Luft- und Raumfahrttechnik

**Daniel Kaufer** 

Validation and Applicability of an Integrated Load Simulation Method for Offshore Wind Turbines with Jacket Structures



# Validation and Applicability of an Integrated Load Simulation Method for Offshore Wind Turbines with Jacket Structures

A thesis accepted by the Faculty of Aerospace Engineering and Geodesy of the University Stuttgart in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Engineering Sciences (Dr.-Ing.)

by

### Daniel Kaufer born in Großröhrsdorf

| Main referee:  | Prof. Dr. Po Wen Cheng     |
|----------------|----------------------------|
| Co-referee:    | Prof. Dr. Michael Muskulus |
| Day of defence | 27.11.2017                 |

Institute of Aircraft Design University Stuttgart 2018

**Daniel Kaufer** 

Validation and Applicability of an Integrated Load Simulation Method for Offshore Wind Turbines with Jacket Structures

D 93 (Diss. Universität Stuttgart)

Shaker Verlag Aachen 2018

#### Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

Zugl.: Stuttgart, Univ., Diss., 2017

Copyright Shaker Verlag 2018 All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publishers.

Printed in Germany.

ISBN 978-3-8440-6069-0 ISSN 0945-2214

Shaker Verlag GmbH • P.O. BOX 101818 • D-52018 Aachen Phone: 0049/2407/9596-0 • Telefax: 0049/2407/9596-9 Internet: www.shaker.de • e-mail: info@shaker.de

#### Acknowledgement

I am very grateful to many people for their support to successfully complete my PhD. It is not possible to mention all, but I would like to thank the most related persons.

First, I would like to thank my supervisor Prof. Dr Po Wen Cheng for his constructive support, new ideas and contributions to finish the PhD and the board of examiners Prof. Dr.-Ing. Tim Ricken and Prof. Dr. Michael Muskulus for their thorough check and acceptance of my doctoral thesis.

Many thanks also to Prof. Dr. Martin Kühn who has initiated and motivated me to start the PhD at the University Stuttgart. In the same way I would like to thank Andreas Rettenmeier, who was truly an inspiring mentor to me. Most likely I would not be where I am without their trust and support.

I thank Ursula Smolka, Jan Quappen, Cord Böker, Jan Dubois, Frank Ostermann, Marc Seidel, Fabian Vorpahl for their great support, helpful feedback and the professional collaboration in the research activities across alpha ventus and our joint research projects.

Along the path at the University Stuttgart I had the pleasure to meet and to work with many amazing colleagues at the SWE and IFB in a unique atmosphere. I would also thank Sarah Lott, Sebastian Schafhirt, Konstantinos Diamantidis, Philip Göbel, Oliver Zirn, Bernhard Feistle, Lutz Kräckel, Tanja Jenter and Hans Wackler, who are former diploma, master and bachelor students, to push and challenge me and my research activities. Thanks also to the Inventus Racing Team for the awesome time in the lab and on the dyke. I am happy to see that many of them are working successful in wind energy.

Special thanks also to Anne Jagemann, Silvia Kaufer and Thomas von Borstel for sharing your valuable time when proofreading the first version of the thesis.

Finally, this long journey would not be possible without the patience, help and support of my beloved family and friends.

v

### **Table of Contents**

| Та                | able o  | f Co  | ntents   | vii  |
|-------------------|---------|-------|--|------|
| Table of Figuresx |         |       | х  |      |
| Li                | st of 1 | Table | 25   | xvii |
| Li                | st of A | Abbr  | eviationsx   | viii |
| Li                | st of S | Symb  | ools   | хх   |
| A                 | ostrac  | :t    | ж  | xiii |
| Ζı                | ısamr   | nenf  | assung   | xxv  |
| 1                 | Int     | trodu | uction   | 1    |
| Ť                 | 1 1     | Stat  | tus of Offshore Wind and Design Challenges                           | 1    |
|                   | 1.1     | Stat  | tus of Integrated Load Simulation and Measurements                   |      |
|                   | 1.3     | Obi   | ectives and Structure of the Thesis                                  | 7    |
| 2                 | De      | cian  | Fundamentals of Offshore Wind Turking Systems                        | ٥    |
| 2                 | 2 1     |       | any of the Design Process  | و    |
|                   | 2.1     | Ter   | minology and Concents of Offshore Wind Turbines                      | 10   |
|                   | 2.2     | loa   | d Assumptions and Dynamics   | 13   |
|                   | 2.3     | 3.1   | Sources and Effects of Loading                                       | . 13 |
|                   | 2.3     | 3.2   | Met-Ocean Conditions   | . 15 |
|                   | 2.4     | Мо    | delling and Load Simulation  | . 18 |
|                   | 2.4     | 4.1   | The Modelling Process  | . 18 |
|                   | 2.4     | 1.2   | Mechanical Models  | . 19 |
|                   | 2.4     | 4.3   | Mathematical Consideration of Mechanical Models                      | . 22 |
|                   | 2.4     | 1.4   | Applied Models and Design Procedures in Industry                     | . 30 |
|                   | 2.5     | Me    | thods for the Design Assessment                                      | . 33 |
|                   | 2.6     | Lim   | itations of Conventional Design Methods                              | . 36 |
| 3                 | Im      | plen  | nentation and Verification of an Integrated Simulation Method        | 37   |
|                   | 3.1     | Ove   | erview of the Fully-Coupled Approach for Integrated Load Simulations | . 37 |
|                   | 3.2     | 1.1   | Description of the Approach  | . 37 |
|                   | 3.2     | 1.2   | Synthesis of the Equations of Motion                                 | . 40 |
|                   | 3.2     | 1.3   | Interface for Flex5-Poseidon   | . 41 |
|                   | 3.2     | 1.4   | Interface for Flex5-ANSYS  | . 43 |
|                   | 3.2     | Мо    | dels for Verification  | . 45 |
|                   | 3.3     | Ver   | ification using Simplified Deterministic Load Cases                  | . 46 |
|                   | 3.4     | Ver   | ification using Combined Aero- and Hydrodynamic Loading              | . 50 |

