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1. Sector forecast and overview
121GW of new offshore capacity or 18% of global total over the 10-year outlook

China more than tripled the amount of capacity it added YoY, contributing 38% of the record 4.3GW of offshore capacity grid-connected globally in 2018.
US offshore wind sector to install more than 12GW through 2028

Carbon policies, state initiatives and improving economics fuel an 82% sector CAGR over the forecast period
# US offshore wind sector state-level overview (East Coast)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Name</th>
<th>Contracted</th>
<th>Offshore Specific Mandate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>12MW*</td>
<td>5GW by 2030 [goal]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>800MW</td>
<td>3.2GW by 2035 [goal]**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>130MW</td>
<td>2.4GW by 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>3.5GW by 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>12-16MW</td>
<td>2GW by 2028 [goal]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>300MW</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>400MW</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>368MW</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>3.5GW by 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>12-16MW</td>
<td>2GW by 2028 [goal]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, mandates are binding. *PPA under renegotiation. **1.6GW by 2027 remains the only mandate in Massachusetts; H.4857 set a non-binding goal.

**Maine (12MW* | 5GW by 2030 [goal])**
Significantly deeper coastal waters compared to the rest of the Northeast require floating wind installations, with an associated increase in costs. Relatively limited electricity demand and extreme transmission congestion in paths to demand centres further south disincentivise offshore development.

**Massachusetts (800MW | 3.2GW by 2035 [goal]**)
Home to the largest and lowest awarded cost US offshore solicitation thus far, Massachusetts has several positive indicators for additional offshore development, including strong policy mechanisms, onshore transmission constraints, developed port facilities and access to multiple lease areas with above-average windspeeds.

**New York (130MW | 2.4GW by 2030)**
The state with the most potential for offshore wind deployment within the forecast period, New York features coastal demand centres behind severe onshore transmission constraints and aggressive emissions policies that include carbon pricing in wholesale electricity markets. Access to lease areas is currently lacking, however.

**New Jersey (none | 3.5GW by 2030)**
Home to the most ambitious state policy in 2010, offshore wind development froze through much of governor Chris Christie’s terms and was revived in 2018 under a new administration, with a 3.5GW mandate that is again the highest in the country. If policies remain in place, their execution is supported by strong fundamentals.

**Virginia (12-16MW | 2GW by 2028 [goal])**
Virginia has taken significant steps towards developing an offshore wind policy framework in 2018, but it remains in its infancy and subject to future political changes. Full-scale installations are not expected until near the end of the outlook period.

**Connecticut (300MW | none)**
Like Rhode Island, Connecticut is small in size and electricity demand but has positioned itself as a “hitchhiker” on larger projects or solicitations in neighbouring states, boosting overall project scale and reaping cost savings. A zero-carbon energy RFP is underway but will likely award contracts to the existing Millstone nuclear facility.

**Rhode Island (400MW | none)**
Home to the first operational offshore wind installation, Rhode Island policymakers are particularly supportive of the sector, and are attempting to position the state to provide onshore support facilities for the region. Although it is the best US state for offshore wind on an economic basis, it has little need for new capacity.

**Maryland (368MW | none)**
A first-mover state with a local content policy focus, Maryland launched the first US large-scale offshore wind solicitations in 2017. The state has access to several lease areas, which helped push down pricing, and is a candidate for future bull-case solicitations given costs and need for congestion-bypassing generation.

**New Jersey/ North Carolina (DE,NC)**
DE | Pending governor’s decision after an extensive offshore wind study.
NC | A major potential market but with virtually no state-level policy progress thus far.

**Massachusetts (800MW | 3.2GW by 2035 [goal]**)
Home to the largest and lowest awarded cost US offshore solicitation thus far, Massachusetts has several positive indicators for additional offshore development, including strong policy mechanisms, onshore transmission constraints, developed port facilities and access to multiple lease areas with above-average windspeeds.

**New York (130MW | 2.4GW by 2030)**
The state with the most potential for offshore wind deployment within the forecast period, New York features coastal demand centres behind severe onshore transmission constraints and aggressive emissions policies that include carbon pricing in wholesale electricity markets. Access to lease areas is currently lacking, however.

**New Jersey (none | 3.5GW by 2030)**
Home to the most ambitious state policy in 2010, offshore wind development froze through much of governor Chris Christie’s terms and was revived in 2018 under a new administration, with a 3.5GW mandate that is again the highest in the country. If policies remain in place, their execution is supported by strong fundamentals.

