



MSc Thesis

New TITLE describing the research

Ingmar Wever (4161041)

August 30, 2018



WINCH AREA

This page is intentionally left blank.

(Except for the above line.)

MSc Thesis
ADD NEW TITLE

Make
new title

August 30, 2018

Student:	Ingmar Wever	4161041
Project duration:	September 2017 – July 2018	
Supervisors:	Dr.ir. Robert Hekkenberg Prof.Dr. Mark Neerincx Toine Cleophas	TU Delft, Maritime Technology TU Delft, Computer Science Damen Shipyards
Other committee members:	Prof.ir. Hans Hopman cs begeleider	TU Delft, Maritime Technology TU Delft, Computer Science

Notes

Make new title
list of used symbols	v
link structure to chapters	2
Make own infographic	7
Update with correct projects in timeline	8
more info on JIP and Sovereign	9
add renders/artist impressions of vessels	9
add model from sovereign	10
Not yet implemented	33
Describe why this evasive manoeuvrer (90 deg) is most common critical	35
Evaluate scenarios using decision process as described in previous chapter	39
niet zeker dat dit nuttig is	39
Communication, Observations, Strategy based on current information, Key criteria	41
add screenshot of simulation	43
make table	43
summarize relevant lessons, and what NOT should be forgotton	43
Is dit voldoende?	51
create visual, instead of list	53
describe use case	59
add more user stories?	61
add description and printscrean of tool	64
add SMCP cheatsheet	64
Describe and reference to why tool, to cooperate at sea	64
add concrete measurement	67
make link with variables	67
Describe situations in more detail	68
add summary of description when using the tool, reference to chapter tool	69
add pictures of what is exactly happening in each situations, and what possible decisions might be	69
Is this enough?	70
How is information used. Mention parts on information overload. Thereby also the difference between ships. Officer walking around on big ship, vs small bridge on a tug for example.	83
How does it go in practice, experience.	89
Write into a story	90
add user stories to appendix	92

Extend with more specific requirements	92
describe different modules	92
Show decision trees relevant to determine critical path	95
Are these really relevant accidents, add more/other?	98
Add images of resulting damages	98
Summaries all lessons learned from the above mentioned accidents	105
describe formula to determine crossingpoint of line	109
CPA calculation	109

Preface

Abstract

Glossary

list of
used
symbols

Abbreviations

AIS Automatic Identification System

AMS Alarm Management System

ARPA Automatic Radar Plotting Aid

BNWAS Bridge Navigational Watch Alarm System

CAM-HMI Central Alert Management Human Machine Interface for presentation and handling of alerts

CFD Computational Fluid Dynamics

COLREGs Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea

CPA Closest point of approach

DOF Degrees of freedom

DP Dynamic Positioning

ECDIS Electronic Chart Display Information System

ENC Electronic Navigational Chart

GNSS Global Navigation Satellite System

GPS Global Positioning System

GT Gross Tonnage

IEC International Electrotechnical Commission

IHO International Hydrographic Organization

IMO International Maritime Organization

JIP Joint Industry Project

MARPOL International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships

Navtex Navigational text Messages

no-UI Non-visual User Interface

OoW Officer of Watch

sCE situated Cognitive Engineering

SMCP Standard Maritime Communication Phrases

SMNV Standard Marine Navigational Vocabulary

SOLAS International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea

STCW International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping
for Seafarers

TEU Twenty foot Equivalent Unit

UID User Input Device

VDES VHF Data Exchange System

VHF Very High Frequency radio

Contents

Preface	iii
Abstract	iv
Glossary	v
Introduction	1
I Steps towards safe autonomous shipping	3
1 Steps towards the future	5
1.1 Why autonomous and unmanned shipping	5
1.2 Projects	6
1.3 Stakeholders	10
1.4 Challenges when combining unmanned and manned vessel	10
2 Decision model	12
2.1 Decision process	12
2.2 External factors	13
II Relevance of criteria for decision making	16
3 Decision making process	18
3.1 Decision phases	18
3.2 Nodes in decision making tree	19
3.3 Critical paths in decision trees	21
4 Identification of situation and scenarios	23
4.1 Situation identification	23
4.2 Situations which limit possible strategies	24
4.3 Scenarios	25
5 Definition of criteria	27
5.1 Calculations based on current systems	27
5.2 Proposed algorithm based on planned path	29
6 Dependence of manoeuvrability on decision criteria	32
6.1 Manoeuvrer descriptions	32