|   | 3.4 | l.1   | Verification using OC3 Project Results                     | 51  |
|---|-----|-------|--|-----|
|   | 3.4 | 1.2   | Verification using OC4 Project Results                     | 53  |
|   | 3.5 | Sun   | nmary  | 56  |
| 4 | Wi  | ind F | arm Alpha Ventus and the Measurements                      | 58  |
|   | 4.1 | Ove   | erview on Alpha Ventus                                     | 58  |
|   | 4.2 | Des   | scription of the Measurement Campaign                      | 59  |
|   | 4.3 | Sel   | ection and Preparation of the Measurement Data             | 61  |
|   | 4.4 | Loc   | ation of the Measurement Sensors                           | 64  |
|   | 4.4 | l.1   | Met-Ocean Data   | 64  |
|   | 4.4 | 1.2   | Rotor Blade Measurements                                   | 65  |
|   | 4.4 | 1.3   | Tower Section Measurements                                 | 65  |
|   | 4.4 | 1.4   | Jacket Substructure Measurements                           | 66  |
| 5 | Va  | lidat | tion of the Integrated Simulation Method                   | 68  |
|   | 5.1 | Bas   | eline Model of the AV4                                     | 69  |
|   | 5.1 | .1    | Wind Turbine and Tower Description                         | 69  |
|   | 5.1 | .2    | Substructure and Foundation Model                          | 70  |
|   | 5.1 | .3    | Reference Coordinate Systems                               | 73  |
|   | 5.2 | Cor   | nparison of Natural Frequencies                            | 75  |
|   | 5.3 | Val   | idation of Wind Turbine Characteristic Curves              | 77  |
|   | 5.4 | Val   | idation based on Nacelle Rotation Analysis                 | 78  |
|   | 5.4 | 1.1   | Boundary Conditions of Analysis                            | 78  |
|   | 5.4 | 1.2   | Rotor Blade Loads  | 79  |
|   | 5.4 | 1.3   | Tower Loads  | 81  |
|   | 5.4 | 1.4   | Jacket Stresses  | 86  |
|   | 5.5 | Val   | idation based on Comparisons in Time- and Frequency Domain | 90  |
|   | 5.5 | 5.1   | Boundary Conditions for Analysis                           | 90  |
|   | 5.5 | 5.2   | Rotor Blade Loads  | 91  |
|   | 5.5 | 5.3   | Tower Loads  | 94  |
|   | 5.5 | 5.4   | Jacket Stresses  | 95  |
|   | 5.6 | Sta   | tistical Validation during Normal Operation                | 97  |
|   | 5.6 | 5.1   | Preparation of Simulation Input Data                       | 97  |
|   | 5.6 | 5.2   | Rotor Blade Loads  | 99  |
|   | 5.6 | 5.3   | Tower Loads  | 101 |
|   | 5.6 | 5.4   | Jacket Stresses  | 102 |
|   | 5.7 | Sta   | tistical Validation during Idling Operation                | 104 |
|   | 5.7 | 7.1   | Preparation of Simulation Input Data                       | 104 |
|   | 5.7 | 7.2   | Rotor Loads  | 106 |

