 1$, $a_{ji} = 1$, as well as $a_{ii} = 1$.

The comparison matrix *A* has the form:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{a_{1n}} & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)\ [28]$$

Besides human error, bias, or subjectivity, the final result will also be influenced by the presentation of Saaty's scale, the number of degrees used (eg. five instead of nine) and their form of verbal degrees or numerical as well as the graphical presentation of scale. Also, the method of obtaining the judgments is important, whether as an administrated interview or without the influence of the researcher [26]. The main advantages and disadvantages of the AHP method are listed below.

Among the main advantages of the AHP method are:

- Relative simplicity and transparency [25];
- Useful for organising the complex problem into a structured hierarchy [25];
- Offer the possibility of application of quantitative and qualitative criteria as well as an objective and subjective evaluation of each on one scale [19];
- Support of group judgments [25];
- Consistency check allows for verification of errors in the pairwise comparison process [25,28].

However, the AHP method does have some disadvantages:

- It is based on experts' opinions therefore it may be subjective [27];
- Each group of elements that are pairwise compared should not exceed seven, therefore in the case of many criteria division in many subgroups is required [28];
- The number of pairwise comparisons increases rapidly with the number of criteria [25];
- Presentation of Saaty's fundamental scale and form of gathering expert's opinions may influence results [26];

The AHP procedure supported by GIS was used by The Crown Estate [17]. The pairwise comparison of criteria concerning their risk of achieving the objective was introduced. The criteria selection and weighting are a result of consultations with stakeholders and industry experts. Twenty-six soft constraints were identified and organised in the logic hierarchy. The soft constraints were relatively compared with respect to the risk posed to achieve a goal. Therefore, the higher the weight of the criterion then the higher the risk is. The result of this process is weights were normalised from 0 to 100 and divided into ten groups. Finally, they were fed to the GIS model as the attributes of raster cells, where weights were summed-up as an overlay of multiple data layers of each soft constraint. The higher the score the more constraint the raster cell is. The cells with a score of 50% or less were chosen for further proceedings followed by grouping neighbouring cells to form larger areas. In that manner, the areas with the lowest development risk were identified, so further assessment with the concern of the performance and costs of the FOWF can be conducted.

For the Atlantic coastal region of Spain, France and Portugal, Diaz and Guedos Soares [19], conducted an extensive multicriteria floating site evaluation. Their work comprises not only criteria weighting but also an

https://doi.org/10.52202/069564-0155

evaluation of forty-two sites that have been outlined as a result of the GIS procedure conducted in the preceding study [18]. The pairwise comparisons of constraints were conducted by five experts experienced and competent in broad offshore energy areas. Nonetheless, the evaluation of the importance of certain criteria varied between experts, which indicates the bias made by their area of expertise. The way of objectifying experts' input or at least the measurement of ambiguity and ignorance would contribute in a positive way to the study and assessment of the results. The authors also identified this downside and therefore explored other MCDM methods in the further studies [29].

To reflect the central tendency of the results of pairwise comparisons conducted by the experts, their judgments were averaged throughout the geometric mean. Unlike in [17] the criteria weights calculated in [19] are reflecting risks by minimising weight with the proximity to certain elements (eg. maritime routes) and the opportunities by maximising weight where higher wind speed occurs. The higher the combined weight the better the location is from an economic and risk perspective.

The AHP method assumes that the decision maker in the pairwise comparison process can select a clear winner which may not be the case in many situations. In these cases, the probabilistic approach would provide additional information [30]. Therefore, the AHP is not recommended for scenarios with high uncertainty of judgments. Also, if the final rank of alternatives is convergent, there are no statistical measures to differentiate alternatives and support decision-making [31].

To address issues inherently related to the application of AHP, the study [19] has been extended by Diaz et al. [29] with the addition of the Monte Carlo simulations and Fuzzy Set theory to determine the relative preference of wind farm locations. The fuzzy set theory applied to AHP forming the FAHP allows for ambiguity in decisions, where there are no clear boundaries therefore the decisions are closer to natural human decisions [29,30]. The application of the fuzzy set is executed by replacing the standard Saaty's scale with Triangular Fuzzy Numbers (TFNs).