6.2 Trial results	35
6.3 Dependency analysis	35
7 Analysis of scenarios	39
7.1 Entering Maasgeul towards North Sea, Rotterdam	39
7.2 Relevant lessons	43
8 Lessons learned	44
8.1 Method to define design criteria	44
8.2 Examples of resulting design matrix	44
8.3 Factors not taken into account	44
8.4 Result	44
III Necessity of a protocol to enable teamwork between manned and un-manned ships	45
9 Foundation	47
9.1 Operational demands	47
9.2 Human factors	51
9.3 Envisioned technology	54
10 System design specification	56
10.1 Design scenarios	56
10.2 Use case	58
10.3 Functional requirements and claims	59
10.4 Ontology	61
11 Design evaluation	64
11.1 Artefact	64
11.2 Evaluation method	65
11.3 Evaluation results	70
IV Wrap-up	72
12 Results	73
13 Conclusion	74
13.1 Answers to research questions	74
13.2 Recommendations for future research	74

V Appendices	75
A Current systems for safe navigation	76
B Simulation environment	91
C Decision trees	95
D Accidents	98
E Experiment questionnaire	106
VI TEMPORARY: Old text	107
Bibliography	113

Introduction

More people start to believe in the possibilities of unmanned and autonomous shipping, as there are many projects which try to develop the necessary technologies [SMASH(2017)] [Eriksen(2017)] [MUNIN(2016)] [Sames(2017)] [Rolls-Royce(2015)] [Waterborne(2016)]. One of the major reasons mentioned is the mitigation of human errors, in autonomous shipping this is done by taking out seafarers from the chain of command, this will however introduce new challenges. One of the less explored challenges is the issue that communication becomes harder between manned and unmanned vessels. Communication is used to share information on the intentions or discuss future actions. At the moment there is no protocol which can be used by unmanned vessels. However this is necessary to ensure the safety of all vessels: manned, unmanned, remote, automated and autonomous. To solve this challenge, there are two possibilities: Avoid the need for communication, or develop a new communication protocol.

Context

A computer works most efficient when it has all information in a structured way. Humans however are better with limited and unstructured data, to avoid information overload of the crew and communication channels [CCNR(2017)]. This will result in a challenge when manned and unmanned vessels have to communicate. In many situations are Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (COLREGs) sufficient to determine the intentions of other vessels [IMO(1972)]. They can be seen as ship separation rules, which guide all vessels to make early and correct alterations to the course. As it is safer to make early adjustments to course or speed, than to spend too much time using Very High Frequency radio (VHF), Automatic Radar Plotting Aid (ARPA) or Electronic Chart Display Information System (ECDIS) to make an assessment. These rules do also apply to autonomous ships, and thus can be used when manned and unmanned vessels meet. Examples are to stay on starboard side of the shipping lane and not to cross other ships with small relative angle. However in critical situations such as the entering of harbors or in busy parts of the world, are the COLREGs not always sufficient.

To ensure the safety of all vessels, must decisions be taken well in advance. This depends on the manoeuvrability of the vessel. A cargo vessel will for example, follow a fairly predictable path. While a small tug boat might move around much more. Which results in more false positives on potential collisions with other vessels. The manoeuvrability also means that it is necessary to think ahead several minutes with a long and heavy ship, while this is much shorter for a small tug boat. This time-domain for decision making depends not only on the

ship characteristics, but also the waterway characteristics such as depth, traffic separation schemes and harbor entrances.

Problem statement

This research will be separated into two parts. In those parts, the challenge of communication between manned and unmanned vessels is considered. The first part aims to determine how communication can be avoided, by giving insight into the time-domain for decision making. By looking at the the decision process, critical situation can be selected which are analyzed in more detail. Using manoeuvring models these situations can be simulated to determine the time-domain and determine if this can be improved to ensure that communication is needed in fewer situations.

The second part will focus on the critical situations where communication is a must. Currently there is not yet worked on a communication protocol between manned and unmanned vessels. To ensure this will not delay the implementation of unmanned autonomous vessels. A new communication protocol is needed, based on existing systems and protocols. The aim of this part is to validate if this is sufficient to ensure the right information is shared. This is done by using the situated Cognitive Engineering (sCE) method to quickly define a new protocol which can be tested in a simulation environment.