|        | 5.               | 7.3             | Tower Loads  | 107         |
|--------|------------------|-----------------|--|-------------|
|        | 5.               | 7.4             | Jacket Stresses  | 108         |
|        | 5.8              | Vali            | dation of Damage Equivalent Loads and Load Cycle Distributions   | 109         |
|        | 5.               | 8.1             | Preliminary Assumptions  | 109         |
|        | 5.               | 8.2             | Preparation of Simulation Input Data   | 111         |
|        | 5.               | 8.3             | Rotor Blade Loads  | 112         |
|        | 5.               | 8.4             | Tower Loads  | 115         |
|        | 5.               | 8.5             | Jacket Stresses  | 116         |
|        | 5.9              | Sum             | nmary of Results   | 121         |
|        | 5.10             | D               | iscussion of Uncertainties   | 125         |
| 6      | Im               | pact            | of Coupling Methods on Fatigue Loads   | 128         |
|        | 6.1              | Met             | thod Overview  | 128         |
|        | 6.2              | Offs            | hore Wind Turbine and Substitute Models  | 131         |
|        | 6.               | 2.1             | Model for the Fully-Coupled Approaches I+IV  | 131         |
|        | 6.               | 2.2             | Model for the Semi-Integrated Coupling Approach II+III   | 131         |
|        | 6.3              | Loa             | d Cases and Fatigue Result Comparison  | 135         |
|        | 6.               | 3.1             | Natural Frequency Analysis   | 136         |
|        | 6.               | 3.2             | $\label{eq:comparison} \mbox{ Comparison of the Fully-Coupled with the Semi-Integrated Method \dots}$  | 137         |
|        | 6.               | 3.3             | $\label{eq:comparison} \mbox{ Comparison of the Fully-Coupled with the Decoupled Load Method \dots}$   | 140         |
|        | 6.               | 3.4             | Comparison of the Fully-Coupled with the Rigid-RNA Method  | 143         |
|        | 6.4              | Sum             | nmary of Results   | 146         |
| 7      | Co               | onclu           | sions and Recommendations  | 148         |
|        | 7.1              | Con             | clusions   | 148         |
|        | 7.2              | Rec             | ommendations and Future Work   | 154         |
| A      | ppen             | dix A           | Identification of Damaged Measurements of AV4  | 161         |
| A      | ppen             | dix B           | Measurement Locations at the Jacket  | 164         |
| A      | ppen             | dix C           | Amplitude spectra of further Jacket Measuring Points   | 165         |
| A<br>M | ppen<br>leasu    | dix D<br>ring F | Basic Statistics (standard deviation, min, mean, max) of further Jac<br>Points during Normal Operation | :ket<br>168 |
| A      | ppen             | dix E           | Load Cycle Distribution at Wind Speed of 12 and 16m/s  | 172         |
| Bi     | ibliog           | raphy           | у  | 177         |
| С      | Curriculum Vitae |                 |  |             |

# **Table of Figures**

| Figure 1-1: Share of energy from renewable sources in the EU member States in 2014                            |
|---|
| (Eurostat, Feb 2016)1   |
| Figure 2-1: Design process flow chart for wind turbines9  |
| Figure 2-2: Component definition of bottom fixed offshore wind turbines according to                          |
| IEC Guideline (IEC-61400-3, July 2007)11  |
| Figure 2-3: Common support structure concepts (Vries, et al., 2011)   |
| Figure 2-4: Campbell diagram of a generic wind turbine showing the $1^{st}$ support                           |
| structure and flapwise blade natural frequencies (exemplarily)15  |
| Figure 2-5: Exemplary scatter chart of the turbulence intensity over the mean wind                            |
| speed at 90 m height from FINO 1 measurement platform   |
| Figure 2-6: Extreme wave approaching the FINO 1 platform in the North Sea on                                  |
| October 4 <sup>th</sup> 2009 (Fischer, et al., 2010)17  |
| Figure 2.7. Medalling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to                               |
| Figure 2-7: Modelling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to                               |
| experiments   |
| Figure 2-7: Modeling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to<br>experiments                 |
| Figure 2-9: Modeling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to<br>experiments                 |
| <ul> <li>Figure 2-7: Modeling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to experiments</li></ul> |
| <ul> <li>Figure 2-7: Modeling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to experiments</li></ul> |
| <ul> <li>Figure 2-7: Modeling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to experiments</li></ul> |
| <ul> <li>Figure 2-7: Modeling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to experiments</li></ul> |
| <ul> <li>Figure 2-7: Modeling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to experiments</li></ul> |
| <ul> <li>Figure 2-7: Modeling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to experiments</li></ul> |
| <ul> <li>Figure 2-7: Modeling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to experiments</li></ul> |
| <ul> <li>Figure 2-7: Modeling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to experiments</li></ul> |
| <ul> <li>Figure 2-7: Modeling methodology in structural dynamics and the correlation to experiments</li></ul> |

| Figure 3-8: Correlation of the blade flapwise motion (DOF 16) calculated with Flex5                                    |
|--|
| uncoupled and Flex5-Poseidon (time series, regression and cross correlation). 48                                       |
| Figure 3-9: Correlation of the tower torsion (DOF 11) calculated with Flex5 uncoupled                                  |
| and Flex5-Poseidon (time series, regression and cross correlation)   |
| Figure 3-10: Time series of the flapwise motion of the blade tip using Flex5, Flex5-                                   |
| Poseidon and Flex5-ANSYS at a constant wind speed of 8 m/s   |
| Figure 3-11: Full-system natural frequencies from load case 1.2 (Jonkman, et al.,                                      |
| 2010)  |
| Figure 3-12: Time series of the axial load at node 19, load case 5.1 of OC353  |
| Figure 3-13: Relationship of hydrostatic forces ( $F_{\rm po},F_{\rm pu}$ ), mass forces ( $F_{\rm g}$ ), inner forces |
| $(F_{\text{cut}})$ and bearing reaction forces (R) on a submerged hollow pipe (vertical                                |
| forces only)54   |
| Figure 4-1: Helicopter view on Alpha Ventus from southeast to northwest direction.                                     |
| (Image from www.alpha-ventus.de, June 20 <sup>th</sup> 2013)   |
| Figure 4-2: Wind farm location and layout59  |
| Figure 4-3: Sequence of measurement data handling for aggregated user  |
| Figure 4-4: Example of statistical data showing a one day period of four strain gauge                                  |
| measurements been partly broken. Location is R4_D_S1 on March 1 <sup>st</sup> 2011 63                                  |
| Figure 4-5: Wind and wave rose distribution of 2011  |
| Figure 4-6: Orientation of the wind turbine AV4 at Alpha Ventus  |
| Figure 4-7: Measurement locations at the northwest side of the jacket  |
| Figure 5-1: Procedures for model verification and model validation   |
| Figure 5-2: Main dimensions of WT AV4 simulation model   |
| Figure 5-3: Lattice beam model of the TP and the upper jacket compound71   |
| Figure 5-4: Examples of modelling element intersections at tubular joints  |
| Figure 5-5: Reference coordinate systems of Flex5 and Poseidon (top view)74  |
| Figure 5-6: Wind, wave and yaw angles in the simulation model using the example of                                     |
| 270 degrees measured inflow and 10 degrees yaw misalignment  |
| Figure 5-7: Natural frequencies of the baseline model and (identified) measured  |
| results  |

