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Abstract

Despite the promising outlook, the numerous economic and environmental benefits of offshore wind energy are still compromised by its high operations and maintenance (O&M) expenditures. On one hand, offshore-specific challenges such as site remoteness, harsh weather, high transportation requirements, and production losses, significantly inflate the total O&M expenses relative to land-based wind farms. On the other hand, the uncertainties in weather conditions, asset degradation, and electricity prices largely constrain the farm operator’s ability to determine the time windows at which maintenance is possible, let alone optimal. In response, we propose STOCHOS, short for the stochastic holistic opportunistic scheduler—a maintenance scheduling approach tailored to address the unique challenges and uncertainties in offshore wind farms. Given probabilistic forecasts of key environmental and operational parameters, STOCHOS optimally schedules the offshore maintenance tasks by harnessing the maintenance opportunities that arise due to a combination of favorable weather conditions, on-site maintenance resources, and maximal operating revenues. STOCHOS is formulated as a two-stage stochastic mixed integer linear program, which we solve using a scenario-based rolling horizon algorithm that aligns with the industrial practice. Scenarios are generated using a probabilistic forecasting framework which adequately characterizes the temporal dependence in key input parameters. Evaluated on a real-world case study from the U.S. North Atlantic where several large-scale offshore wind farms are currently being developed, STOCHOS demonstrates considerable improvements relative to prevalent maintenance benchmarks, across several O&M metrics, including total cost, downtime, resource utilization, and maintenance interruptions, attesting to its potential merit towards enabling the economic viability of offshore wind energy.
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1 Introduction

Offshore wind (OSW) is set to play a pivotal role in global climate change mitigation efforts (Buonocore et al., 2016). As a clean source of energy, it has a significantly smaller environmental footprint than fossil fuels, while unlocking access to stronger and steadier wind resources than those in-land, resulting in higher and more reliable generation of electricity. Several countries worldwide have established multi-year targets for the adoption or the expansion of their OSW energy portfolios, with recent reports projecting a growth in its world-wide capacity of at least 15 times by 2040 (IEA, 2019).

Despite the promising outlook, OSW still faces substantial technical challenges pertaining to the high expenditures associated with operating and maintaining a fleet of OSW
turbines. Aside from the high upfront capital costs—which are largely due to the foundation construction and underwater cabling—a substantial portion of the total life cycle cost of OSW farms is attributed to operations and maintenance (O&M) activities. Recent estimates suggest that O&M activities performed throughout an OSW farm’s lifetime contribute up to 30% of the total life cycle costs (Stehly and Beiter 2020).

1.1 The need for opportunistic maintenance:

The high O&M costs in OSW farms are driven by several unique challenges, including:

(C1) OSW farm accessibility: The ability of the maintenance crew to safely access the OSW farm is frequently prohibited by harsh metocean conditions (typically the combination of high wind speeds and wave heights) (Gilbert et al. 2021). Accurate access information is therefore crucial for effective OSW maintenance planning. Our analysis of the metocean conditions in the designated OSW areas in the NY/NJ Bight (where several OSW projects are currently in-development) suggests that an OSW turbine sited at that location can be inaccessible for \(\sim 56\%\) of its operational time due to unsafe wind and/or wave conditions. Incorrectly accounting for access information in maintenance planning leads to frequent maintenance interruptions, prolonged downtimes, and low resource utilization.

(C2) Transportation and maintenance requirements: OSW turbines are installed in remote locations that are accessed via repair vessels or helicopters, typically chartered from private O&M contractors. Crew and equipment transport alone contributes \(\sim 28-73\%\) of the OSW O&M costs (Carroll et al. 2017; Dalgic et al. 2015). Moreover, the harsh weather conditions at OSW farms further accelerate asset degradation and failure rates (Carroll et al. 2016), which directly translate into frequent maintenance visits. Those high maintenance requirements largely inflate the maintenance setup costs relative to onshore wind farms.

(C3) Cost of revenue losses: Modern OSW turbines have \(\sim 2-3\) times higher capacity relative to their land-based counterparts. An example is GE’s Haliade-X, a 220m high, 14 MW turbine, which is set to operate off of the US Northeastern coast by 2024 (GE 2021; Golparvar et al. 2021). A shutdown of such ultra-scale turbine results in significant revenue losses, especially at times of strong winds and/or favorable market prices.

Those offshore-specific challenges (C1-C3) make the conventional maintenance scheduling approaches—which may be well-suited for land-based operations—sub-optimal, moti-
vating the need for an “opportunistic” approach for OSW maintenance scheduling. The essence of opportunistic maintenance is to incentivize the grouping of maintenance tasks (that would have been otherwise scheduled independently) at times of “maintenance opportunity” (De Jonge and Scarf, 2020). In light of C1-C3, those opportunities can be one of the following: (i) access-based opportunities: grouping maintenance tasks at times of projected OSW farm access to minimize maintenance delays, interruptions, and downtime due to inaccessibility; (ii) resource-based opportunities: grouping maintenance tasks to leverage maintenance resources that are already on-site (e.g. vessels, equipment, crew) in order to share the setup cost among multiple turbines and maximize resource utilization; and (iii) revenue-based opportunities: grouping maintenance tasks at times where production losses would be minimal (e.g. at times of anticipated low winds and/or low market prices).

Our survey of the literature (see Table 1) suggests that the overwhelming majority of research in wind farm opportunistic maintenance solely focuses on resource-based opportunities, which are often referred to in the literature as “economic dependencies” (Shafeeq et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2019; Ding and Tian, 2012; Lu et al., 2017; Sarker and Faiz, 2016; Besnard and Bertling, 2010; Ko and Byon, 2017). A small fraction of those efforts partially account for revenue losses by incentivizing the grouping of maintenance tasks at periods of low power production (Besnard et al., 2009; Yildirim et al., 2017; Song et al., 2018). A separate line of research focuses on forecasting access-based opportunities (Zhang et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2020; Lubing et al., 2019; Taylor and Jeon, 2018), but largely overlooks those based on economic dependencies and/or those related to revenue losses.

Barring few recent efforts (Mazidi et al., 2017; Besnard et al., 2011; Papadopoulos et al., 2022), there is a lack of approaches that holistically account for multiple components of maintenance opportunity. Papadopoulos et al. (2022) show that such a holistic approach can lead to major reductions in O&M costs due to the inter-dependencies between the three opportunistic components, making their combined impact on total costs multiplicative rather than additive. For instance, both access- and revenue-based opportunities are weather-related, while leveraging resource-based opportunities are only possible when OSW farm access is guaranteed. However, a main limitation in the work of Papadopoulos et al. (2022) is its inherent assumption that perfect knowledge about key environmental and operational parameters is available to the maintenance planner.
## 1.2 The value of recognizing uncertainty in OSW maintenance

Several prior studies have advocated the importance of uncertainty modeling in wind farm maintenance planning (Byon et al., 2010; Perez et al., 2015). We argue that, for an opportunistic maintenance approach, the need for recognizing uncertainty is even more pressing because the imperfect knowledge about key environmental and operational parameters can largely compromise (or may even reverse) the economic gains from such approach.