The AHP and FAHP do not provide a measure for the imprecision and disagreement between decision-makers. The Monte Carlo Analytic Hierarchy Process (MAHP) provides information about the influence on results of judgment variability of decision-makers. The application of Monte Carlo simulation is recommended when there is a large uncertainty associated with the ranking of alternatives. However, the exact level of uncertainty over which the Monte Carlo Analytic Hierarchy Process (MAHP) outperforms the AHP is not clearly defined [31,32]. In [29] nine different locations were ranked based on twenty-three criteria resulting in twenty-three separate sets of pairwise comparisons for each location. Finally, the ranking of each location was performed with three methods: AHP. FAHP and MAHP. The same results were derived for locations ranked at first, second and third place. Seven out of nine locations were ranked the same by AHP and MAHP, the only differences being locations ranked as seven (Bilbao) and eight (Mutriku). Five out of nine locations were ranked the same by AHP and FAHP, where the highest difference in ranking is by two places, the location ranked by AHP is in seventh position while using the FHAP method is in ninth position. In All three methods, changes by one to two locations in the ranking occurred between Bilbao, Mutriku and San Vicente sites. The probability distribution derived from MAHP shows that the probability of ranking those three locations at the place of seventh, eighth and ninth is very close oscillating around 30%. That explains slight differences in final results between the three methods. Convergent results especially between the AHP and MAHP and slight variance between AHP and FAHP indicates that in the given example, the AHP method itself performs equally or if not better considering its simplicity than FAHP and MAHP. The clear advantage of study is application of MAHP resulting with an additional data to be used in interpretation of the results. The Table 4 lists the results of the [29].

Table 4. Comparison of AHP, FAHP and MAHP results from [29].

No.	Site name	Ranking			Probability of occurrence at a given ranking place					
		AHP	FAHP	MAHP	Ranking No.	Probability	Ranking No.	Probability	Ranking No.	Probability
1	Ribadeo	1	1	1	1	87%	2	6%	3	4%
2	Navia	2	2	2	2	40%	3	36%	4	10%
3	A Guarda1	3	3	3	3	35%	4	24%	2	21%
4	Huelva	4	5	4	4	24%	2	21%	6	20%
5	A Guarda2	5	4	5	5	33%	4	25%	6	22%
6	Santander	6	6	6	6	43%	5	29%	4	13%
7	Bilbao	7	9	8	9	32%	7	28%	8	28%
8	Mutriku	8	8	7	8	31%	9	30%	7	29%
9	San Vicente	9	7	9	8	32%	9	30%	7	29%

 https://doi.org/10.52202/069564-0155

A slightly different approach to multi-criteria site selection of FOWF is presented in [21]. Researchers applied the AHP method to calculate weights of general and basic criteria and then employed the Evidence Reasoning (ER) method to rank the sites. The AHP method combined with ER is also named Multiple Attribute Decision Analysis (MADA). The ER is an evidence-based primary MCDM method developed in the early nineties. It applies to solving problems having quantitative and qualitative criteria [21]. Unlike in the AHP, the ignorance and uncertainty of decision-makers can be assessed. The downside of this method is its complexity, therefore non specialists may not be able to apply it or interpret results [33]. In [21] the MADA method was applied to rank forty-three sites of Shannon Foynes Bay off the coast of Galway. The utility ranking derived in the MADA method vary in the range of 0.6193 for the site ranked at first place to 0.5421 for the site at forty-third place which results in an average step per rank of 0.002. As a result of the study, the most suitable site has been determined along with other sites where five of the most suitable sites are adjacent. The site named F16 is the most favourable site among all forty-three sites explored. Furthermore, this site was ranked high in all three general criteria. However, site G14 ranked third position was ranked twelve and nineteenth in terms of the general criteria of met-ocean and facilities and environment but first in general criteria of logistics. The general criteria weighting has been distributed in [21] as follows: met-ocean 51.50%, facilities and environment 30.94% and logistic 17.56%. It is seen that combination weighting has a profound effect on the final assessment of site suitability [21]. The very small average step per place in rank and therefore high sensitivity to criteria alteration and resulting high uncertainty indicate that MADA method may not suit well in ranking adjacent sites of similar characteristics. To support the result interpretation, the ignorance and uncertainty of decision-makers shall be assessed in [21].