| Figure 5-8: Normalized comparison of generator speed (top), pitch behaviour (left)           |
|--|
| and electrical power output (right) under normal operation and free stream                   |
| wind direction77   |
| Figure 5-9: Angles definition of the wind turbine rotor80                                    |
| Figure 5-10: Normalized comparison of the blade loads at $\psi$ = 6.7 degrees80              |
| Figure 5-11: Tower top bending moment in [kNm] from measurement and simulation               |
| during nacelle rotation82  |
| Figure 5-12: Tower base bending moment in [kNm] from measurement and                         |
| simulation during nacelle rotation83   |
| Figure 5-13: Correlation of nacelle azimuth and wind direction at hub height from            |
| FINO1  |
| Figure 5-14: Tower fore-aft and side-side bending moments over nacelle azimuth               |
| angle85  |
| Figure 5-15: Time series of stresses $[N/m^2]$ at four measurement levels on the west        |
| leg during nacelle rotation (simulation = red dashed line, measurement = blue                |
| line)88  |
| Figure 5-16: Time series of stresses $[N/m^2]$ at a brace close to mudline during nacelle    |
| rotation of measurement (blue plot) and simulation (dotted red plot)                         |
| Figure 5-17: Normalized edgewise bending moment of blade 1 on March 23 <sup>rd</sup> 2011 92 |
| Figure 5-18: Normalized flapwise bending moment of blade 1 on 23rd March 2011.92             |
| Figure 5-19: Comparison of the flapwise bending moments from simulation (dash                |
| lines) and measurements (continuous lines). Normalized to measured mean of                   |
| blade 193  |
| Figure 5-20: Normalized amplitude spectrum of the resulting tower base (left) and            |
| tower top (right) bending moments from March 23 <sup>rd</sup> 2011 at 3 pm                   |
| Figure 5-21: Normalized amplitude spectrum of strain gauge R4_DT-W1_1 from                   |
| March 23 <sup>rd</sup> 2011 at 3 pm95  |
| Figure 5-22: Normalized amplitude spectrum of strain gauge R4_D-W1_N2_3 from                 |
| March 23 <sup>rd</sup> 2011 at 3 pm96  |

| Figure 5-23: Normalized amplitude spectrum of strain gauge R4_D-N1W2_W2_1               |
|---|
| from March 23 <sup>rd</sup> 2011 at 3 pm97  |
| Figure 5-24: Normalized statistics of the edgewise moment of blade 1 at normal          |
| operation   |
| Figure 5-25: Normalized statistics of the flapwise moment of blade 1 at normal          |
| operation   |
| Figure 5-26: Normalized statistics of the resulting tower base bending moment at        |
| normal operation101   |
| Figure 5-27: Normalized statistics of the tower base torsional moment at normal         |
| operation   |
| Figure 5-28: Normalized statistics of the jacket leg stresses from R4_DT-W1_1 at        |
| normal operation  |
| Figure 5-29: Normalized statistics of the jacket brace stresses from R4_D-W2/S1_1 at    |
| normal operation104   |
| Figure 5-30: Normalized statistics of the flapwise moment of blade 1 during idling 107  |
| Figure 5-31: Normalized statistics of the resulting tower base bending moment during    |
| idling 108  |
| Figure 5-32: Normalized statistics of the jacket leg stresses from R4_DT-W1_1 during    |
| idling 109  |
| Figure 5-33: Normalized DEL over mean hub wind speed of the edgewise (left) and         |
| flapwise (right) bending moment at the root of blade 1113                               |
| Figure 5-34: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) edgewise  |
| bending moment at 8 m/s turbulent wind114   |
| Figure 5-35: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) flapwise  |
| bending moment at 8 m/s turbulent wind114   |
| Figure 5-36: Normalized DEL over mean hub wind speed of the resulting tower             |
| bottom bending moment (left) and the torsion moment (right)                             |
| Figure 5-37: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) resulting |
| tower bottom bending moment at 8 m/s turbulent wind 116                                 |
| Figure 5-38: Selection of jacket measurements for DEL and stress cycle analyses 117     |