The main reason is that those parameters, which are uncertain and difficult to predict, are the primary determinants of the “opportunity windows”, i.e. times at which maintenance grouping is economically desirable, including: (i) uncertainty of metocean conditions (wind speed and wave height), which are the main determinants of OSW farm access (access- and resource-based opportunities), as well as the power production (revenue-based opportunities), (ii) uncertainty of electricity prices, which govern the generated revenues.
(revenue-based opportunities), and (iii) uncertainty in asset degradation, which impacts a turbine’s downtime and production losses (revenue- and resource-based opportunities).

This suggests that an opportunistic maintenance approach, albeit being desirable in essence, could have conflicting effects: On one hand, if (near) perfect knowledge of the uncertain parameters listed above is available, then the maintenance planner can precisely anticipate the windows of opportunity, and hence, fully harness the economic gains of an opportunistic approach. On the other hand, incorrect information about such parameters can have an adverse impact: Multiple maintenance tasks will be grouped at a time when maintenance may not even be feasible, let-alone optimal, leading to significant maintenance delays and excessive downtime. In such situations, even an “unopportunistic” approach that individually schedules maintenance actions would have possibly been more cost-efficient.

Figure 1: Impact of overlooking uncertainty on the OSW maintenance schedules. (A) Wind speed and wave height true data, forecasts and 50 random scenarios. (B) Accessibility states. (C) Maintenance schedules obtained from a deterministic and a stochastic strategy.

We illustrate the value of considering parameter uncertainty in OSW opportunistic maintenance scheduling with a realistic example, shown in Figure 1 where the wind speed and wave height data, point forecasts, and scenarios are displayed in Figure 1-A (more about
our data and forecasts in Section 3. Figure 1-B conveys information about the “access state”; the OSW farm is inaccessible when either the wave height or the wind speed exceed their respective safety thresholds. Specifically, the top row of Figure 1-B shows the scenario-based probability of access, whereas the middle and bottom rows show the accessibility as a binary variable informed by the point forecasts and real data, respectively. Figure 1-C is a Gantt chart, representing the maintenance schedules obtained by two optimization models: a deterministic (dotted bars) and a stochastic (hashed bars) model. The $x$-axis denotes the planning horizon (in hours) and the $y$-axis denotes the wind turbine (WT) index (here, we have 5 WTs). Note that both optimization approaches are opportunistic, i.e., they are formulated to holistically leverage access-, resource-, and revenue-based opportunities. Yet, the main difference between both models is that the former only takes as input the point forecasts of the environmental and operational parameters listed above, while the latter makes use of the full probabilistic distribution of the forecasts to generate uncertainty scenarios as inputs to the stochastic optimization.

In the case of the deterministic model which assigns complete confidence to the point forecasts, small forecasting errors can incur significant maintenance costs. Consider the fifth day (96-120-h range) where the point forecasts under-predict the wave height, projecting that the OSW farm would be accessible (while in reality, it is not; See Inset in Figure 1-A). Thus, the deterministic approach (mistakenly) perceives it as an optimal time to group three maintenance tasks for WT3, WT4, and WT5 to leverage this access period and concurrent low power production. With access inaccurately estimated, all three maintenance tasks end up being interrupted (See Figure 1-C), leaving the WTs in a non-operational status until the following day, where maintenance is ultimately resumed once access is restored.

The stochastic approach, on the other end, recognizes the forecast uncertainty, and hence, the risk of maintenance interruption is foreseen. Here, the model delays the maintenance until day 7, where both wind and wave conditions are expected to be tolerable, resulting in uninterrupted maintenance for all three WTs, and a total cost reduction of 31% relative to the deterministic approach’s schedule.

It is natural to expect, that in complex operational environments such as that of OSW farms, similar cases caused by the synergistic effects of parameter uncertainty occur quite often. It is therefore necessary for a maintenance scheduling optimization model to be
able to account, not only for maintenance opportunities, but also for the uncertainties in
the environmental and operational parameters that define what constitutes a maintenance
opportunity in first place. Looking at Table 1, there is a lack of efforts that attempt to holis-
tically consider maintenance opportunities and the full spectrum of parameter uncertainty
in a unified framework. This is the research gap addressed in this work.

1.3 Contributions

To fill this gap, this paper proposes the STOChastic Holistic Opportunistic Scheduler (STO-
CHOS)\(^1\). The contributions of this work are listed as follows:

1. STOCHOS is the first offshore-tailored maintenance optimization framework which
   (i) holistically leverages the combined maintenance opportunities arising due to ac-
   cessibility, maximal revenue, and transportation costs, and (ii) accounts for the multi-
   source uncertainties of metocean conditions, asset degradation, and electricity prices.
   We propose a new formulation for STOCHOS as a two-stage stochastic mixed integer
   linear program (MILP), and solve it using a scenario-based rolling horizon algorithm
   that aligns with the industrial practice of OSW maintenance planning.

2. Instead of using temporally invariant distributional assumptions about input param-
   eters, as prevalent in the classical stochastic optimization literature, we generate
   scenarios (or trajectories) from a probabilistic forecasting framework which provides
   a powerful representation of the temporal nature of OSW data (e.g. metocean condi-
   tions, electricity prices), and constitute optimal inputs to the stochastic optimization.
   We demonstrate the economic value of this probabilistic forecasting approach relative
   to the use of marginal predictive distributions or point predictions.

3. In terms of practical relevance, we extensively evaluate STOCHOS using real-world
data from a unique geographical region in the U.S. North Atlantic. With several
large-scale projects currently in-development, this geographical region will soon be the
epicenter of the U.S. OSW energy transition \(^{BOEM\[2021]}\). We compare STOCHOS
against a set of prevalent maintenance benchmarks, and show its superior performance
in terms of several O&M metrics. Our data, models, and findings can therefore provide
timely and key insights to the operators of those soon-to-be-operational OSW farms\(^2\).

\(^1\)In Greek, STOCHOS (written as Στόχος) translates to “target,” or “objective.”
\(^2\)Our codes and data are available on GitHub at https://github.com/petros-pap/STOCHOS
The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the formulation of STOCHOS. Section 3 presents the probabilistic forecasting and scenario generation approaches, followed by the solution procedure in Section 4. Section 5 presents our results and findings. We summarize our conclusions and future research directions in Section 6.

2 Model Formulation

This section starts with an introduction of notation and modeling assumptions, followed by the model formulation of STOCHOS.

2.1 Problem description and assumptions

(A1) We define \( I := \{ i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}^+, 1 \leq i \leq N_I \} \) as the set of offshore WTs that must undergo a preventive maintenance task of \( \tau_i \) hours. We focus on minor to medium maintenance tasks which typically require less than a day to complete (e.g. electrical components, grease/oil cooling liquids, sensors and controls), which comprise \( \sim 75\% \) of all maintenance tasks in OSW farms (Carroll et al., 2016; Dinwoodie et al., 2015).

(A2) The planning horizon is divided into two sub-horizons: a day-ahead short-term horizon (STH) and a long-term horizon (LTH). The STH, \( \mathcal{T} := \{ t \mid t \in \mathbb{Z}^+, 1 \leq t \leq 24 \text{ hours} \} \), is of hourly resolution. The LTH, \( \mathcal{D} := \{ d \mid d \in \mathbb{Z}^+, 1 \leq d \leq N_D \text{ days} \} \), has a daily resolution, starting the day after the STH up to \( N_D \) days ahead. We denote LTH variables and parameters with a superscript \( L \) to distinguish them from their STH counterparts. The separation into STH and LTH is inspired by the industrial O&M practice in OSW (Browell et al., 2016; Koltsidopoulos Papatzimos, 2020).

