Dynamic Analysis of Power Cable in Floating Offshore Wind Turbine

Presenter :MohsenSobhaniasl (Sapienza)
(Second year PhD Student)Email:Mohsen.Sobhaniasl@Uniroma1.it

Co-Authors:Dr. FrancescoPetrini (Sapienza)Dr. MadjidKarimirad (QUB)Prof. FrancoBontempi(Sapienza)







Presentation Highlights



Part 1. Motivation and Background

Between 1971 and 2015, global energy consumption more than doubled from 61,900 TWh to 160,000 TWh (EIA, 2017; IEA, 2017a).



- Hydropower 16.6%
- Wind power 4.0%
- Bio-power 2.0%
- Solar PV 1.5%
- Ocean, CSP, and geothermal power 0.4%

Figure 1. Estimated renewable energy share of global electricity production at the end of 2016; data extracted from REN21 (2017).

Part 1. Motivation and Background

Europe installed 11.7 GW (10.1 GW in EU-28) of new wind energy in 2018. This is a 32% decrease on 2017. Europe decommissioned 0.4 GW of wind turbines. So the net increase in Europe's wind energy capacity in 2018 was 11.3 GW.



Figure 2. Total power generation capacity in the European Union 2008-2018

Figure 3. Renewable energy investments in 2018 (€bn)14

Wind energy accounted for 63% of Europe's investments in renewable energy in 2018, compared to 52% in 2017. Onshore wind projects alone attracted 39% of the total investment activity in the renewable energy sector

Part 2. Offshore Wind Technology Development



Figure 4. Natural progression of substructure designs from shallow to deep water(source NREL)

16 January 2020

Part 2. Offshore Wind Technology Developement

✓ Barge

✓ Spar-Buoy

✓ Tension Leg Platform (TLP)



Figure 5. Floating platform concepts for offshore wind turbines

Part 2. Complexity of Infrastructure of FOWTs



Layout of Horns Rev 2 Wind Farm







Source NREL

Dynamic Anaysis of Power Cable in FOWT

16 January 2020

Page 7

Part 2. Fatigue as an issue for FOWTs

Source of Failure

- Fatigue
- Corrosion
- Fishing



Source: Floating Offshore Wind: Market and Technology Review



Dynamic Anaysis of Power Cable in FOWT

16 January 2020

Page 8

Modeling

Part 3. Numerical Modeling



FAST

Is a tool for simulating the coupled dynamic response of wind turbines.



Figure 6. Model of FOWT in FAST code



ANSYS AQWA

Is an engineering analysis suite of tools for the investigation of the effects of wave, wind and current on floating and fixed offshore and marine structures,.



Figure 7. Model of FOWT in Ansys AQWA

Part 3. Global Dynamics and Loads



16 January 2020

Part 3. Benchmark for Validation





Structural Properties of Mooring Lines

Description	Unit		
the mass per unit length of the line (kg/m)	77.7066		
the line stiffness, product of elasticity modulus and cross-sectional area (N)	384.243E6		
Diameter (m)	0.09		