In [34] the researchers compared AHP and MADA methods. The comparison has been performed based on the case study of twenty-two feasible sites off the coast of Scotland and three sites off the Madeira Islands. The locations used in the case study were derived from other studies performed by Loughney et al. [35] and Diaz and Guedes Soares [18,19]. The final results of ranking sites off Scotland's shore show no substantial differences in location suitability assessment. Results up to eight in rank vary by one place. Results of ranking sites off the Madeira Islands are the same for the first place in ranking however the second and third places are reversed between AHP and MADA.

The weights range for the ranking of the Scottish sites is very narrow for the AHP method ranging between 0.9984 for the site ranked at first place to 0.9866 for the site ranked at the twenty-second place. It means that the average step of weight per place in the ranking is 0.0006. The range of weights derived in the MADA method vary in range of 0.7565 for the site ranked at first place to 0.6325 for the site at twenty-second place which results in an average step per rank of 0.006. The range of weights in the ranking of the Madeira Islands is wider than for Scottish sites the weights range from 0.697 to 0.567 in the AHP method and from 0.392 to 0.300 in the MADA method. Respectively the average step of weight per place of rank is then 0.065 and 0.046. The relatively narrow weight range in the case study of Scottish [35] sites are compared to Irish sites as in [21] which were also grouped in a relatively small area is probably the result of lower differentiation of sites' characteristics. The very small average step per place in rank, high sensitivity and resultant high uncertainty indicate that AHP and MADA methods may not suit well in ranking adjacent sites of similar characteristics.

The comparison shows that both methods are suitable to support multi-criteria decision-making and allow for the engagement of the industry experts and stakeholders considering all interests because both methods support group-decision making. The inherent subjectivity of preferences between criteria is one of the disadvantages of the AHP method. Limited involvement of experts in the final steps of the MADA method, which requires a detail study of criteria by the methodology developer, may reduce the influence of the subjectivity of the experts [34]. One of the advantages of the MADA method is its ability to measure ignorance, however this factor has not been estimated in reviewed studies. [21,34].

The AHP method requires less computations, is easier to implement, and more intuitive, therefore in this regard, it outperforms the MADA method. Because of this the AHP may be the preferred method to be applied where stakeholders and non-specialists are engaged in the process of site selection. Results indicate that the value of the weight across all sites is very similar, therefore there is no clear winner. In this case, the uncertainty of the results is high. This can raise confusion among stakeholders that no clear information for decision-making has been obtained as a result of the study. Ranking sites of similar characteristics using the AHP and MADA methods requires a diligent approach because of large uncertainty of the results.

4. Conclusion and further research

The complexity of this task is reflected in different sets of soft and hard criteria chosen by researchers as listed in Table 1 and Table 2. Some of the discrepancies in the criteria selection result from the methodology and some from the geographical region that is analysed but most of them are caused by lack of standardisation and immaturity of technology therefore lack of clear guidance that would set the framework to floating offshore farm site selection.

https://doi.org/10.52202/069564-0155

The methods of site selection are evolving and researchers use various GIS techniques, different criteria sets, as well as various combinations of MCDM methods. Very often the AHP method has been used to derive the criteria weights and rank sites.

The inherent disadvantage of the AHP method is its subjectivity and lack of possibility to measure ignorance and ambiguity of the expert's input. Some researchers applied a combination of the AHP method with other methods like fuzzy set theory, Monte Carlo simulations and evidence reasoning. A comparison of the results shows that there is no clear winner among those methods. Some of them like ER method add extra layers of complexity that its application is limited to advanced users and therefore would work as a black box for non-specialists. One of the advantages of the ER method is its ability to measure ignorance however this estimation has not been performed in reviewed studies [21,34].