(A3) STOCHOS is solved using sample average approximation by optimizing a stochastic MILP (to be presented next) over a random scenario subset, \( \mathcal{S} := \{ s \mid s \in \mathbb{Z}^+, 1 \leq s \leq N_S \text{ scenarios} \} \). Hereinafter, notations for random variables, real data, point forecasts, and scenarios are denoted as follows. If \( z(t) \) denotes an arbitrary random variable in the STH, then \( z_t \) denotes its true (actual) value at the \( t \)-th hour, \( \hat{z}_t \) denotes the corresponding point forecast, while \( z_{t,s} \) is the realization of a random scenario \( s \) at time \( t \). Replacing \( t \) by \( d \) extends this notation to an LTH variable \( z^L(d) \).

(A4) We assume that the wind speed, wave height, and electricity prices are uncertain
during both the STH and LTH, which are denoted by $\nu(t), \eta(t), \kappa(t)$ for STH, and $\nu^L(d), \eta^L(d), \kappa^L(d)$ for LTH, respectively. For asset degradation, we assume that the OSW turbine is an integrated system with a system-level residual life (RL), denoted by $\lambda^L(i) \forall i \in I$, which is a turbine-specific random variable defined as the time (in days) at which the $i$th turbine fails. We assume that the RL is only uncertain in the LTH, i.e. $\lambda^L(i)$ is stochastic. A WT for which the realized RL is smaller than a day is bound to fail by the end of the STH (unless it is maintained). Maintenance tasks performed before the realized (true) RL are preventive (PM), otherwise they are corrective (CM). Understandably, CMs are associated with a higher cost than PMs.

(A5) The power produced from the WTs is primarily a function of the hub-height wind speed, and is typically estimated nonparametrically using historical data [Ezzat et al., 2018]. Details of estimating wind power given stochastic wind speed conditions are shown in the supplementary material, SM-1.

(A6) WTs are accessed by crew transport vessels (CTVs) which are subject to accessibility constraints defined by wind speed and wave height safety thresholds, denoted as $\nu_{\text{max}}$ and $\eta_{\text{max}}$, respectively. We assume that maintenance operations are subject to interruptions due to access constraints, and can be resumed once access is restored. Thus, each maintenance task is associated with a “mission time,” $A(t, i)$ which is a random variable denoting the time needed to complete a task of $\tau_i$ hours starting at time $t$, taking into account maintenance interruptions. Hence, we always have $A_{t,i} \geq \tau_i$. Similarly, $A^L(d,i)$ is the LTH variable for mission time. $A(t, i)$ is a function of $\tau_i$ and the access state denoted by $X(t) \in \{0, 1\}$, which, in turn, is a function of the stochastic metocean conditions $\nu(t)$ and $\eta(t)$, and the safety thresholds $\nu_{\text{max}}$ and $\eta_{\text{max}}$. Details of estimating $X(t)$ and $A(t, i)$ given stochastic metocean conditions and maintenance times are shown in the supplementary materials SM-2.

2.2 The optimization model

We model STOCHOS as a two-stage stochastic mixed linear integer program (MILP). The following binary variables constitute the set of decision variables:

$m_{t,i}$ : A maintenance task for WT $i$ is scheduled to start at hour $t$ in the STH.

$r$ : A vessel is rented for the STH.
$m_{d,i,s}^L$ : A maintenance task is scheduled for WT $i$ at day $d$ in the LTH, in scenario $s$.

$r_{d,s}^L$ : A vessel is rented at day $d$ in the LTH, in scenario $s$.

The objective, shown in (1), is to maximize the profit in the planning horizon, comprising the day-ahead profit $l^{STH}$, the long-term profit $\{l_d^{LTH}\}_{d \in D}$, and a stochastic penalty term.

$$
\max_{m_{t,i},m_{d,i,s}^L,r_{d,s}^L} \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
l^{STH} \\
\text{short-term profit}
\end{array} + \sum_{d \in D} l_d^{LTH} \\
\text{prolonged interruptions}
\right. \\
- \frac{1}{NS} \sum_{s \in S} \left[ \sum_{i \in I} (U_s \cdot w_{i,s} + Y_s \cdot b_{i,s}) + (C_1 \cdot a_s^x + C_2 \cdot a_s^q) \right] \\
\text{stochastic penalty term}
\right. 
$$

The short-term profit, $l^{STH}$, defined as in (2), is the difference between day-ahead operating revenues and maintenance costs. The revenue is generated from selling the power output of the $i$th WT at time $t$ and scenario $s$, denoted by $p_{t,i,s}$, at an hourly market price $\kappa_{t,s}$. The maintenance costs comprise four components: (1) the repair costs which are dictated by the PM and CM cost coefficients, $K$ ($/\text{task}$) and $\Phi$ ($/\text{task}$), respectively, (2) the daily vessel rental cost with a daily rate of $\Omega$ ($/\text{day}$), (3) Crew-related costs charged at the crew hourly cost rate $\Psi$ ($$/\text{h}$) where $x_{t,i,s} \in \{0,1\}$ denotes whether a crew is assigned to the $i$th WT at time $t$ and scenario $s$, and (4) Overtime costs charged at the crew overtime cost rate $Q$ ($$/\text{h}$) where $q_s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ denotes the overtime hours worked in the STH.

The binary variable $\zeta_i$ indicates the day-ahead operational status of the $i$-th WT, wherein $\zeta_i = 0$ indicates a failed WT needing a CM. The parameter $\rho_i \in \{0,1\}$ denotes whether a maintenance task was initiated in a previous day but is yet to be completed (when $\rho_i = 1$, repair cost goes to zero as it has already been accounted for in a previous day).

$$
l^{STH} = -\sum_{i \in I} \sum_{t \in T} \left[ (1 - \rho_i) \cdot |K - (1 - \zeta_i) \cdot (K - \Phi)| \cdot m_{t,i} - \frac{\text{vessel cost}}{\Omega} \right] + \frac{1}{NS} \sum_{s \in S} \left[ \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{t \in T} \left( \kappa_{t,s} \cdot p_{t,i,s} - \Psi \cdot x_{t,i,s} \right) - \frac{Q \cdot q_s}{\text{overtime cost}} \right]
$$

The long-term profit, in (3), is similarly calculated. The crew work hours are calculated
as the product of the mission time $A_{d,i,s}^L$ and the tasks scheduled at that day, $m_{d,i,s}^L$.

$$t_d^{LTH} = \frac{1}{N_S} \sum_{s \in S} \left\{ \sum_{i \in I} \left[ \text{operating revenue} \cdot n_{d,i,s}^L \cdot p_{d,i,s}^L - (1 - \rho_i) \cdot [K - (1 - \zeta_{d,i,s}^L) \cdot (K - \Phi)] \cdot m_{d,i,s}^L \right] - \underbrace{\Psi \cdot A_{d,i,s}^L \cdot m_{d,i,s}^L}_{\text{crew cost}} - \underbrace{\Omega \cdot r_{d,s}^L - \underbrace{q_{d,s}^L}_{\text{overtime cost}}} \right\} \forall d \in D$$