**Virginia (12-16MW | 2GW by 2028 [goal])**
Virginia has taken significant steps towards developing an offshore wind policy framework in 2018, but it remains in its infancy and subject to future political changes. Full-scale installations are not expected until near the end of the outlook period.

**Connecticut (300MW | none)**
Like Rhode Island, Connecticut is small in size and electricity demand but has positioned itself as a “hitchhiker” on larger projects or solicitations in neighbouring states, boosting overall project scale and reaping cost savings. A zero-carbon energy RFP is underway but will likely award contracts to the existing Millstone nuclear facility.

**Rhode Island (400MW | none)**
Home to the first operational offshore wind installation, Rhode Island policymakers are particularly supportive of the sector, and are attempting to position the state to provide onshore support facilities for the region. Although it is the best US state for offshore wind on an economic basis, it has little need for new capacity.

**Maryland (368MW | none)**
A first-mover state with a local content policy focus, Maryland launched the first US large-scale offshore wind solicitations in 2017. The state has access to several lease areas, which helped push down pricing, and is a candidate for future bull-case solicitations given costs and need for congestion-bypassing generation.

**New Jersey/ North Carolina (DE,NC)**
DE | Pending governor’s decision after an extensive offshore wind study.
NC | A major potential market but with virtually no state-level policy progress thus far.

**Massachusetts (800MW | 3.2GW by 2035 [goal]**)
Home to the largest and lowest awarded cost US offshore solicitation thus far, Massachusetts has several positive indicators for additional offshore development, including strong policy mechanisms, onshore transmission constraints, developed port facilities and access to multiple lease areas with above-average windspeeds.

**New York (130MW | 2.4GW by 2030)**
The state with the most potential for offshore wind deployment within the forecast period, New York features coastal demand centres behind severe onshore transmission constraints and aggressive emissions policies that include carbon pricing in wholesale electricity markets. Access to lease areas is currently lacking, however.

**New Jersey (none | 3.5GW by 2030)**
Home to the most ambitious state policy in 2010, offshore wind development froze through much of governor Chris Christie’s terms and was revived in 2018 under a new administration, with a 3.5GW mandate that is again the highest in the country. If policies remain in place, their execution is supported by strong fundamentals.

**Virginia (12-16MW | 2GW by 2028 [goal])**
Virginia has taken significant steps towards developing an offshore wind policy framework in 2018, but it remains in its infancy and subject to future political changes. Full-scale installations are not expected until near the end of the outlook period.

Note: Unless otherwise indicated, mandates are binding. *PPA under renegotiation. **1.6GW by 2027 remains the only mandate in Massachusetts; H.4857 set a non-binding goal.
Making up for 26 years of lost time, the US will rapidly ramp up its offshore wind capabilities in the next decade.

An example of the benefits of federal leadership, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) leases federal waters for wind energy development, sufficient to install dozens of gigawatts of offshore wind.

With virtually no offshore wind-specific stateside industry to speak of, the US will take the better part of a decade to even reach a fraction of Europe’s capabilities. This is not necessarily a deal-breaker; the US can leverage European resources to a degree and can create unique, US-specific solutions to overcome obstacles, albeit often at cost.

One of the first elements of the sector to localize, aggressive state involvement in worker training and domestic hiring practices will quickly yield a trained US labour pool, with the exception of specialized roles for supply chain elements not localized.

While underwriters and financing entities will grow more comfortable with the sector and contingency costs will fall, US offshore wind projects will always hold the risk of catastrophic damage from Atlantic hurricanes, particularly given recent climate patterns.

Reliance on state-level policymaking will remain a crutch; on a federal level, popular opinion precludes the costliest European policies currently assisting offshore wind.

Balkanized policymaking is a particular impediment to the development of “backbone” infrastructure, especially RTO-led possibilities, with any new offshore transmission-specific policies from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) unlikely before 2021. Onshore interconnection upgrade requirements are also often extensive.

Despite relatively weak load growth in the Northeast, demand remains strong in nascent Mid-Atlantic and Southeast markets like Virginia and the Carolinas, and high retirement expectations in New York will require significant capacity additions to fill the supply gap.

While LCOE will compare positively to Europe by the end of the forecast term, the US will remain disadvantaged on a net cost of new entry (CONE) basis given the lower wholesale market prices in the US. Carbon policies, whether state-level or national, are likely to close this gap, but not fully. The gap is lowest in Northeast winters, when offshore generation is highest and power prices spike on natural gas supply constraints.