| Figure 5-39: Normalized DEL over mean hub wind speed of the stress at the jacket leg          |
|---|
| at measurement location R4_DT-W1_1118   |
| Figure 5-40: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) jacket          |
| stress at R4_DT_W1_1 at 8 m/s turbulent wind118   |
| Figure 5-41: Normalized DEL over mean hub wind speed of the stresses at the brace             |
| measurement locations R4_DT-W1/N2_3 and R4_DT-W1/N2_1119                                      |
| Figure 5-42: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) jacket          |
| stresses at R4_DT_W1/N2_3 at 8 m/s turbulent wind   |
| Figure 5-43: Normalized DEL over mean hub wind speed of the stresses at the X-brace           |
| measurement location R4_D-N1W2/W1_3121  |
| Figure 5-44: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) jacket          |
| stresses at R4_D_N1W2/W1_3 at 8 m/s turbulent wind  |
| Figure 5-45: Normalized DEL of resulting tower bending moment $M_{xy}\xspace$ in free inflow  |
| (low turbulence) and wake conditions (high turbulence)  |
| Figure 5-46: Uncertainties for the validation of OWT with jackets                             |
| Figure 6-1: Overview of the different applied simulation approaches 129                       |
| Figure 6-2: Resulting tower top deflection of the semi-integrated and fully-coupled           |
| OWT model using turbulent wind (8 m/s) and severe sea state (Hs = 6 m) 134                    |
| Figure 6-3: NFA results of methods II-IV compared to the fully-coupled method (I) 137         |
| Figure 6-4: $DELs(v_{mean})$ of the blade flapwise bending moment (left) and the tower        |
| bending moment (right): fully-coupled method compared to semi-integrated                      |
| method  |
| Figure 6-5: $DELs(v_{mean})$ of the stress at the jacket leg (left) and the stress at a brace |
| (right): fully-coupled method compared to semi-integrated method                              |
| Figure 6-6: FFT of the tower bottom bending moment and a local brace stress of the            |
| integrated and semi-integrated simulation methods (logarithmic scale)                         |
| Figure 6-7: DEL of fully-coupled method compared to semi-integrated method for 26             |
| sensors (channel 1-6 WT, 7-8 tower, 9-13 & 21-22 jacket legs, other braces) . 140             |

Figure 6-8:  $DELs(v_{mean})$  of the blade flapwise bending moment (left) and the tower bending moment (right): fully-coupled method compared to decoupled method Figure 6-9: DELs( $v_{mean}$ ) of the stress at the jacket leg (left) and the stress at a brace Figure 6-10: DEL of fully-coupled method compared to decoupled method for 26 sensors (channel 1-6 WT. 7-8 tower, 9-13 & 21-22 jacket legs, other braces), 142 Figure 6-11: DELs(v<sub>mean</sub>) of the blade flapwise bending moment (left) and the tower bending moment (right): fully-coupled method compared to rigid-RNA method Figure 6-12: DELs(v<sub>mean</sub>) of the stress at the jacket leg (left) and the stress at a brace Figure 6-13: DEL of fully-coupled method compared to rigid-RNA method for 26 sensors (channel 1-6 WT, 7-8 tower, 9-13 & 21-22 jacket legs, other braces) . 145 Figure 6-14: FFT of the tower bottom bending moment (black) and a local brace stress (blue) of the integrated and rigid-RNA simulation methods (logarithmic scale) Figure 7-4: Amplitude spectra of the DMS at the lowest x-bracing at the north-west Figure 7-5: Amplitude spectra of the DMS at the lowest x-bracing at the south-west Figure 7-6: Normalized statistics of jacket leg stresses from R4 D-E1 4 ...... 168 Figure 7-7: Normalized statistics of jacket leg stresses from R4 D-E5/E4 4...... 169 Figure 7-9: Normalized statistics of jacket leg stresses from R4\_D-N5/N4\_3 ...... 169 Figure 7-10: Normalized statistics of jacket leg stresses from R4 D-S1 2 ...... 170 Figure 7-11: Normalized statistics of jacket leg stresses from R4 D-S5/S4 3...... 170

| Figure 7-12: Normalized statistics of brace stresses from R4_D-N1/W2_1170               |
|---|
| Figure 7-13: Normalized statistics of brace stresses from R4_D-N2/W1_4171               |
| Figure 7-14: Normalized statistics of brace stresses from R4_D-W1/S2_4171               |
| Figure 7-15: Normalized statistics of brace stresses from R4_D-W2/S1_1171               |
| Figure 7-16: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) flapwise  |
| bending moment at 12 m/s turbulent wind172  |
| Figure 7-17: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) flapwise  |
| bending moment at 16 m/s turbulent wind172  |
| Figure 7-18: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) resulting |
| tower bottom bending moment at 12 m/s turbulent wind 173                                |
| Figure 7-19: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) resulting |
| tower bottom bending moment at 16 m/s turbulent wind 173                                |
| Figure 7-20: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) jacket    |
| stress at R4_DT_W1_1 at 12 m/s turbulent wind 173                                       |
| Figure 7-21: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) jacket    |
| stress at R4_DT_W1_1 at 16 m/s turbulent wind 174                                       |
| Figure 7-22: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) jacket    |
| stresses at R4_DT_W1/N2_3 at 12 m/s turbulent wind                                      |
| Figure 7-23: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) jacket    |
| stresses at R4_DT_W1/N2_3 at 16 m/s turbulent wind                                      |
| Figure 7-24: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) jacket    |
| stresses at R4_D_N1W2/W1_3 at 12 m/s turbulent wind 175                                 |
| Figure 7-25: Load cycle distribution of measured (left) and simulated (right) jacket    |
| stresses at R4_D_N1W2/W1_3 at 16 m/s turbulent wind 175                                 |