The application of Monte Carlo simulations adds extra information to the site selection process. Despite its complexity, the probability distribution of rank place of various alternatives may be very important information in the decision-making process. However, very similar results between AHP and MAHP in the reviewed study [29] as presented in Table 4 together with the simplicity of AHP compared to MAHP are questioning the application of this method.

The application of MCDM methods to rank sites of very similar characteristics may result in convergent results for the sites, however, the uncertainty of the results is high and the final site ranking may be questionable. Therefore, the GIS and MCDM methods perform well in high-level spatial analysis over a large area on a national or international scale. While assessing adjacent sites on a local level different methods or at least different sets of criteria shall be considered.

Further research on site selection for floating wind farms should be focused on creating the standards reflecting the technical specification of floating platforms supported by operational data. That would decrease the level of experts' judgment subjectivity as well as allow for test robustness of various MCDM methods using the same criteria and possibly a quantitative comparison of them.

Future research shall also be conducted towards the economic aspects concerning the Levelised Cost of Energy (LCOE) from floating offshore wind farms. The success and pace of implementation of this technology are strongly correlated with this factor.

References

[1] Electronic Irish Statute Book (eISB) – Available at:<https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2021/act/50/enacted/en/html> [accessed 23.1.2023].

[2] The Crown Estate, Offshore Wind Leasing Round 4 – Available at:<https://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/round-4/> [accessed 25.1.2023].

[3] Act of the Scottish Parliament. Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Act 2019 (asp 15).

[4] The Crown Estate Scotland, ScotWind Leasing – Available at:<https://www.crownestatescotland.com/news/scotwind-offshore-wind-leasing-delivers-major-boost-to-scotlands-net-zero-aspirations> [accessed 25.1.2023].

[5] The Esbjerg Offshore Wind Declaration - Available at:<https://windeurope.org/policy/joint-statements/the-esbjerg-offshore-wind-declaration/> [accessed 26.1.2023].

[6] Williams R, Zhao F, & Lee J. (2022). *GWEC GLOBAL OFFSHORE WIND REPORT 2022*

[7] IRENA (2019), Future of wind: Deployment, investment, technology, grid integration and socio-economic aspects (A Global Energy Transformation paper), International Renewable Energy Agency, Abu Dhabi.

[8] Jiang, Z. (2021). Installation of offshore wind turbines: A technical review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *139*, 110576. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2020.110576

[9] The Global Wind Atlas – Available at:<https://globalwindatlas.info/en> [accessed 23.1.2023].

[10] Sergiienko, N. Y., da Silva, L. S. P., Bachynski-Polić, E. E., Cazzolato, B. S., Arjomandi, M., & Ding, B. (2022). Review of scaling laws applied to floating offshore wind turbines. In *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* (Vol. 162). Elsevier Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2022.112477

[11] Eastman, J. R. (1999). Multi-criteria evaluation and GIS. *John Wiley and Sons*, 493–502.

[12] Principle Power the official website – Available at:<https://www.principlepower.com/windfloat> [accessed 27.1.2023].

[13] Equinor the official website – Available at:<https://www.equinor.com/energy/hywind-scotland> [accessed 27.1.2023].

[14] Möller Bernd, B. (2011). Continuous spatial modelling to analyse planning and economic consequences of offshore wind energy. *Energy Policy*, *39*(2), 511–517. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2010.10.031

[15] European Commission. Directive 2014/89/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2014 establishing a framework for maritime spatial planning.

 https://doi.org/10.52202/069564-0155

[16] Fitch-Roy, O., Baldock, N., Gibberd, G., & Phillips, J. (2020). BROAD HORIZONS: Key resource areas for offshore wind Summary Report An Everoze Report, commissioned by The Crown Estate.