Source: Wood Mackenzie NAPS tool
2. Key sector dynamics
Key sector drivers |

- Investment tax credit
- BOEM leasing
- State initiatives
- Global interest
- Battery storage

Source: Wood Mackenzie
Key sector drivers | LCOE reductions

Current pricing counts on availability of EU resources; overreliance on them renders cost reductions unsustainable.

Offshore wind LCOE by state, East Coast, 2018e to 2028e

(USD/MWh) vs. (GW)

- Connecticut
- Maryland
- New Jersey
- Rhode Island
- Delaware
- Massachusetts
- New York
- Virginia

Contracted capacity additions
Uncontracted but forecasted capacity additions

Source: Wood Mackenzie NAPS tool
Contrasting product moves on next generation offshore platforms

Offshore Western turbine OEMs thrive on power uprates, while Chinese emphasise rotor upgrades

Next generation turbine projections for Western and Chinese turbine OEMs

Source: Wood Mackenzie
US weighted average turbine rating will more than double in next 5 years

Turbine OEMs leverage the European platforms into the emerging US offshore market to benefit from economies

Turbine rating developments globally

Rotor diameter developments globally

Hub height developments globally

Note: Based on annual grid-connected capacity. Interpolated.
Source: Wood Mackenzie
## Key sector barriers | supply chain immaturity

Supply to migrate as long-term demand visibility solidifies and state-funded port upgrades break ground

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;2021</th>
<th>2021 to 2025</th>
<th>2026+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstration-scale</strong></td>
<td><strong>European-dependent development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sustainable domestic supply</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration-scale projects move without a domestic supply chain and reliance on – but limited access to – European resources.</td>
<td>European “imports” of installation vessels, know-how, component designs and equipment such as turbines, blades and substations are brought over wholesale and immediately brought to bear on LCOE. Labour is more evenly sourced between the US and Europe, expanding training opportunities.</td>
<td>A variety of manufacturers across the value chain produces blades, nacelles and other high-value components at competitive prices. Developers enjoy access to a fleet of specialized, Jones Act-compliant vessels including turbine installation vessels, crew accommodation and foundation installation vessels, an advanced installation port and staging area, as well as a deep and knowledgeable domestic labor pool.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
China, UK and Germany will be large offshore manufacturing hubs due to market size

Onshore facilities will be leveraged for components not challenged by expensive logistics

Offshore market cumulative installs 2018-2027e

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Nacelles</th>
<th>Blades</th>
<th>Gearboxes</th>
<th>Generators</th>
<th>Towers</th>
<th>Converters</th>
<th>Main bearings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
<td>☢️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wood Mackenzie
Key sector barriers | solving the supply chain challenge

A durable and capable supply chain is key to leveraging EU technological innovations and facilitating cost-out

US local content potential by main component

While monopile installation requires lifting capacities upwards of 1,000t as well as heavy equipment for piling, jacket installation is less challenging, allowing for local vessels to be used.

Cable installation in Europe has been performed by barges with installed turntables before, and similar approaches may be used in the US to satisfy local content requirements. The Jones Act is less applicable to cable-laying, however, and the purpose-built cable installation vessels with integrated turntables currently in use in Europe decrease both installation time and CAPEX.

Turbines pose high requirements to vessels, both in terms of hook height, crane capacity and stability. Consequently this part of installation is more challenging to localize.

Localization potential of jackets is high as jackets can be split into multiple components and the cost of assembly is labor-intensive and the costs for a facility is comparatively low. However, many European suppliers have faced challenges in this segment and developers have therefore split contracts amongst multiple suppliers. Similarly, the lead time and cost-out of offshore wind can be challenged without the setup.

The offshore substation [5%] is the segment that most resembles the offshore oil and gas industry in terms of manufacturing and installation, so there may be some opportunities for US involvement. The onshore substation [4%] is, of course, localized by default.

Despite its simple design, the large piles of a monopile foundation imposes high equipment requirements that makes localization the European pile market is consolidated and localization potential is limited. Opportunities do exist, however, for the more labor-intensive transition piece elements.

High Europe-to-US transportation costs for a large and unwieldy product and a labor-intensive (and job-producing) manufacturing process make blade production localization an attractive long-term option. The complexity of manufacturing and high costs of setting up a blade facility can make this choice unattractive from an OEM perspective, however.

The high transportation costs, comparatively low facility costs and high steel content (95%) makes a strong case for towers to be localized. However, European suppliers have shipped offshore towers long distances in the past without much trouble.

High localization potential

[ ] Share of CAPEX

Low localization potential

Medium localization potential

Source: Wood Mackenzie NAPS tool
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