The last term in (1) is a stochastic penalty which entails two sub-terms. The first term, which we call “prolonged interruptions,” represents the cost of maintenance actions that started in the STH, but were not completed and hence, must be resumed in the LTH. Understandably, the WT remains non-operational when such event takes place. In that term, $U_s \cdot w_{i,s}$ represent the cost incurred until the maintenance is restarted (pre-maintenance), while $Y_s \cdot b_{i,s}$ is the cost incurred while the maintenance is ongoing (during maintenance). In specific, $w_{i,s} \in \{0, 1\}$ denotes the occurrence of the interruption event, $U_s$ is the associated pre-maintenance cost, $b_{i,s} \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ denotes the remaining maintenance time that has to be completed in the LTH, and $Y_s$ is the associated cost incurred during the maintenance. The second sub-term penalizes the (unlikely) case when the overtime- (11) or crew-related (17) budgets are exceeded. We assign large cost coefficients, $C_1$ and $C_2$, for such exceedances to align with the unavoidable practice of on-the-spot contracting with additional crew, equipment, or other immediate maintenance resources. In our experiments, those exceedances occur less than 0.09% of the time.

**Maintenance Constraints:** The equality in (4) forces a maintenance task to be scheduled either in the ST or in the LTH.

$$\sum_{t \in T} m_{t,i} + \sum_{d \in D} m_{d,i,s}^L = 1 \quad \forall \ i \in I, s \in S$$

A maintenance task in the STH can only be initiated after the time of first light, $t_R$, and before the time of last sunlight, $t_D$, as expressed in (5) and (6), respectively.

$$m_{t,i} \leq \frac{t}{t_R} \quad \forall \ t \in T, i \in I$$

$$m_{t,i} \leq \frac{t_D}{t} \quad \forall \ t \in T, i \in I$$

Once a maintenance task is initiated at time $t$ for the $i$th WT, then it would be under maintenance for a period of time computed as the minimum between the remaining time...
in the STH, which is \(24 - t\), and the mission time \(A_{t,i,s}\). This is expressed in (7), where \(u_{\tilde{t},i,s} = 1\) denotes a turbine under maintenance at time \(\tilde{t}\).

\[
\min\{24, t + A_{t,i,s}\} \\
\sum_{t=1}^{\tilde{t}} u_{\tilde{t},i,s} \geq \min\{24 - t, A_{t,i,s}\} \cdot m_{t,i} \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, i \in \mathcal{I}, s \in \mathcal{S},
\] (7)

If that maintenance task is not completed within the STH, then \(b_{i,s} \in \mathbb{Z}^+\), as shown in (8), denotes the remaining time required to complete it in the LTH, while \(w_{i,s} \in \{0, 1\}\), as shown in (9), denotes the occurrence of such event and is only set to 1 once \(b_{i,s} > 0\), as it is multiplied by M, an arbitrary large number. This is the case where the “prolonged interruption” penalty term in (1) is activated.

\[
b_{i,s} \geq \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} m_{t,i} \cdot [A_{t,i,s} - 24 + t]^+ \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, s \in \mathcal{S}
\] (8)

\[
b_{i,s} \leq M \cdot w_{i,s} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, s \in \mathcal{S}
\] (9)

The maintenance crew, once dispatched, is occupied until the maintenance is completed or their shift ends by the time of last sunlight, \(t_D\), as shown in (10). An upper bound on the number of available maintenance crews is set to \(B\) (crews), as shown in (11). The auxiliary variable \(a^x_s \in \mathbb{Z}^+\) is added to the right-hand-side (RHS) of (11) to account for the (unlikely) case in which the crew budget limit is exceeded, but almost always remains zero since it is heavily penalized by \(C_1\) in (1). In practice, this translates to situations where additional crew or equipment is contracted on-the-spot.

\[
x_{t,i,s} \geq u_{t,i,s} - \frac{t}{t_D} \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, i \in \mathcal{I}, s \in \mathcal{S}
\] (10)

\[
\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} x_{t,i,s} \leq B + a^x_s \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, s \in \mathcal{S}
\] (11)

**Turbine Availability Constraints:** A failed WT (i.e., one which has not been maintained at or before its RL), or a WT currently undergoing maintenance, remains unavailable until a maintenance action is completed. In case of the STH, this can be expressed as in (12).

\[
y_{t,i,s} \leq \zeta_i \cdot (1 - p_i) + \frac{24 \cdot \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}} m_{i,i} - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}} (t \cdot m_{i,i})}{24 - t + g} \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, i \in \mathcal{I}, s \in \mathcal{S}
\] (12)
The first term of the RHS in (12) denotes whether the turbine is in a failed state at the beginning of the STH, or if a maintenance task was initiated in a previous day. In case the RL is reached, then the turbine fails \((\zeta_i = 0)\), and can only return to its former operational status once a CM action is performed. This is enforced by the second term in the RHS; if no CM is scheduled, then \(m_{t,i} = 0\) and the term drops to 0. In contrast, if \(m_{t,i} = 1\), the term is greater than 1 after the time of maintenance. An arbitrary small number \(g\) avoids division by zero. A similar constraint for the LTH is shown in (13).

\[
y_{d,i,s}^L \leq \zeta_{d,i,s}^L \cdot (1 - \rho_i) + \frac{N_D - \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} (d \cdot m_{d,i,s}^L)}{N_D - d + g} \quad \forall d \in \mathcal{D}, i \in \mathcal{I}, s \in \mathcal{S} \tag{13}
\]

A WT under maintenance remains unavailable until the task is completed, as in (14).

\[
y_{t,i,s} \leq 1 - u_{t,i,s} \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, i \in \mathcal{I}, s \in \mathcal{S} \tag{14}
\]

**Vessel Rental Constraints:** Vessels are rented daily only if a maintenance task has been scheduled at that day. This is enforced via (15)-(16), for the STH and LTH, respectively.

\[
M \cdot r \geq \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} m_{t,i} \tag{15}
\]

\[
M \cdot r_{d,s}^L \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} m_{d,i,s}^L \quad \forall d \in \mathcal{D}, s \in \mathcal{S} \tag{16}
\]

**Overtime Constraints:** The total work hours, as shown in (17), cannot exceed \(W\) (hour/crew). Otherwise, overtime hours, tracked by integer variable \(q_s\), are incurred and compensated at a higher rate determined by \(Q\) ($/hour). An upper bound of \(H\) (in hours) limits the total number of overtime hours in both the STH and LTH, as expressed in (20) and (21).

Similar to \(a_x^s\) in (11), \(a_q^s\) in (17) accounts for the on-spot contracting of additional crew, charged at a significant cost set by \(C_2\).