## List of Tables

| Table 2-1: Overview of load sources according to their chronological sequence 14                     |
|--|
| Table 3-1: Sharing of computing times of Flex5 and Poseidon for one time step, CPU                   |
| Intel T9500 with 2.59GHz43   |
| Table 3-2: Main data of the NREL 5 MW wind turbine   |
| Table 3-3: Influence of buoyancy for load case 2.1 (OC4). Results show the summed                    |
| vertical forces (4 piles) as bearing reaction ( $F_{z})$ and as nodal forces $\left(F_{x}\right)$ at |
| mudline  |
| Table 5-1: Nacelle rotation campaigns of WT AV4 in 2011  |
| Table 5-2: Amplitudes of tower bending moments caused by nacelle rotation from                       |
| measurement, simulation and estimated results in [kNm]   |
| Table 5-3: Estimated order of magnitudes of normal stress ranges at the four                         |
| measurement levels at the jacket west leg87  |
| Table 5-4: Averaged boundary conditions on March 23 <sup>rd</sup> 2011 between 3:00 pm and           |
| 3:10 pm  |
| Table 5-5: Simulation input for normal operation based on filtered measurements in                   |
| 2011, allowable wind sector 210-250 degrees98  |
| Table 5-6: Simulation input for idling operation based on filtered measurements in                   |
| 2011, allowable wind sector 190-270 degrees105   |
| Table 5-7: Parameters for calculating damage equivalent loads (DEL)                                  |
| Table 5-8: Simulation input for the validation of load cycles and DELs derived from                  |
| measurements in 2011, allowable wind sector 236-244 degrees111                                       |
| Table 6-1: Substitute monopile properties  |
| Table 6-2: Largest calculated differences of DEL per main component compared to                      |
| the fully-coupled method (I) during normal operation load cases                                      |

## List of Abbreviations

| 1p      | 1p periodic excitation frequency of the rotor                                       |
|---------|---|
| 3р      | 3p periodic excitation frequency of the rotor                                       |
| AV1AV12 | Short name of the offshore wind turbines in Alpha Ventus                            |
| AV4     | Research wind turbine Senvion 5M with jacket  |
| BEM     | Blade element momentum theory   |
| COG     | Center of gravity   |
| DEL     | Damage equivalent load(s)   |
| DLL     | Dynamic link library  |
| DMS     | Resistance strain gauge   |
| DOF     | Degree(s) of freedom  |
| FE      | Finite element(s)   |
| FEED    | Front-end engineering design  |
| FEM     | Finite element method(s)  |
| FFT     | Fast Fourier transformation   |
| FINO 1  | Research platform in the North Sea "Forschung in Nord und Ostsee $1^{\prime\prime}$ |
| FLS     | Fatigue limit state analysis  |
| GLGH    | Germanischer Lloyd Garrad Hassan  |
| HRD     | High resolution data  |
| IEC     | International Electrical Commission   |
| LJF     | Local joint flexibility   |
| Max     | Maximum   |
| MBS     | Multi-body-system   |
| Min     | Minimum   |
| MSL     | Mean sea level  |
| NFA     | Natural frequency analysis  |
| OC3     | Offshore code comparison collaboration project under IEA Annex 23                   |
| OC4     | Offshore code comparison collaboration continuation project                         |
| OWT     | Offshore wind turbine   |

| RNA   | Rotor-nacelle-assembly                            |
|-------|---|
| SCADA | Supervisory control and data acquisition          |
| STD   | Standard deviation                                |
| SWE   | Stuttgart Wind Energy (SWE), University Stuttgart |
| ТР    | Transition piece                                  |
| ULS   | Ultimate limit state analysis                     |
| WT    | Wind turbine                                      |

### **List of Symbols**

Bold written symbols represent for matrices or vectors if not specified differently. A dot over a symbol is the abbreviation for the first derivative in time. Two dots mark the second derivative in time of a quantity.