[17] The Crown Estate. (2022). *Celtic Sea Floating Wind Programme: Draft Site Selection Methodology*. https://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/media/4150/2022-floating-wind-site-selection-methodology-report.pdf

[18] Díaz, H., & Guedes Soares, C. (2020). An integrated GIS approach for site selection of floating offshore wind farms in the Atlantic continental European coastline. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *134*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110328

[19] Díaz, H., & Guedes Soares, C. (2022). A novel multi-criteria decision-making model to evaluate floating wind farm locations. *Renewable Energy*, *185*, 431–454. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2021.12.014

[20] Castro-Santos, L., Lamas-Galdo, M. I., & Filgueira-Vizoso, A. (2020). Managing the oceans: Site selection of a floating offshore wind farm based on GIS spatial analysis. *Marine Policy*, *113*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2019.103803

[21] Loughney, S., Wang, J., Bashir, M., Armin, M., & Yang, Y. (2021). Application of a multiple-attribute decision-analysis methodology for site selection of floating offshore wind farms off the West coast of Ireland. *Developments in Renewable Energies Offshore - Proceedings the 4th International Conference on Renewable Energies Offshore, RENEW 2020*, 389–398. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003134572-45

[22] Eastman, L. R., Jin, W., K' Kyem, P. A., & Toledano, J. (1995). Raster Procedures for Multi-Criteria /Multi-0biective Decisions. In *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing* (Vol. 61, Issue 5).

[23] Mardani, A., Jusoh, A., Nor, K. M. D., Khalifah, Z., Zakwan, N., & Valipour, A. (2015). Multiple criteria decision-making techniques and their applications - A review of the literature from 2000 to 2014. In *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja* (Vol. 28, Issue 1, pp. 516–571). Taylor and Francis Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2015.1075139

[24] Baydaş, M., & Pamučar, D. (2022). Determining Objective Characteristics of MCDM Methods under Uncertainty: An Exploration Study with Financial Data. *Mathematics*, *10*(7). https://doi.org/10.3390/math10071115

[25] Saaty, R. W. (1987). THE ANALYTIC HIERARCHY PROCESS-WHAT IT IS AND HOW IT IS USED (Vol. 9, Issue 5).

[26] Prusak, A., Stefanów, P., & Strojny, J. (n.d.). Monica GARCIA-MELON 4 THE INFLUENCE OF THE FORM OF THE 9-POINT SCALE IN THE AHP METHOD ON THE CONSISTENCY OF JUDGMENTS: Vol. XXI. www.superdecisions.com

[27] Saaty, T. L., & Vargas, L. G. (2001). *The Seven Pillars of the Analytic Hierarchy Process* (pp. 27–46). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-1665-1_2

[28] Saaty, T. L., & Ozdemir, M. S. (2003). Why the Magic Number Seven Plus or Minus Two. In *MATHEMATICAL coMPuTEa MODELLING Mathematical and Computer Modelling* (Vol. 38). www.elsevier.com/locatp!mcm

[29] Díaz, H., Teixeira, A. P., & Guedes Soares, C. (2022). Application of Monte Carlo and Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Processes for ranking floating wind farm locations. *Ocean Engineering*, *245*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2021.110453

[30] Taoufik, M., & Fekri, A. (2021). GIS-based multi-criteria analysis of offshore wind farm development in Morocco. *Energy Conversion and Management: X*, *11*, 100103. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ECMX.2021.100103

[31] Rosenbloom, E. S. (1996). EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF OPERATIONAL RESEARCH A probabilistic interpretation of the final rankings in AHP. In *European Journal of Operational Research* (Vol. 96).

[32] Yaraghi, N., Tabesh, P., Guan, P., & Zhuang, J. (2015). Comparison of AHP and Monte Carlo AHP under different levels of uncertainty. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, *62*(1), 122–132. https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2014.2360082

[33] Ngan, S. C. (2015). Evidential Reasoning approach for multiple-criteria decision making: A simulation-based formulation. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *42*(9), 4381–4396. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2014.12.053

[34] Díaz, H., Loughney, S., Wang, J., & Guedes Soares, C. (2022). Comparison of multicriteria analysis techniques for decision making on floating offshore wind farms site selection. *Ocean Engineering*, *248*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2022.110751

[35] Loughney, S., Wang, J., Bashir, M., Armin, M., & Yang, Y. (2021). Development and application of a multiple-attribute decision-analysis methodology for site selection of floating offshore wind farms on the UK Continental Shelf. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, *47*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seta.2021.101440