A task that has started but not finished in the LTH is prioritized in the first day of the LTH \((d = 1)\). This is expressed in (18) where \(A_{d=1,i,s}^L \cdot m_{d=1,i,s} + b_{i,s}\) denotes the total work hours in the first day of the LTH (the sum of the mission times and the remaining maintenance time of unfinished tasks). A similar constraint in (19) is imposed for the remaining days of the LTH, i.e. for \(d \in \{2, ..., N_D\}\).

\[
\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}, i \in \mathcal{I}} x_{t,i,s} \leq B \cdot W + q_s + a_s^q \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S} \tag{17}
\]
\[
\sum_{i \in I} \left[ A_{i,s}^L \cdot m_{i,s}^L + b_{i,s} \right] \leq B \cdot W + q_{t,s}^L \quad \forall s \in S \tag{18}
\]

\[
\sum_{i \in I} \left[ A_{d,i,s}^L \cdot m_{d,i,s}^L \right] \leq B \cdot W + q_{d,s}^L \quad \forall d \in \{2, ..., N_D\}, s \in S \tag{19}
\]

\[
q_{s} \leq H \quad \forall s \in S \tag{20}
\]

\[
q_{d,s}^L \leq H \quad \forall d \in D, s \in S \tag{21}
\]

**Electricity Generation Constraints:** The hourly power output, \(p_{t,i,s}\), is computed as a fraction \(f_{t,i,s} \in [0, 1]\) of the turbine’s rated capacity \(R\) (MW), multiplied by the turbine’s availability \(y_{t,i,s}\), as shown in (22). When the turbine is in a failed state, or under maintenance, \(p_{t,i,s} = y_{t,i,s} = 0\), and the operator forfeits the associated revenue. The fraction \(f_{t,i,s}\) is called the normalized power level. Full details of estimating \(f_{t,i,s}\) and \(f_{d,i,s}^L\) given stochastic wind speed conditions are shown in the supplementary materials, SM-1.

\[
p_{t,i,s} \leq R \cdot f_{t,i,s} \cdot y_{t,i,s} \quad \forall t \in T, i \in I, s \in S \tag{22}
\]

Likewise, the daily power output, \(p_{d,i,s}^L\), is defined in (23), wherein \(f_{d,i,s}^L \in [0, 1]\) is a function of the daily average wind speed. The term \(m_{d,i,s}^L \cdot \zeta_{d,i,s}^L \cdot A_{d,i,s}^L / 24\), accounts for the production losses if a maintenance has been scheduled on day \(d\).

\[
p_{d,i,s}^L \leq 24 \cdot R \cdot f_{d,i,s}^L \cdot \left(y_{d,i,s}^L - m_{d,i,s}^L \cdot A_{d,i,s}^L \cdot \zeta_{d,i,s}^L / 24\right) \quad \forall d \in D, i \in I, s \in S \tag{23}
\]

Curtailing wind power production is common in renewable-dominant power systems, wherein curtailment is defined as the need to reduce the wind power production to circumvent certain system balancing constraints or transmission challenges (Bird et al., 2016). This is accounted for by introducing the parameter \(C_{t,s} \in [0, 1]\) in (24), which defines the fraction of the farm-level power output that can be injected to the grid at each hourly interval \(t\). \(C_{t,s} = 1\) denotes no curtailment—All power produced is eventually sold.

\[
\sum_{i \in I} p_{t,i,s} \leq \sum_{i \in I} f_{t,i,s} \cdot R \cdot C_{t,s} \quad \forall t \in T, s \in S \tag{24}
\]
3 Probabilistic Forecasting and Scenario Generation

We first introduce the data used in this work and its relevance to the U.S. OSW industry, then present our probabilistic forecasting and scenario generation framework.

3.1 Data description

This work is motivated by the ongoing large-scale OSW developments in the US North Atlantic, and in particular, the NY/NJ Bight (shown in Figure 2), where several Gigawatt-scale OSW projects are currently in-development [BOEM 2021]. We use real-world OSW data and meteorological forecasts from this geographical location, and hence, we believe our findings, insights, and analyses can provide timely insights to the developers and operators of those soon-to-be-operational OSW projects.

Figure 2: The location of two OSW measurement LiDAR buoys (E05 and E06) recently deployed by NYSERDA in the NY/NJ Bight, in proximity to several ongoing OSW projects.

Metocean Data and Forecasts: We use wind speed and wave height measurements collected by the E05 Hudson North buoy between August 2019 and May 2020. This is one of two floating LiDAR buoys recently deployed by the NY State Energy Research & Development Authority (NYSERDA) [NYSERDA 2021] in the NY/NJ Bight—See Figure 2. Co-located with the measurements are numerical weather predictions (NWPs) of wind speed and wave height. The wind speed NWPs come from RU-WRF, which is a meso-scale weather model developed by the Rutgers University Center For Ocean Observing Leadership (RUCOOL) to capture the unique physical phenomena in this geographical region [RUCOOL 2022, Optis]
et al., 2020). Wave height NWPs come from WAVEWATCH III, a numerical wave model maintained by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) (NOAA, 2022). The metocean data and their NWPs are shown in Figures 3-A and 3-B, respectively.

Electricity Price Data and Forecasts: Real day-ahead electricity prices are obtained from PJM’s Data Miner III (PJM, 2021), at node COMED (node id: 33092371). Forecasts for the same node using the Lasso Estimated Auto-Regressive (LEAR) model proposed by (Lago et al., 2021) are used in our analysis. The time series of the real electricity prices, the LEAR predictions, and the associated error histograms are shown in Figure 3-C.

Asset Degradation Data and Forecasts: Unlike the above-listed parameters (metocean conditions and electricity prices), actual turbine degradation data requires access to O&M records. Currently, there are no operational OSW farms in this geographical area. So, we assume a set of observed RLs, \( \{\lambda_i\}_{i \in I} \), which are unknown to the planner, who only has access to a set of (imperfect) RL predictions \( \{\hat{\lambda}_i\}_{i \in I} \) provided by a condition monitoring system. In this study, true and predicted RLs are carefully selected in light of the summary statistics derived in previous rigorous studies on offshore WT reliability analyses (Carroll et al., 2016), thus ensuring a faithful replication of real-world WT failure scenarios.

Figure 3: Time series of the data and forecasts of wind speed (A), wave height (B) and electricity price (C). Histograms of the forecast residuals are shown to the right.
3.2 Uncertainty modeling and scenario generation

Modeling uncertainty in scenario-based stochastic optimization requires probabilistic characterizations of the input parameters. A prevalent approach in the literature is to impose a distributional assumption on the marginal distribution of the forecast residuals at each lead time. Albeit convenient, such approach, by handling each lead time individually, is sub-optimal when temporal dependencies exist. In OSW data, forecast residuals tend to exhibit notable temporal correlations. This is demonstrated in Figure 4 which depicts the density of the forecast residuals at four different time lags for wind speed (top), wave height (middle), and electricity price (bottom).

![Density plots](image)

Figure 4: Density plots of the point forecast residuals versus their lagged versions for wind speed (A), wave height (B) and electricity price (C) time series forecasts.

