

Interactive comment on “Improving mid-altitude mesoscale wind speed forecasts using LiDAR-based observation nudging for AirborneWind Energy Systems” by Markus Sommerfeld et al.

Massimo Ippolito

m.ippolito@kitegen.com

Received and published: 10 April 2019

We have observed a large number of scientific and patent publications focused on high-altitude wind exploitation, reflecting a truly exponential trend. KiteGen, as the first global entity to produce energy using this revolutionary method, finds itself in a difficult position following the massive amount of material produced by third parties and the consequential technical inaccuracies desperately needing rectification. The latter has a detrimental effect on the potential acceptance of the concept and occasionally leads to technological nonsense, weakening the potential for widespread

C1

common awareness of this powerful technology that has the potential to enable global transition from fossil fuel energy sources. We have observed that, due to the absolute originality and novelty of this concept, there is a lack of qualified peer review, and blatant errors have been propagated and transferred, undisturbed, from one poorly informed publication to another, with no-one critically re-analyzing their stratified assumptions. We have also observed that these same errors have confused the informal competition that has grown over time around our project, among what seems a hundred actors, leading to the copious physical development of low TPL and/or unfeasible or extremely deficient alternative architectures. KiteGen has long refrained from scientific communication due to the absolute certainty of our original and long-established architectural and scientific consistency, but having the devil hiding in the details of the technological issues, this certainty has correctly governed and become involved daily in our developmental activities. The subject paper, despite the voluminous data and formal processes involved, is an example of a misguided effort that fails to produce significant forward progress in this scientific and technological domain and risks becoming completely out of sync and out of the dynamic range of most of the architectures and technology cited in block by the article. We hope that our position will be widely accepted through reading and understanding the comments we make available in the attached paper, accompanied by the appreciation of the articulation of this logical, albeit rare, thinking in professional and strategic energy planning.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.wind-energy-sci-discuss.net/wes-2019-7/wes-2019-7-SC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Wind Energ. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-2019-7>, 2019.

C2



Fig. 1.

C3