#### Indices

| aero       | Aerodynamic  |
|------------|--------------|
| hydro      | Hydrodynamic |
| i, j, l, n | Index number |
| m          | Master       |
| mean       | Average      |
| ref        | Reference    |
| res        | Resulting    |
| S          | Slave        |
| subst      | Substitute   |

#### **Greek Symbols**

| Wind shear exponent  | [-]  |
|--|--|
| Angle measured against horizontal plane                      | [deg]  |
| Eigenvalue   |  |
| Eigenvector  |  |
| Rotor azimuth angle (0 deg = blade pointing vertically down) | [deg]  |
| Density  | [kg/m³]  |
| Structural stress  | [N/m²]   |
|  |  |
| Coefficient of drag  | [-]  |
| Coefficient of mass  | [-]  |
| Damping  | [kg/s]   |
| Diameter   | [m]  |
| Damping matrix   |  |
| Frequency  | [Hz]   |
| Force  | [N]  |
| General force vector   |  |
|  | Wind shear exponent Angle measured against horizontal plane Eigenvalue Eigenvector Rotor azimuth angle (0 deg = blade pointing vertically down) Density Structural stress Coefficient of drag Coefficient of mass Damping Diameter Damping matrix Frequency Force General force vector |

| g                | Acceleration of gravity                                     | [m/s²]  |
|------------------|---|---------|
| Hs               | significant wave height                                     | [m]     |
| I                | Identity matrix   | [-]     |
| m                | Mass  | [kg]    |
| m                | Woehler coefficient   | [-]     |
| М                | Mass matrix   |         |
| М                | Bending moment  | [Nm]    |
| n                | Number of stress cycles                                     | [-]     |
| $N_{ref}$        | Number of reference cycles                                  | [-]     |
| р                | Pressure  | [N/m²]  |
| Pelect           | Electrical power  | [W]     |
| q                | Modal DOF   |         |
| q                | Modal vector of DOF   |         |
| r                | Distance, radius from jacket center                         | [m]     |
| r <sub>cog</sub> | Effective lever of the center of gravity                    | [m]     |
| S                | Stiffness   | [kg/s²] |
| S                | Stiffness matrix  |         |
| S                | Reference surface   | [m²]    |
| u                | Horizontal flow velocity                                    | [m/s]   |
| U                | Modal matrix containing eigenvectors $oldsymbol{arphi}$     |         |
| U*               | Reduced model matrix  |         |
| t                | Time  | [s]     |
| T <sub>0</sub>   | Zero-up crossing period of waves                            | [s]     |
| T <sub>p</sub>   | Peak period of waves  | [s]     |
| Т                | Transformation matrix                                       |         |
| v                | Reduced vector of DOF                                       |         |
| Vw               | Wind speed  | [m/s]   |
| Vdir             | Wind direction  | [deg]   |
| Vmean            | Average wind speed usually at hub height                    | [m/s]   |
| х                | Quantity of a DOF   |         |
| X, Xm, Xs        | Vector of DOF, indicating also master and slave sub vectors |         |

#### Abstract

Today the design of offshore wind turbines is an iterative process between different designers of special roles in order to ensure a cost-efficient solution. Responsibilities in offshore business are clearly split between the wind turbine designer and the support structure designer. A major collaborative task for both parties is the determination of the governing design loads due to the site-specific and stochastic met-ocean conditions over the lifetime including transport, installation, operation and decommissioning phases. The design calculations for the operation require an integrative model approach, which is able to consider all relevant subsystems and the governing loads. In general, these subsystems are the rotor, controller, nacelle, tower, substructure, foundation and soil. Common practise in industry application is that specialized structural models are applied for the wind turbine (i.e. rotor, tower, nacelle and controller) and the support structure (substructure, foundation and soil). Each of the specialized models considers an approximated and temporal constant model of the other subsystem during the design load iterations. For many applications this is a valid approach, but it can have disadvantages when dynamic interactions between the wind turbine and the support structure become excited or the natural frequency of the full system changes during subsystem optimization.

In this thesis an integrated model has been further developed and applied, which facilitates the combination of the wind turbine and the support structure in one direct solution by coupling the equations of motion during runtime. This ensures full dynamic interaction of the models without further simplification of the original models. Two applications have been realised: Flex5 coupled to Poseidon and Flex5 coupled to ANSYS. The coupled models are verified against other state-of-the art load simulation tools to proof the correct implementation.

In a next step the simulation method is validated against measurements from a commercial offshore wind turbine. The measurement campaign is carried out in the

wind farm Alpha Ventus, the first commercial wind farm in the German North Sea. The considered wind turbine is a Senvion 5M installed on a jacket in 28m water depth. The validation considers mainly the strain gauge measurements from the rotor blades, the tower and the jacket substructure at different operational states of the wind turbine. High resolution data and the derived statistical parameters are taken into account for the validation. The results consider natural frequencies, quasi-static loadings, time series, statistic parameters, damage equivalent loads and rainflow count distribution. Correlated wind and wave conditions from a nearby met-mast are used directly in the simulation model. In conclusion very good consistence between load measurements and the results from the integrated simulation approach is shown. Some differences remain because the turbulence of the wind field and the elevation of the random sea state do not correspond with the model in detail. The spatial and temporal resolution of the wind and wave data was not measured. This highlights the necessity of very accurate and correlated measurements of wind and waves for the design of offshore wind turbines and the relevance of models that can process more complex data.

The final part of the thesis addresses the distinctions between different simulation approaches compared to the newly developed fully-integrated approach for offshore wind turbines with jackets. The three alternative models differ mainly in the accuracy of the jacket subsystem or the limited dynamic interaction between wind turbine and support structure. For most components like the blades, the tower or the jacket legs good correspondences between the simplified models and the fully-integrated model are achieved. Larger differences occur in the local stresses of the jacket brace elements. This has a significant impact on the hot-spot stresses of tubular joints, which can be decisive for the entire jacket design. It is therefore recommended to use a fully-integrated model that is able to capture the dynamic interaction between wind turbine and local support structure components.