Instead, a more powerful approach is to fully describe the density of the temporal process governing each input parameter. Scenarios generated from such approach would preserve the temporal dependence and constitute the optimal input to a stochastic program (Pinson, 2013). Specifically, we define $z(t)$ as the random variable denoting either the wind speed...
\(\nu(t)\), wave height \(\eta(t)\), or electricity price \(\kappa(t)\) (we treat the RL predictions differently as discussed at the end of this section). We also denote by \(z = [z_1, ..., z_{tc}]^T\) the set of historical measurements of \(z(t)\) up to the current time \(tc\). Similarly, \(\hat{z} = [\hat{z}_1, ..., \hat{z}_{tc}]^T\) are the raw point predictions available to the planner (RU-WRF for \(\nu(t)\), WAVEWATCH III for \(\eta(t)\), and LEAR for \(\kappa(t)\)). Then, we propose the following probabilistic forecasting framework, comprising three independent terms:

\[
z(t) = \mu(t) + \omega(t) + \epsilon(t),
\]

where \(\mu(t)\) is a mean function which we set as the predictions available to the maintenance planner (that is, \(\mu(t) = \hat{z}_t \forall t\)). The term \(\omega(t)\) is a zero-mean temporal Gaussian Process with its pairwise covariance denoted by \(\sigma_{t,t'} = \text{Cov}\{\omega(t), \omega(t')\}, \forall t, t'\), while \(\epsilon(t)\) is the zero-mean Gaussian noise, such that \(\epsilon = [\epsilon_1, ..., \epsilon_{tc}]^T \sim N(0, \delta I)\), where \(I\) is the \(tc \times 1\) identity matrix, and \(\delta\) is the noise variance.

Let us use \(C\) to denote the \(tc \times tc\) covariance matrix whose \((t, t')\)-th entry is defined as \(\sigma_{t,t'} + \delta \mathbb{1}(t = t')\), where \(\mathbb{1}()\) is the indicator function. Those entries are estimated using a stationary parametric kernel function \(C(\cdot, \cdot)\) which are used to encode the temporal dependence. Several mathematically permissible choices for \(C(\cdot, \cdot)\) are possible and we use the popular squared exponential covariance function (Williams and Rasmussen, 2006), defined as in (26).

\[
C(t, t') = \alpha \exp\left(-\frac{||t - t'||}{2\ell^2}\right),
\]

where \(||\cdot||\) is the Euclidean norm, \(\alpha > 0\) is the marginal variance, and \(\ell > 0\) is a length-scale parameter which controls the decay of the temporal dependence. The parameter set \(\Theta = \{\alpha, \ell, \delta\}\) is estimated by maximizing the log-likelihood of the GP. Using the estimated parameters denoted by \(\hat{\Theta}\), we can obtain the estimated covariance matrix \(\hat{C}\).

Putting together all the pieces, one can fully characterize the predictive distribution of the random variable \(z^*(tc + h)\) which denotes the forecast of \(z(tc + h)\). This predictive distribution is, by virtue of the GP, Gaussian with the predictive mean and variance expressed as in (27) and (28), respectively.

\[
\bar{z}_{tc+h} = \mathbb{E}[z^*(tc + h)|z, \hat{z}] = \hat{z}_{tc+h} + \hat{k}^T \hat{C}^{-1}(z - \hat{z}),
\]

\[
\bar{\sigma}_{tc+h}^2 = \mathbb{V}[z^*(tc + h)|z, \hat{z}] = \hat{\alpha} - \hat{k}^T \hat{C}^{-1}\hat{k},
\]
where $h \in \{1, \ldots, H\}$ is the forecast lead time, $\hat{z}_{tc+h}$ is the raw forecast (e.g. from RU-WRF for wind speed) at $tc + h$. The $t_c \times 1$ vector $\hat{k}$ contains the pairwise covariances between $[1, \ldots, t_c]^T$ and $t_c + h$, computed using $C(\cdot, \cdot)$. A similar model to (25) is developed for the LTH (in daily resolution), and similar expressions to those in (27) and (28) are derived.

The advantages of this probabilistic framework are two-fold. First is its ability to effectively account for the temporal dependencies in OSW data. This is obvious in how the predictive mean in (27) depends on the correlation between the target forecast and the historical observations. This is also apparent in how the predictive variance in (28) is reduced from the marginal variance when information about strongly correlated values in the process history is available. This is in contrast to distributional assumptions which treat each lead time individually, thus overlooking the value added by the temporal dependence. Even if we decide to only communicate single-valued predictions, then the point forecast $\bar{z}_{tc+h}$ (i.e. the predictive mean of (27)) should, in principle, provide us with a “calibrated,” more accurate version of the raw point prediction of $\hat{z}_{tc+h}$.

The second advantage is our ability to draw random temporal trajectories (or scenarios) by sampling from the joint multivariate Gaussian distribution of the forecasts, as shown in (29). The resulting trajectories, which naturally encode the temporal dependence in them, are optimal inputs to the stochastic program, as opposed to marginal predictive densities.

$$z^* = [z^*(tc + 1), \ldots, z^*(tc + H)]^T \sim \mathcal{N}(\bar{z}, \bar{C}),$$

(29)

where $\bar{z} = [\bar{z}_{tc+1}, \ldots, \bar{z}_{tc+H}]^T$ is the $H \times 1$ vector of the GP predictive means, and $\bar{C}$ is the correspondent $H \times H$ predictive covariance matrix.

Figure 5: Fan charts of 1,000 random scenarios (trajectories) on 09/21/2019.
Table 2: Average solution times for \( N_s = 25, 50, 100, \) and 200 (optimality gap = 0.1\%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of scenarios</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solution time [s]</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>155.4</td>
<td>563.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 shows a fan chart of 1,000 trajectories of wind speeds drawn randomly on a select day using (29). Similar trajectories can be drawn for the wave height and electricity prices. While the above two advantages are widely acknowledged in the wind forecasting literature (Pinson, 2013; Ezzat et al., 2019), limited research has bridge such probabilistic forecasting models into the stochastic maintenance optimization realm. One of the key outcomes of our analyses in this paper is to demonstrate the “economic value” realized by an effective uncertainty modeling of temporal dependencies in input parameters.

Finally, for turbine RL estimates, we assume a simpler probabilistic model where the prediction from the \( i \)th WT is assumed to follow a Weibull distribution with \( \hat{\lambda}_i \) and \( \xi^i_\lambda \) as scale and shape parameters, respectively, such that the forecast variable \( \lambda^*_i \sim \text{Weibull}(\hat{\lambda}_i, \xi^i_\lambda) \). The calibrated point forecast (or predictive mean) of \( \lambda^*_i \) is denoted by \( \bar{\lambda}_i = \hat{\lambda}_i \Gamma(1 + \frac{1}{\xi^i_\lambda}) \).

### 4 Solution Procedure and Computational Efficiency

We solve STOCHOS using the Gurobi 9.0 solver with a Python interface in a system with a 14-core processor, for a relative optimality gap of 0.1\%. Table 2 shows the average solution time (in seconds) as function of the number of scenarios \( N_s = 25, 50, 100, \) and 200, for \( N_T = 5 \) WTs. Even with 200 scenarios, STOCHOS is solved in under 10 minutes. In practice, the operator only needs to run STOCHOS once per day, so they can use 200 (or even more) scenarios. For our experiments, we set \( N_s = 50 \), which still provides decent solution quality, while allowing us to conduct extensive validations.