Hydrodynamic Properties of Model

	Description	Unit		
	Water density (kg/m^3)	1025		
	Water depth (meters)	320		
	Displaced volume of water when the	8029.21		
	platform is in its undisplaced position (m^3)			
	Incident wave kinematics model	Regular		
	Analysis time for incident wave calculations (s)	3630		
	Time step for incident wave calculations	0.25		
	Significant wave height of incident waves (meters)	6		
~	Peak-spectral period of incident waves	10		
	Range of wave directions(degrees)	90		
	Wave Type	Stokes 2 nd -order wave theory		
	Low frequency cutoff used in the summation-frequencies (rad/s)	0.1		
	High frequency cutoff used in the summation-frequencies (rad/s)	1.9132		
	High frequency cutoff used in the summation-frequencies (rad/s) Current profile model	1.9132 No Current		
	High frequency cutoff used in the summation-frequencies (rad/s) Current profile model Analysis time for wave (s)	1.9132 No Current 1000		
	High frequency cutoff used in the summation-frequencies (rad/s) Current profile model Analysis time for wave (s) Time step for wave (s)	1.9132 No Current 1000 0.0125		
	High frequency cutoff used in the summation-frequencies (rad/s) Current profile model Analysis time for wave (s) Time step for wave (s) Additional Linear Damping in Surge N/(m/s)	1.9132 No Current 1000 0.0125 100,000		
	High frequency cutoff used in the summation-frequencies (rad/s) Current profile model Analysis time for wave (s) Time step for wave (s) Additional Linear Damping in Surge N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Sway N/(m/s)	1.9132 No Current 1000 0.0125 100,000 100,000		
	High frequency cutoff used in the summation-frequencies (rad/s) Current profile model Analysis time for wave (s) Time step for wave (s) Additional Linear Damping in Surge N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Sway N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Heave N/(m/s)	1.9132 No Current 1000 0.0125 100,000 100,000 130,000		
	High frequency cutoff used in the summation-frequencies (rad/s) Current profile model Analysis time for wave (s) Time step for wave (s) Additional Linear Damping in Surge N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Sway N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Heave N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Yaw Nm(rad/s)	1.9132 No Current 1000 0.0125 100,000 100,000 130,000 13,000,000		
	High frequency cutoff used in the summation-frequencies (rad/s) Current profile model Analysis time for wave (s) Time step for wave (s) Additional Linear Damping in Surge N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Sway N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Heave N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Yaw Nm(rad/s) Hydrostatic Restoring in Heave (N/m)	1.9132 No Current 1000 0.0125 100,000 100,000 130,000 13,000,000 332,941		
	High frequency cutoff used in the summation-frequencies (rad/s) Current profile model Analysis time for wave (s) Time step for wave (s) Additional Linear Damping in Surge N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Sway N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Heave N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Yaw N/(m/s) Additional Linear Damping in Yaw Nm(rad/s) Hydrostatic Restoring in Heave (N/m) Hydrostatic Restoring in Roll (Nm/rad)	1.9132 No Current 1000 0.0125 100,000 100,000 130,000 13,000,000 332,941 -4,999,180,000		

16 January 2020

Part 3. Load Case for Validation

DOF	Wind Condition	Wave Condition	Analysis Type
Platform, Tower	Steady, Uniform Vhub = 8 m/s	Regular Airy: H=6m T=10S	Time-Series solution

Description	Unit
Total run time (s)	1000
Time steps for Analysis (s)	0.0125
Time step for tabular output	: (s) 0.1
Compute structural dynamic	cs ElastoDyn
Compute hydrodynamic	HydroDyn
Compute mooring system	MoorDyn
Compute inflow wind veloci	ties Off
Compute aerodynamic load	s Off
Compute control and elect	rical- Off
drive dynamics	
Compute sub-strue	ctural Off
dynamics	
Compute ice loads	Off

Part 3. Flowchart of modeling in FAST



Source NREL

Part 3. Result Validation

Platform Heave



16 January 2020

Part 3. Result Validation



Figure 9. Jonkman Report Surge

Part 3. Result Validation

Part 3. Motion in Ansys AQWA

Part 4. Flowchart for fatigue analysis of electrical cable

Part 4. Properties of Electrical Cable

Standard flexible riser configurations for floating offshore structures

Part 4. Properties of Electrical Cable

Parameter of short-term sea state (South China Sea)

5.6 0.675 0.168 2.24096 4 6 0.675 5 0.180 8.68372 7 1.050 4 0.210 1.96084 7.80 1.050 0.234 14.006 6 8.5 1.550 0.255 4 1.4006 9 1.550 5 0.270 10.36444 9.40 1.550 6 0.282 20.16864 2.175 0.324 5.32228 10.8 5 11.2 2.175 6 0.336 15.4066 12 2.875 0.360 8.96384 6 13.2 3.625 6 0.396 3.08132 14.5 0.432 0.56024 4 6 15.0 4.5 0.450 3.64156 7 16.1 5 7 0.483 0.84036 16.7 4.5 10 0.501 0.84036 17.2 4.5 11 0.516 0.28012 5.5 0.522 17.4 10 0.56024 18 5.5 0.540 0.56024 11 19.1 6.750 10 0.573 0.84020 20 3.625 12 0.6 0.280

S – N Curve Used for Cable Section

Source: Karlsen, S., Slora, R, Heide, K., Lund, S. Eggertsen, F. and Osborg, P.A. Dynamic Deep Water Power Cables. 2009 RAO/CIS Offshore, pp.184-203.

