



Towards standardised WASP performance predictions (updates from the WiSP project)

Rogier Eggers, MARIN Natural Propulsion Seminar, Blue Week 2020

Outline



- General Wind Assistance developments at MARIN
- WiSP objectives
- Scope
- Preliminary results



Aerodynamic forces, incl. interaction

- Propeller performance (oblique inflow)
- Better hull forms and appendages
- Unsteady
 performance
- Steady performance (PPP)
- Voyage simulations







- Aerodynamic forces, incl. interaction
- Propeller performance (oblique inflow)
- Better hull forms and appendages
- Unsteady performance
- Steady performance (PPP)
- Voyage simulations







66 £1 32 02 67 35 04 C7 3A 05 -Realizes for each before the form



- Aerodynamic forces, incl. interaction
- Propeller performance (oblique inflow)
- Better hull forms and appendages
- Unsteady performance
- Steady performance (PPP)
- Voyage simulations





- Aerodynamic forces, incl. interaction
- Propeller performance (oblique inflow)
- Better hull forms and appendages
- Unsteady performance
- Steady performance (PPP)
- Voyage simulations







- Aerodynamic forces, incl. interaction
- Propeller performance (oblique inflow)
- Better hull forms and appendages
- Unsteady performance
- Steady performance (PPP)
- Voyage simulations





Dagmar Nelissen et al. "Study on the Analysis of Market Potentials and Market Barriers for Wind Propulsion Technologies for Ships", CE Delft, 2016

Identified as key barrier:

"Factors that contribute to the **uncertainty of the cost efficiency** ... information on the **performance, operability, safety, durability, and economic implications** of wind propulsion is available yet and since the available information may only have a **limited value** and may not be **trusted or understood**."



Help overcome the barriers to implementation by:

- Improving transparency and methodology of performance predictions
- Providing reliable predictions to ship owners & operators
- Provide examples for compliance with existing rules and recommendations for rule improvements

- Task 1: Improved methods for transparent performance prediction
- Task 2: Transparent performance predictions for ship owners/ operators
- Task 3: Safety issues; compliance with class rules and statutory regulations; new rules











EEDI (MEPC.1/Circ.815) as baseline for prediction methodology:

$$\left(\prod_{j=1}^{M} f_{j}\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{nME} P_{ME(i)} \cdot C_{FME(i)} \cdot SFC_{ME(i)}\right) + \left(P_{AE} \cdot C_{FAE} \cdot SFC_{AE}*\right) + \left(\left(\prod_{j=1}^{M} f_{j} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{nPT'} P_{PTI(i)} - \sum_{i=1}^{neff} f_{eff}(i) \cdot P_{AEeff}(i)\right)C_{FAE} \cdot SFC_{AE} - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{neff} f_{eff}(i) \cdot P_{eff}(i) \cdot C_{FME} \cdot SFC_{ME}*\right)\right)$$

 $f_i \cdot f_c \cdot Capacity \cdot f_w \cdot V_{ref}$

CO₂ emissions savings calculated with

= Availability factor

f_{eff}

- P_{eff} = Effective (saved) power
- C_{FME} = Carbon content in fuel (main engine)
- SFC_{ME} = Specific fuel consumption (main engine)

Starting point for WiSP: MEPC.1/Circ.815 is judged to be much too simple and open

- Internal detail reports
 - Task 1&2: Sensitivity studies showing the impact of various modelling, applied to real data

- Public reports, aimed to start an industry standard:
 - Task 1&2: Performance prediction methodology aimed at EEDI (two tiers)

Preliminary Results Case 1 – WASP (Ecoliner)



Preliminary Results - Baseline Circ.815



• Most simplified, but still conforming to Circ.815

Preliminary Results - Comprehensive



• Comprehensive modelling with more detailed physics and operational constraints

Baseline Circ.815 versus Comprehensive

- Savings are much more favourable for the baseline (Circ.815) modelling
- A bias in modelling that deserves more attention!



Sensitivity Heel, rudder and thrust limits





Heel<10 deg; Rudder Angle<20 deg; T>0 N (reference)

CO2 WASP TOT diff. [%]

0

0

5 10 CO2 REF [g/(tnm)]

- MARIN
- It is mainly important to consider sway (leeway) balance; then leeway induced resistance is accounted for



Only WASP thrust and surge equilib. Sway equilib. and induced drag (no heel & yaw) Heel equilib. and induced drag (no sway & yaw) Sway and yaw equilib. and induced drag (no heel) 4 dof equilibrium and induced drag (reference)



MEPC 62/INF.34

Additional routes





Sensitivity wind statistics







West Coast Europe (S -> N)



TWA [deg]





• The IMO global wind statistics in INF.34 are not generally conservative





- Savings simple (Circ.815) calculations yield a much bigger saving than in more accurate calculations
- Particularly important (so far):
 - Wind statistics INF34 not always conservative
 - Resolving leeway induced heel resistance
 - Resolving wind at correct (centre of effort) height is important
 - Minimum propeller thrust and engine envelope, as well as maximum heel angle can limit savings

- Additional theoretical cases:
 - Hybrid Transition Coaster (MARIN)
 - Asphalt carrier (Blue Wasp Consultancy)
- Applied case(s)
- Publication of main results and recommended prediction methods
- Participants still welcome
- Completion of project by end of 2020
- Potential follow-up with onboard data (targeting EEOI)





www.marin.n



For any questions: <u>R.Eggers@marin.nl</u> <u>P.M.Hooijmans@marin.nl</u>

Propeller propulsion – CPP versus FPP



Green area: possible conditions for engine ("" engine envelope")

Fixed Pitch Propeller

- Cannot depower when minimum engine RPM is hit
- Also results in convergence prolems



Controllable Pitch Propeller

 Can depower further, by reducing pitch

10 to 15

15 to 20

05 to 10

TWS int [m/s]

00 to 05



Propeller propulsion – Engine limits



With engine limits

 Power reduction limited by lowest rotation rate of engine



Without engine limits:

05 to 10

TWS int [m/s]

00 to 05

• Power can be reduced further

10 to 15

15 to 20

20 to 25