In practice, STOCHOS is solved at the end of each working day to inform the day-head maintenance plan (Koltsidopoulos Papatzimos, 2020). The rolling procedure presented in Algorithm 1 explains the details of such implementation, starting from parameter and data input, to training the probabilistic forecasting models of Section 3.2, followed by the scenario generation step, in which \( N_s \) trajectories for the wind speed, wave height, and electricity price are generated, together with \( N_s \) turbine-specific RL prediction samples. Those scenarios are then used to determine scenario-specific power output predictions, accessibil-
ity estimations, and projected mission times. STOCHOS is then solved by minimizing the
objective function in (1), returning an hourly day-ahead maintenance schedule \((m_{t,i} \text{ and } r_t)\), and a daily schedule for the long-term horizon \((m_{d,i,s}^L \text{ and } r_{d,s}^L)\). Once a solution has
been obtained, the planning horizon is shifted by one day into the future. We call this as
a single optimization “roll,” and the whole process is repeated until all maintenance tasks
in the planning horizon have been carried out successfully. Finally, all STH schedules from
all rolls are patched representing the executed hourly maintenance schedule for the whole
planning horizon. This is the hourly schedule that is implemented by following STOCHOS’
solutions, and hence, are used to assess its performance relative to other benchmarks.

5 Experimental Results

This section starts with the experimental setup, followed by our results and analyses.

5.1 Experimental Setup

We consider an OSW farm with \(N_I = 5\) WTs requiring maintenance in a planning horizon
of 20 days. Data and forecasts used in this case study are described in detail in Section
3.1. True RLs (unknown to the planner ahead of time) are set at \(\lambda_1 = 2.0, \lambda_2 = 6.8,\)
\(\lambda_3 = 11.5, \lambda_4 = 16.2, \lambda_5 = 21.0\) days. Point predictions of those RLs (available to the
planner) are set at \(\hat{\lambda}_1 = 4.0, \hat{\lambda}_2 = 6.1, \hat{\lambda}_3 = 13.2, \hat{\lambda}_4 = 6.8, \hat{\lambda}_5 = 23.8\) days, reflecting
different error magnitudes (low for WTs 2, 3, and 5, relatively high for WTs 1, and 4). Maintenance times are set at \(r_1 = 11, r_2 = 5, r_3 = 6, r_4 = 4\) hours. Maintenance
times, as well as true and predicted RLs are set in light of the summary statistics for minor
repairs reported by Dinwoodie et al. (2015); Carroll et al. (2016). Those, together with the
real-world data about the wind speed, wave height, and electricity price, are used as input
to the probabilistic forecasting and scenario generation framework described in Section 3.2.

Table 3 shows our selection for the remaining parameters: \(K\) and \(\Phi\) were selected follow-
ing Yildirim et al. (2017); \(B, \Psi,\) and \(Q\) were selected based on the report recommendations
of Maples et al. (2013). Medium-sized crew transport vessels (CTVs), which are common
for minor to medium repairs in OSW turbines, are assumed to be used for our analysis.
Values for \(\Omega, \nu_{max},\) and \(\eta_{max}\) were chosen according to the studies by Dalgic et al. (2013);
Algorithm 1 A rolling-based solution procedure for STOCHOS

1: Input set dimensions $N_I, N_D, N_S \rightarrow$ # of WTs, # of days, and # of scenarios
2: Input parameters $K, \Phi, \Psi, \Omega, Q, R, B, W, \tau_i, \nu_{max}, \eta_{max} \rightarrow$ operational parameters
3: Initialize $\theta_i = 1 \ \forall i \in I \rightarrow$ parameter denoting maintenance requirement
4: Initialize $\rho_i = 0, \zeta_i = 1 \ \forall i \in I \rightarrow$ parameters denoting WT operational status
5: Set the roll counter $j = 0$
6: while $\sum_{i \in I} \theta_i > 0$ do
7: Set $T = \{24 \cdot j, \ldots, 24 \cdot (j + 1)\}$; $D = \{j + 1, \ldots, N_D + j\}$
8: Input observations and predictions for $\nu(t), \eta(t), \kappa(t)$, and $\lambda(i) \ \forall i$.
9: Train the STH probabilistic models of Section 3.2 for $\nu(t), \eta(t), \kappa(t)$.
10: Train the LTH probabilistic models of Section 3.2 for $\nu^L(d), \eta^L(d), \kappa^L(d), \lambda^L(i) \ \forall i$.
11: Sample $N_s$ scenarios $\{\nu_{t,s}, \eta_{t,s}, \kappa_{t,s}\} \rightarrow$ STH scenarios for wind speed, wave height & price
12: Sample $N_s$ scenarios $\{\nu^L_{d,s}, \eta^L_{d,s}, \kappa^L_{d,s}\} \rightarrow$ LTH scenarios for wind speed, wave height & price
13: Sample $N_s$ scenarios $\{\lambda^L_{i,s}\} \rightarrow$ scenarios for turbine RL
14: Evaluate $\{f_{t,s}\}$ and $\{f^L_{d,s}\} \rightarrow$ Speed-to-power conversion; SM-1
15: Evaluate $\{A_{t,s}\}$ and $\{A^L_{d,s}\} \rightarrow$ Computing STH and LTH mission times; SM-2
16: Solve STOCHOS for $N_S$ scenarios
17: Return the decisions for the $j$th roll: $S_j^{STH} = \{m_{t,i}, r\}$ and $S_j^{LTH} = \{m^L_{d,i,s}, r^L_{d,s}\}$.
18: Evaluate $S_j^{STH}$ under real operational parameters
19: for $i \in I$ do
20: if $\sum_{t \in T} m_{t,i} > 0$ then
21: if $b_i > 0$ then
22: Set $\rho_i \leftarrow 1; \tau_i \leftarrow b_i$ (maintenance resumed if unfinished in the STH)
23: else
24: Set $\theta_i \leftarrow 0$ (maintenance no longer required if completed in the STH)
25: end if
26: end if
27: end for
28: Update roll counter $j = j + 1$
29: Update RLs & WT status $\lambda_i = (\lambda_i - 1, 0^+); \hat{\lambda}_i = (\hat{\lambda}_i - 1, 0^+); \zeta_i = 1 - \mathbb{I}(\lambda_i = 0) \ \forall i$
30: end while
31: return the final executed schedule by STOCHOS, $S^* = \{S_1^{STH}, \ldots, S_{j-1}^{STH}\}$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Cost of preventive maintenance (PM)</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>Cost of corrective maintenance (CM)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁, C₂</td>
<td>Spot contracting costs</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Number of available crews</td>
<td>2 crews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td>Crew hourly rate</td>
<td>$250/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Overtime hourly rate</td>
<td>$125/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Maximum number of non-overtime work hours</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Maximum number of overtime work hours</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Daily vessel rental cost</td>
<td>$2,500/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν&lt;sub&gt;max&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Wind speed safety threshold</td>
<td>15 m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η&lt;sub&gt;max&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Wave height safety threshold</td>
<td>1.8 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t&lt;sub&gt;R&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Time of first light</td>
<td>6:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t&lt;sub&gt;D&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Time of last sunlight</td>
<td>9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Operational parameters for our experimental setup

[Anderberg (2015)](#). Curtailment is assumed to be 0%, and hence, we set $C_{t,s} = 1 \forall t, s$.

### 5.2 Numerical Results

The performance of STOCHOS is compared against the following set of benchmarks:

1. Holistic Opportunistic Strategy with Perfect Knowledge (**PK-HOST**): PK-HOST is a deterministic variant of STOCHOS which assumes perfect knowledge of all input parameters: metocean data, electricity prices, and RL predictions. The goal of this benchmark is to assess how far is STOCHOS from the best possible performance attained had the planner known, with full certainty, all environmental and operational conditions.