#### Zusammenfassung

Der Entwurf von Offshore-Windkraftanlagen ist ein iterativer Prozess mit dem Ziel, ein kostengünstiges Gesamtkonzept zu entwickeln. Dabei gibt es klar aufgeteilte Verantwortlichkeiten zwischen Anlagenhersteller und Entwickler von Tragstrukturen. Ein wichtiges gemeinsames Ziel ist die Bestimmung der Entwurfslasten aufgrund standortspezifischer Randbedingungen von Wind und Welleneinflüssen über die gesamte Lebensdauer hinweg. Es werden sowohl Transport, Installation, Betrieb und Rückbau betrachtet. Die Berechnungen für den Betrieb erfordern einen integrierten Gesamtansatz, welcher alle relevanten Teilsvsteme inklusive der äußeren Lasten abbildet. Gängige industrielle Praxis ist die Verwendung verschiedener spezialisierter Strukturmodelle für die Windkraftanlage einerseits (Rotor, Gondel, Turm und Regler) und für die Tragstruktur andererseits (Unterstruktur, Fundament und Boden). Diese Modelle benutzen stets vereinfachte Teilmodelle des jeweils anderen Modells und nehmen diese innerhalb der Lastiteration als konstant an. Dieser Ansatz ist für viele Anwendungen geeignet. Die Nachteile zeigen sich sobald die dynamische Interaktion zwischen Windkraftanlage und Tragstruktur relevant wird oder sobald sich die Eigenfrequenzen des Gesamtsystems bei Optimierung der Teilmodelle verändern. Dadurch steigen die Anzahl der Lastiterationen und der notwendige Datenaustausch.

Im Rahmen dieser Arbeit wird ein Verfahren weiterentwickelt und angewendet, welches diese dynamischen Interaktionen in einer Gesamtsimulation ermöglicht. Die Bewegungsgleichungen (Modelle) der Teilsysteme werden während der Lösung im Zeitbereich kombiniert. Dadurch ist die Kopplung aller Freiheitsgrade der Modelle gewährleistet, ohne dass zusätzliche Vereinfachungen der ursprünglichen Teilmodelle von Windkraftanlage und Tragstruktur nötig werden. Zwei konkrete Anwendungen werden umgesetzt: Flex5 gekoppelt mit Poseidon und Flex5 gekoppelt mit ANSYS. Beide Lösungen sind mit anderen gängigen Simulationsprogrammen verifiziert, um die korrekte Implementierung der Kopplungen zu prüfen. Im Weiteren wird das gekoppelte Verfahren zur Lastberechnung mit Messdaten validiert. Die Messdaten entstammen Alpha Ventus, dem ersten deutschen Offshore-Windpark in der Nordsee. Eine Windkraftanlage vom Typ Senvion 5M ist auf einer Jacket Tragstruktur in rund 28m Wassertiefe installiert und messtechnisch ausgestattet. Die Validierung basiert hauptsächlich auf Dehnungsmessungen an den Komponenten Rotorblatt, Turm und Jacket, wobei verschiedene Betriebszustände berücksichtigt werden. Hochaufgelöste Signale sowie deren statistische Größen werden genutzt, um Eigenfrequenzen, quasi-statische Lasten, Lastzeitreihen, statistische Parameter, schädigungsäquivalente Lasten und Schwingweiten-Klassifizierung zwischen Simulation und Messung zu vergleichen. Korrelierende Windund Welleninformationen vom nahegelegenen Messmast werden direkt im Simulationsmodell verwendet. Die Ergebnisse von Simulation und Messung stimmen sehr gut überein. Unterschiede entstehen im Wesentlichen aufgrund der gemittelt bestimmten Umgebungsbedingungen. Der turbulente Wind sowie Seegang sind messtechnisch nicht räumlich erfasst und können ohnehin nur bedingt im Modell approximiert werden, so dass eine exakte Nachbildung unrealistisch bleibt. Dies verdeutlicht aber auch die Notwendigkeit, sowohl möglichst genaue standortspezifische und zeitgleiche Messungen von Wind und Wellen für den Entwurf von Offshore Windkraftanlagen durchzuführen, als auch die notwenigen Modelle für deren Umsetzung zu entwickeln.

Alternative Simulationsverfahren und deren Vergleich mit dem entwickelten integrierten Ansatz werden am Schluss untersucht. Drei Verfahren sind berücksichtigt, die sich jeweils in der Abbildung des Jacket Modells und ihrer dynamischen Interaktion mit der Windkraftanlage unterscheiden. Für viele Hauptkomponenten (d.h. Rotor und Turm, sowie Jacket-Beine) liefern die bisherigen Ansätze plausible Ergebnisse, jedoch werden größere Unterschiede bei lokalen Stäben deutlich, was Einfluss auf die Bemessung der Knoten hat, die oft Design entscheidend sind. Daher werden Berechnungen mit Modellen empfohlen, die eine Kopplung zwischen Windkraftanlage und Jacket möglichst exakt abbilden.