

Uncertainty evaluation of BEM approaches for offshore wind turbine design

Maria Laura Mayol, Pierre-Antoine Joulin, N. K. Dimitrov, A. Lovera, S. Eldevik, Alexis Cousin, Martin Guiton

▶ **To cite this version:**

Maria Laura Mayol, Pierre-Antoine Joulin, N. K. Dimitrov, A. Lovera, S. Eldevik, et al.. Uncertainty evaluation of BEM approaches for offshore wind turbine design. EmrSim22 : Simulation et Optimisation pour les Énergies Marines Renouvelables, May 2022, Roscoff (FR), France. hal-03890887

HAL Id: hal-03890887
https://ifp.hal.science/hal-03890887

Submitted on 8 Dec 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Uncertainty evaluation of BEM approaches for offshore wind turbine design



M. Laura Mayol[1], maria-laura.mayol@ifpen.fr
P. A. Joulin[1], N. K. Dimitrov[2], A. Lovera[3], S. Eldevik[4], A. Cousin[1], and M. Guiton[5]

[1] IFP Energies nouvelles, Rueil-Malmaison, France.
[2] Denmark Technical University, DTU, Lyngby, Denmark
[3] EDF R&D, EDF Lab. Saclay, France
[4] DNV Group Research and Development, Høvik, Norway
[5] IFP Energies nouvelles, Solaize, France



HIghly advanced Probabilistic design and Enhanced Reliability methods for high-value, cost-efficient offshore WIND

Main objective: reduce the Levelized Cost Of Energy (LCOE) by reducing the uncertainty in the complete chain of modeling OWTs in a wind farm

Uncertainty evaluation of BEM approaches for offshore wind turbine design



Main goal: to evaluate the uncertainty of Blade Element momentum approaches, by comparing them with a high fidelity model

Introduction





Aerodynamic approaches

- Aerodynamic methods
  - Different levels of complexity

  - **Blade Element Momentum (BEM)**:
    - Widely used for design
    - Steady conditions, empirical corrections
    - Low computational cost
    - Limitations for large/floating wind turbines


  - **Vortex method**:
    - State of the art
    - Free vortex wake model based on lifting line theory
    - Unsteady, less empirical corrections
    - Higher computational cost





Aerodynamic approaches


- Calculation cost:
  - Larger than BEM
  - N-body problem
  - Ideal time step: equivalent to $\Delta\theta \in [5°; 10°]$
  - Wake length: $\theta \geq 2\pi N_{rot}$ with $N_{rot} \in [15; 25]$



- Aero-elastic simulations constraints:
  - Time step often driven by the controller : $\Delta\theta \approx 0.1°$
  - Low time step → very high number of vortex elements


→ Time-consuming routines ported to GPU (CUDA)


→ Still not enough : the number of filaments must be reduced



Aerodynamic approaches

- Reducing vortex sheet:
  - Shed Merging:
    - Shed filaments are progressively merged
  - Tip Vortex:
    - Filaments are conserved in the near wake. Then, a transition to “Tip Vortex” is applied






Methodology




Aerodynamic approaches

- BEM (DTU, EDF, IFPEN):
  - HAWC2 / DIEGO / DeepLines Wind™ (DLW)
  - Coupled with servo-hydro-elastic models




- Vortex Method (IFPEN)
  - CASTOR + DLW
  - Coupled with servo-hydro-elastic models




Study cases


- 2 wind turbines:
  - **Teesside**
    - Monopile 2.3MW
    - DoE: $\boldsymbol{U, TI, \theta_{yaw}}$
    - **300** BEM, **30** Vortex (iterative GP)
  - **South Brittany**
    - Floating (UMaine) 15MW
    - DoE: $\boldsymbol{U, TI, \theta_{\mathrm{wind}}, H_s, T_p, \theta_{wave}}$
    - **700** BEM, **60** Vortex (iterative GP)

Teesside



South Brittany






Results




Results


- Several GP models have been trained based on different relevant responses in the simulation results from both the BEM and Vortex simulations.
- Output: **metamodels** for BEM and Vortex
  - For several variables and inputs parameters
    - Integrated forces on the rotor (Thrust, Power, Torque)
    - Aerodynamic forces along the blades (over 5 points)
    - Damage at the blade root




Results


- 3 software:
  - HAWC2, DIEGO, DLW










Results


Mean Power, fixed TI, Yaw=0°
Teesside
Power ave [-]
U [-]
Vortex
BEMs
95% CI Vortex
95% CI BEMs


1e7
Mean Power, TI = 14%, Hs = 2m, Tp = 6s
South Brittany
Power ave [W]
U [m/s]
Vortex
DLW
95% CI Vortex
95% CI DLW

Results


Mean Thrust, fixed TI, Yaw=0°
Teesside
Vortex
BEMs
95% CI Vortex
95% CI BEMs
Thrust ave [-]
U [-]
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0


Mean Thrust, TI = 14%, Hs = 2m, Tp = 6s
South Brittany
Vortex
DLW
95% CI Vortex
95% CI DLW
Thrust ave [N]
U [m/s]
500000
1000000
1500000
2000000
5
10
15
20
25

Uncertainties

➢ relative discrepancy between the BEM and Vortex GPs

- Teesside:

	delFlap	delEdge	Power	Thrust
Min	-9.8%	-15.2%	-8.3%	-12.6%
Max	13.4%	9.7%	14.6%	13.9%
Mean	**0.2%**	**0.2%**	**2.0%**	**2.3%**
Std	**3.0%**	**2.4%**	3.3%	4.2%

- South Brittany:

	delFlap	delEdge	Power	Thrust
Min	-34.0%	-33.5%	-3.3%	-18.6%
Max	9.3%	9.2%	7.2.%	27.7%
Mean	**-1.8%**	**-5.2%**	**1.3%**	**4.4%**
Std	**4.2%**	**4.6%**	2.4%	5.9%

Conclusions



Summary, Conclusions and future work

- Comparison between BEM and Vortex models for two different offshore technologies:
- BEM models, using different ASHE tools (Diego, Hawc2, and DLW)
- Vortex model, Castor + DLW
- Several GP models have been trained based on results from both the BEM and Vortex simulations.
- Benchmark, overall good agreement between BEM codes.
- BEM vs Vortex differences are higher for the floating wind turbine.
- GPs or metamodels can be used in two different ways:
  - either to select a conservative response with a specified confidence level for all relevant input scenarios
  - or to fully quantify the uncertainties between both approaches.

Future work

- Estimate the **model uncertainty** by comparing **engineering models** with high fidelity **LES simulations**.

Acknowledgements



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under Grant Agreement No. 101006689