2. Holistic Opportunistic Strategy with Point Forecasts (**PF-HOST**): PF-HOST is a deterministic variant of STOCHOS which uses the raw point forecasts of all uncertain parameters: RU-WRF for wind speed, WAVEWATCH III for wave height, LEAR for electricity prices, and predicted RLs from the condition monitoring system. The goal of this benchmark is to showcase the value of accounting for uncertainty.

3. Time-Based Strategy (**TBS**): Maintenance tasks are only scheduled prior to the predicted RLs (unless turbine access prevents it).
4. Corrective Maintenance Strategy (CMS): Maintenance tasks can only be performed reactively, or post-failure. The goal of both TBS and CMS is to showcase the combined benefit of accounting for opportunities and parameter uncertainties relative to prevalent benchmarks in the academic literature and industrial practice.

We run STOCHOS 100 times under different environmental and operational conditions. Figure 6 illustrates the boxplots of the final costs achieved by STOCHOS and the four benchmarks, namely: PK-HOST, PF-HOST, TBS, and CMS. Looking at Figure 6, we make few immediate observations: First, STOCHOS is the closest to PK-HOST with a relative cost difference (in terms of median costs) of 10.69%, while PF-HOST comes as a far second with a relative cost difference of 18.14%. This demonstrates how accounting for uncertainty makes the maintenance planner as close as possible to the “utopian” case of having perfect knowledge of information.

Second, STOCHOS improves upon PF-HOST by 6.30%. Another interesting observation is that the interquantile range (the difference between the third and first quantiles) of STOCHOS is 24.16% smaller than that of PF-HOST, suggesting that STOCHOS is not only better “on average,” but is also consistently better, and hence, a more reliable strategy. PF-HOST experiences few cases where the performance is significantly worse than other strategies (e.g., the motivating example in Figure 1). This again confirms the value of accounting for uncertainty in terms of both average performance and reliability, relative to the case of assuming full confidence in the available forecasts. Third, both STOCHOS and PF-HOST significantly outperform “non-opportunistic” approaches like TBS and CMS. By accounting for both opportunities and uncertainties, STOCHOS achieves 60.39% reduction in median costs over TBS, while PF-HOST achieves 57.73% cost improvement.

We also summarize important O&M metrics for each benchmark in Table 4. Those include: the number of vessel rentals (lower the better), total downtime, accessibility downtime (i.e. how much downtime is attributed to incorrect assessment of accessibility), production losses (in MWh) and revenue losses (in $K). We also report the total number of PM tasks (higher the better) and CM tasks (lower the better), as well as the number of maintenance interruptions due to inaccessibility. Finally, we report the total maintenance cost, as well as the increase in cost relative to the optimal solution. Across all metrics, STOCHOS is shown to significantly outperform all benchmarks (excluding PK-HOST).
5.3 The value of probabilistic forecasting

We would like to demonstrate the value of our probabilistic forecast and scenario generation approach presented in Section 3.2. To do so, we add two additional benchmarks:

1. Holistic Opportunistic Strategy with Calibrated Point Forecasts (CPF-HOST): CPF-HOST is similar to PF-HOST, except that it uses the predictive means of the probabilistic models as point predictions, instead of the raw point forecasts as in PF-HOST.

2. Stochastic Holistic Opportunistic Scheduler with Marginal Densities (MD-STOCHOS): MD-STOCHOS is similar to STOCHOS except that it uses scenarios generated from Gaussian distributions estimated using the residuals of the raw point forecasts of Section 3.1. This approach is prevalent in the classical stochastic optimization literature.

Table 5 shows the median cost of those two benchmarks, in addition to that of STOCHOS and PF-HOST. The main interesting finding from this experiment is to show how an inadequate approach of handling uncertainty via marginal densities that do not accommodate
Table 4: Average O&M metrics for our extensive experimental results. Bold-faced values indicate the best value—RD-HOST excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PK-HOST</th>
<th>STOCHOS</th>
<th>PF-HOST</th>
<th>TBS</th>
<th>CMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of vessel rentals</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total downtime [h]</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>44.20</td>
<td>47.30</td>
<td>111.80</td>
<td>142.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility downtime [h]</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>81.80</td>
<td>112.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production loss [MWh]</td>
<td>101.21</td>
<td>141.05</td>
<td>154.59</td>
<td>845.93</td>
<td>1037.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue loss [$/K]</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>42.10</td>
<td>51.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PM tasks</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CM tasks</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance interruptions</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. total cost [$/K]</td>
<td>38.92</td>
<td>43.43</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>106.10</td>
<td>127.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost inc. from optimal [$/K]</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>67.28</td>
<td>89.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median total cost [$/K]</td>
<td>35.86</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>42.36</td>
<td>100.20</td>
<td>127.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: The economic value of our probabilistic forecast framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STOCHOS</th>
<th>PF-HOST</th>
<th>CPF-HOST</th>
<th>MD-STOCHOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median cost [$/K]</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>42.36</td>
<td>42.18</td>
<td>44.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Improvement [%]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>10.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the dynamic nature and temporal dependencies in OSW data can lead to decisions that are even worse than deterministic strategies. Another interesting finding is that even if the maintenance planner decides not to use the rich information in our probabilistic models (perhaps due to practical constraints or reluctance to change in business practice), then even using the single-valued predictive means of our probabilistic models as input to the deterministic approach provides a modest but noticeable improvement in cost reduction. This is evident in how CPF-HOST improves upon PF-HOST. Finally, STOCHOS, with its adequate treatment of uncertainty and calibrated forecasts is able to achieve the maximal economic gain relative to both its deterministic and stochastic variants: PF-HOST, CPF-HOST, and MD-STOCHOS.
6 Conclusion

The unique challenges and uncertainties in OSW farms motivate the need for an offshore-tailored approach for maintenance optimization. Towards this goal, we proposed STOCHOS, short for the stochastic holistic opportunistic scheduler—a maintenance scheduling approach that is capable of harnessing the maintenance opportunities arising due to favorable weather conditions, on-site maintenance resources, and maximal operating revenues, while adequately accounting for key operational and environmental uncertainties in the planning horizon. Our results showed that STOCHOS outperform multiple prevalent benchmark strategies, across several O&M metrics, including total cost, downtime, maintenance interruptions, among others.

Future work will look into two broad research questions: (1) Given the same optimization model, how can we improve our probabilistic forecasting and scenario generation approaches? In other words, how to seek more powerful probabilistic representations that can achieve maximal economic gains; and (2) Given the same forecasting model, how can we improve our optimization formulation? This will include extending the model to accommodate more intricate representation of the complex failure modes in wind turbine systems, as well as exploring the impact of vessel routing and crew logistics in large-scale wind farms.

Supplementary Materials

SM-1 describes how to statistically obtain wind power estimates given hub-height wind speed forecasts. SM-2 details the estimation of mission times given accessibility information.

Data Availability Statement

Our data and codes have been made available on GitHub: [https://github.com/petros-pap/STOCHOS](https://github.com/petros-pap/STOCHOS).
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