Part 4. Cable tension in different sea states

Stress Time History in Different Sea States and Rainflow Cycles

Part 4. Fatigue Life estimation

Vw (m/s)	total damage (1000 sec)	total damage (1 day)	P (%)	Yearly Damage
5.6	3.60407E-09	3.11392E-07	2.241	2.54703E-06
6	4.37E-09	3.77725E-07	8.6837	1.19722E-05
7	2.64145E-09	2.28221E-07	1.9608	1.63339E-06
7.8	3.95964E-09	3.42113E-07	14.006	1.74894E-05
8.5	1.87E-09	1.61391E-07	1.4006	8.2506E-07
9	3.9601E-09	3.42152E-07	10.364	1.29437E-05
9.4	5.12178E-09	4.42522E-07	20.169	3.25765E-05
10.8	6.85957E-09	5.92667E-07	5.3223	1.15133E-05
11.2	7.69934E-09	6.65223E-07	15.407	3.74082E-05
12	8.92858E-09	7.71429E-07	8.9638	2.52396E-05
13.2	1.01E-08	8.68329E-07	3.0813	9.76594E-06
14.5	1.06209E-08	9.17649E-07	0.5602	1.87648E-06
15	3.07823E-08	2.65959E-06	3.6416	3.53505E-05
16.1	1.74282E-08	1.5058E-06	0.8404	4.61876E-06
16.7	2.41503E-08	2.08658E-06	0.8404	6.4002E-06
17.2	2.81661E-08	2.43355E-06	0.2801	2.48816E-06
17.4	3.74334E-08	3.23425E-06	0.5602	6.61364E-06
18	5.1396E-08	4.44061E-06	0.5602	9.0805E-06
19.1	9.12866E-08	7.88716E-06	0.8402	2.41878E-05
20	3.61286E-08	3.12151E-06	0.28	3.19018E-06
Sum of yearly damage				0.000257721
Safety Factor				10
Lifetime				388 years

$$FD = \sum \frac{ni}{Ni}$$

Yearly Damage = P * Total Windy Days

In Process

- More Sea States and Different Seed Numbers
- Considering Bending Stiffness
- Modeling Lazy Wave Configuration for the cable

Future

• Using Irregular sea states

References

[1] Nasution, Fachri P., Svein Sævik, and Janne KØ Gjøsteen. "Fatigue analysis of copper conductor for offshore wind turbines by experimental and FE method." Energy Procedia 24 (2012): 271-280.

[2] de Alegría, Iñigo Martínez, et al. "Transmission alternatives for offshore electrical power." Renewable and sustainable energy reviews 13.5 (2009): 1027-1038.

[3] Green, Jim, et al. Electrical collection and transmission systems for offshore wind power. No. NREL/CP-500-41135. National Renewable Energy Lab.(NREL), Golden, CO (United States), 2007.

[4] Jonkman, J., and W. Musial. "Offshore code comparison collaboration (OC3) for IEA task 23 offshore wind technology and deployment." Contract 303.275 (2010): e3000.

[5] BERGE, S. 2006. Fatigue and Fracture Design of Marine Structures

[6] LARSEN, C. M. 2009. Marine Dynamics

[7] Georg E. Dieter, Mechanical Metallurgy, ISBN 0-07-100406-8, p 375-431

[8] NIST Monograph 177, Properties of copper and copper alloys at cryogenic temperatures, by N J. Simon,

E. S. Drexler and R. P. Reed, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 1992

[9] ASM Handbook vol. 2, Properties of Wrought Copper and Copper Alloys –C1100

[10] Karlsen, Stian, et al. "Dynamic deep water power cables." Proceedings of the 9th International Conference and Exhibition for Oil and gas resources development of the Russian Arctic and CIS continental shelf, RAO/CIS Offshore, St Petersburg. 2009.

[11] DNV-OSS-401, Offshore Service Specification, Technology Qualification Management, Det Norske Veritas, July 2006

[12] - DNV September 2012. Design of Offshore Wind Turbine Structures. DNV-OS-J101.

[13] Loos, Bart. "Operability limits based on vessel motions for submarine power cable installation." (2017).

[14] Huang, Wei, et al. "Fatigue analysis of the taut-wire mooring system applied for deep waters." China Ocean Engineering 25.3 (2011): 413.

[15] Qiao, Dongsheng, Jun Yan, and Jinping Ou. "Fatigue analysis of deepwater hybrid mooring line under corrosion effect." Polish Maritime Research 21.3 (2014): 68-76.

Thanks for Your Attention

Dynamic Anaysis of Power Cable in FOWT

16 January 2020