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1. Context and Problem Statement

• Advanced control strategies can reduce the platform motion and hence loads on the tower

• Blades that pitch-to-stall cause a drag force which increases with wind speed, therefore avoid undesirable ‘negative damping’ effects.
2. Aim, Objectives & Approach

The aim is to assess whether pitching the turbine blades actively to stall in Region III, using advanced control strategies, could aid in reducing the loads on the tower of a turbine coupled to a semi-submersible platform design.
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- DeepCwind semisubmersible model coupled to the three bladed NREL 5MW HAWT.
- Controllers designed in Simulink (MATLAB)
- Simulations utilizing FAST to predict system responses and loads in the time domain.
- Fast provides an inbuilt interface with Simulink.
- Identify fatigue reduction benefits available from different control strategies.
3. Results - Baseline pitch-to-stall controller

- Constant gain, closed-loop, feedback PI pitch controller
- Input = Error (the difference between the set-point (rated) and the actual rotor speed)
- Output = the summed results after $K_P$ & $K_I$ are applied & added to the equilibrium pitch value
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- Initially unstable and would not converge
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- Initially unstable and would not converge
- $K_P$ & $K_I$ gains increased
- Excessive blade deflections - striking the tower
- Blade flapwise stiffness increased
- A realistic active stall designed blade would be preferable
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- Increase in tower deflection
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3. Results - Gain scheduling benefits

- 12mps mean turbulent winds
- Irregular waves H<sub>s</sub> 2m, T<sub>p</sub> 7s
- Gain scheduling more complex in stall, may require 2 controller schedules
  + Faster response
  + Improved performance

* at minimum pitch setting, Ref: Robertson A et al, 2014, Definition of the Semisubmersible Floating System for Phase II of OC4, NREL/TP-5000-60601
3. Results - Gain scheduling benefits

- 12mps mean turbulent winds irregular waves Hs 2m, Tp 7s
- Gain scheduling more complex in stall, may require 2 controller schedules
  + Faster response
  + Improved performance
  + Loads & motion reduced

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Case ID} & \text{Control Regime} & \text{Natural Frequency, } \omega_n (\text{rad/s}) & \text{Damping Ratio, } \zeta & \text{Proportional Gain, } K_p (\text{rad}) & \text{Integral Gain, } K_I \\
\hline
\text{Case F1} & \text{Feather: Gain Scheduling} & 0.2 & 0.7 & 0.006275694 & 0.000896515 \\
\text{Case S1} & \text{Stall: Constant Gains at 12mps} & 0.6 & 0.7 & -0.08553923 & -0.03666824 \\
\text{Case S2} & \text{Stall: Constant Gains at 18mps} & 0.6 & 0.7 & -0.00772205 & -0.00330945 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

*at minimum pitch setting, Ref: Robertson A et al, 2014, Definition of the Semi-submersible Floating System for Phase II of OC4, NREL/TP-5000-60601
3. Results - Tower base fore-aft load mitigation

- 18 mps mean turbulent winds irregular waves Hs 4m, Tp 10s
- Response too slow with calculated gains
  ∴ proportional gain too low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case ID</th>
<th>Control Regime</th>
<th>Natural Frequency, ( y_{nat} ) (rads)</th>
<th>Damping Ratio, ( \xi )</th>
<th>Proportional Gain, ( K_p ) (g)</th>
<th>Integral Gain, ( K_i )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case F1</td>
<td>Feather, Gain Scheduling</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.009275634^*</td>
<td>-0.008365145^*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case F2</td>
<td>Feather, Constant Gains at 18 mps</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.00919716</td>
<td>-0.00931245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case F3</td>
<td>Stabilization, Constant Gains at 18 mps</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.00772212</td>
<td>-0.00336955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case S4</td>
<td>Stall Constant Gains at 18 mps x 10</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.00772205</td>
<td>-0.00309845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case S5</td>
<td>Stall Constant Gains at 18 mps x 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.772205</td>
<td>-0.339450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* at minimum pitch setting, Ref: Robertson A et al, 2014, Definition of the Semisubmersible Floating System for Phase II of OC4, NREL/TP-5000-60601
3. Results - Tower base fore-aft load mitigation

- 18mps mean turbulent winds
- Irregular waves Hs 4m, Tp 10s
- Response too slow with calculated gains
  - Proportional gain too low
- Pitch actuation increased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case ID</th>
<th>Control Regime</th>
<th>Natural Frequency, ( f_n ) (rad/s)</th>
<th>Damping Ratio, ( \zeta )</th>
<th>Proportional Gain, ( K_p ) (%)</th>
<th>Integral Gain, ( K_i )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case F1</td>
<td>Feather, Gain Scheduling</td>
<td>0.2 *</td>
<td>0.7 *</td>
<td>0.000275654 *</td>
<td>0.000965145 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case F2</td>
<td>Feather, Constant Gains at 18mps</td>
<td>0.2 *</td>
<td>0.7 *</td>
<td>0.0019716 *</td>
<td>0.0002745 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case S3</td>
<td>Stall, Constant Gains at 18mps</td>
<td>0.6 *</td>
<td>0.7 *</td>
<td>-0.0777221 *</td>
<td>-0.0033955 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case S4</td>
<td>Stall, Constant Gains at 18mps \times 10</td>
<td>0.6 *</td>
<td>0.7 *</td>
<td>-0.6772260 *</td>
<td>-0.0330945 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case S5</td>
<td>Stall, Constant Gains at 18mps \times 100</td>
<td>0.6 *</td>
<td>0.7 *</td>
<td>-0.7722950 *</td>
<td>-0.3309450 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* at minimum pitch setting, Ref: Robertson A et al, 2014, Definition of the Semisubmersible Floating System for Phase I of OC4, NREL/TP-5000-60691
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- 18mps mean turbulent winds
  - irregular waves Hs 4m, Tp 10s

- Response too slow with calculated gains
  - proportional gain too low

- Pitch actuation increased

- Performance improved

- Tower base fore-aft moment range & StD lower than F2
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4. Conclusions

• A robust control system with gain scheduling for stall operation could be further enhanced when coupled to other advanced control strategies.

• Increasing the gains gave improved performance and reductions in the tower base fore-aft moment range.

• The increase in positive mean of the platform pitch and tower fore-aft motions compared to feather indicate that this platform’s stability would need increasing, for a pitch to stall operating regime.
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