



PHD THESIS

**Improve the Understanding of
Uncertainties in Numerical Analysis of
Moored Floating Wave Energy
Converters**

Submitted by Andrew William Vickers to the University of Exeter as a Thesis
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Earth Resources in June 2012.

This Thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright
material and that no quotation from this Thesis may be published without
proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been
identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for
the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Signature.....

July 30, 2013

Abstract

The wave energy industry, still in its infancy compared to similar activities offshore, must look to the oil and gas industry for guide lines on design criteria for survival, safety and operational optimisation for installations at sea. Numerical analysis tools for prediction of the response of floating moored structures have become an important part of the design task for the offshore industry offering a low cost and low risk option compared to scale tank testing. However, rather than having only a task of station keeping and survival, the moorings for a wave energy converters (WECs) would also be required to provide the ability of not adversely affecting the power capture task. The main aim of this work is to gain an understanding and reduce the uncertainties in the numerical modelling of WECs.

Experimental work designed and performed under the HydraLab III project of which the author was a member were used to evaluate the response characteristics of a 1:20 scale “generic WEC” device with a 3 point mooring system. The investigation was enhanced through further tests implemented by the author at Heriot-Watt wave tank using a single WEC device. The outcomes from these experiments were used to aid in the implementation of the aim identified above.

Two numerical model categories were set up to understand the uncertainties apparent to the mooring simulations. The first category included only the calculation of the mooring line response using experimental data to inform the motion of the floating body. The second category included the motion response of the floating body coupling the complex behaviour to the moored system. The mooring tension results for the first category shows an error between the numerical prediction and the experimental results up to 16 times that of the experimental value. This was mainly during slack conditions where the mooring line tension was lower than the pretension in the line at still water. During the higher tension events the average error was 26%. For the second category it was found that the numerical predictions of the WEC motion response in six degree of freedom (6DOF) were generally over predicted. The tension predictions for the coupled simulations identified an error of between 1.4 and 4.5%.

The work presented here contributed to the understanding of uncertainties in numerical simulations for WEC mooring designs. The disparity between the simulation and experimental results re-enforced the requirement for a better understanding of highly dynamic responding moored coupled systems. From this work it is clear that the numerical models used to approximate the response of moored WECs could provide a good first design step. Whilst this work contributed to the understanding of uncertainties and consequently reduced some of these, further work is recommended in chapter 6 to investigate the definition of some of the mechanical and hydrodynamic properties of the mooring line. It is also suggested that external functions should be included

that would allow to model the coupled effect of Power-Take-Off (PTO) system. It is intended to conduct future work deriving a fully dynamic mooring simulation including the effects of PTO.

Acknowledgements

This thesis represents research I have carried out over the last four years within the Renewable Energy Group at the University of Exeter, Cornwall campus. It has been the most challenging and rewarding experience I have ever been through and I would like to thank all those who have made it possible.

I would like to thank my primary and secondary supervisors Dr Lars Johanning and the late Prof George Smith. Without their guidance and dedication I would have been lost in the early stages of my work. As my project progressed they were there to guide me through and fought to make themselves available when I needed them. Sadly Prof George Smith passed away before getting the chance to read this thesis and I can only hope that the final product would have met his approval.

I would also like to thank David Parish and Dr Ian Ashton who were always there to help both professionally and personally, mentoring me through my PhD. They both helped me with many aspects of my work and were always on hand to bounce ideas off of.

My PhD project was one of many that were part of the SuperGen Marine Energy Research Consortium. As a result of this I had the privilege to meet many different researchers from many different backgrounds. Many of these researchers have also helped me to complete my project in one way or another and I would like to thank everyone involved with SuperGen.

I could not have made it through the difficult time in my studies without the love and support of my family and I would like to thank them all for putting up with me over last four years.

The final stages of this project have been the most stressful and challenging. I was however, blessed when I met my partner Lucy Cruse who has helped me so much over the last few years, keeping me positive and uplifting me on a daily basis. Within the final months of the thesis and after a very difficult and dangerous pregnancy and birth we had our son Owen Andrew Michael Vickers, who is to become the next great chapter in my life.

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	16
1.1	Introduction	17
1.2	Wave Energy Converters	18
1.3	Moorings	20
1.3.1	Motion independent device (MID) and Motion dependent device (MDD)	22
1.4	Design Criteria for a floating moored system	26
1.4.1	First order oscillating forces on small structures	27
1.4.2	Radiation and added mass	35
1.5	Theoretical Response Amplitude Operators (RAOs)	36
1.5.1	Mean drift forces on a small structure	37
1.6	Experimental Mooring line damping	38
1.6.1	HydraLab III	43
2	Numerical modelling	46
2.1	Introduction to Numerical model of a moored structure	47
2.1.1	Simple Analytical Models	49
2.1.2	Dynamic analysis	51
2.2	Dynamic time domain modelling	53

2.2.1	Environment	54
2.2.2	The mooring system model	55
2.2.3	Floating body response	63
2.2.4	Experimental RAOs	65
2.2.5	Numerical RAOs and QTFs using diffraction theory	65
2.2.6	Numerical RAOs using 6D buoy approximation	70
2.2.7	Mean drift forces	70
3	Mooring properties	72
3.1	Introduction to mooring line property characterisation	73
3.2	Attachment method	73
3.3	Preliminary Tests	75
3.3.1	Outcome of Preliminary tests	78
3.4	Chosen load extension test method	78
3.4.1	Test schedule	79
3.4.2	Discussion of load extension results	79
4	Mooring line tension prediction	83
4.1	Introduction to Mooring line tension prediction study	84
4.1.1	Wave Basins	85
4.1.2	Generic WEC	93
4.1.3	Motion capture system	95
4.1.4	Mooring systems	96
4.1.5	WEC Instrumentation setup	99
4.2	Test methodologies	101
4.2.1	Decay tests	101
4.3	Time domain analysis of mooring system	103
4.3.1	Vessel representation of the floating body	104
4.3.2	Mooring approximation	105
4.3.3	Marker buoy approximation	105
4.3.4	Simulation condition	106
4.3.5	Wave field	106
4.3.6	Simulation scheme	107

4.4	Discussion on comparison between experimental and numerically predicted mooring loads	110
5	Motion and tension prediction	124
5.1	Introduction to coupled simulation study	125
5.2	Experimental RAOs	125
5.2.1	RAO tests with different amplitudes	127
5.2.2	Different mooring arrangements	129
5.2.3	Power take-off system	131
5.3	Numerical RAOs	132
5.4	Time domain simulation of coupled system	134
5.4.1	Floating body	135
5.4.2	Wave environment	139
5.5	Discussion on comparison between experimental and numerically predicted tension and response of coupled system	140
5.5.1	Regular Wave Comparison	140
5.5.2	Irregular wave comparison	143
6	Conclusions	158
6.1	Further work	162
A	Heriot-Watt test results	167
B	Trondheim MarinTek test results	172
C	RAOs	182
C.1	RAOs	183
D	Geometric data file for Trondheim WEC	185
D.0.1	Functions defining Shapes	186
E	Numerical RAOs of simple cylinders	195
E.0.2	Simple Cylinder	196
E.0.3	Modified simple cylinder	196