Research questions

This research will be a start, to solve the challenge of communication between manned and unmanned vessel. This can be used as a foundation to build a system for decision making which ensure safe operation of both manned and unmanned vessels. The parts relate to different research domains: Maritime Technology and Computer Science. Which resulted in two research questions:

How do ship manoeuvrability characteristics influence the domain for decision making, to ensure that the chosen strategy will result in a safe minimal distance between vessels in critical situations?

Are existing systems and protocols for communication, sufficient to ensure that manned and unmanned ships can operate side by side safely?

Report structure

link
struc-
ture to
chapters

Part I

Steps towards safe autonomous shipping

Safety at sea has been a relevant topic as long as ships exist. Nowadays communication has become very important to ensure the safety of all ships. Where communication can be all forms of sharing information. Before the invention of radio communication, ships literally lost all connection with the shore and other ships when setting sail. Flags were used when ships were close to others ships or to the shore. This form of communication was not complete as it only gave limited insight in the intentions of other vessels for example. Which led to the development of COLREGs.

New technologies led to new ways for communication, which subsequently led to safer operation. This works very well between manned vessels, as human can work well with limited unstructured information compared to computers. With autonomous ships getting closer, a solution must be found. Also because new technologies have led to more complex situations. As ships get bigger and perform more complex operations. Due to the limited possibility for communication by unmanned ships, it becomes even more important to make the right decisions well in advance to avoid critical situations, or enable those ships to share the right information at the right time.

As discussed in the introduction are many projects working on unmanned autonomous ships. Chapter 1 describes why these steps are taken towards autonomous and unmanned shipping. Followed by a description of projects. This will give more insight into what others see as challenges for the introduction of unmanned vessels. A separation is made between the more exploitative projects aimed to form a vision of the future, and the applied projects aimed develop prototypes on the short term. Resulting in the challenges as defined by others. Chapter 2 relates these challenges to the decision model for ships. This shows how the need for communication depends on the steps taken in the decision process, thus that it might be possible to avoid communication and ensure safe operation.

1 | Steps towards the future

Research projects funded by the EU should aim at sustainable growth. This means, be competitive while also improving the safety of people working in the industry and reduce the environmental footprint [Eriksen(2017)] [European Commision(2017)]. This research will mainly focus on improving safety at sea within existing projects developing autonomous ships. Most of these project build upon previously developed technologies which are currently already in use. This chapter will first discuss: Why the step towards autonomous and unmanned is taken? Followed by a description of current projects to develop new technologies. To finally identify which challenges will most likely arise in this process.

1.1 Why autonomous and unmanned shipping

Due to digitalization, ships will become more sophisticated. More data is generated by sensors, improved connectivity and new ways to visualize data. This enables ships to continuously communicate with managers and traffic controllers. At first, this can be used to analyze data and give better advice based on expected weather, fuel consumption and arrivals at bottlenecks like ports and bridges. But further ahead this might result in unmanned vessels, which might be operated remotely. In parallel there is the transition where people are taken out the chain of commands, which will result in automated or completely autonomous vessels. The main arguments heard for the transition towards autonomous or unmanned ships:

- *Improved safety*, as most accidents are caused by human errors. Thereby will there be less crew at the ship, thus less crew is at risk when an accident occurs.
- *Lower cost*, as insurance goes down due to improved safety. Thereby is manning a large portion of total cost. With more automation, less crew is needed, although they need to be schooled better.
- *Higher productivity*, when there is better usage of data and communication. Thereby comes that computers don't have to work in shifts to go home or take breaks.
- *Improve competitiveness*, as tankers which are traded for example, do not have to enter a harbor to get fresh supplies.
- *More comfort and attractiveness industry*, as people can have more regular hours to work and do not have to be away for many weeks when working remote.

Thereby are maritime trade volumes expected to increase in the future and accordingly the numbers of ships needed to transport the freight will grow, as will the number of seamen required to operate the vessels. At the same time European shipping faces a lack of seafaring

personnel already today. An often cited reason for this lies in the unattractiveness of seagoing professions, especially for youngsters. To some extend this is caused by seafaring's inherent problem of lacking family friendliness and the high degree of isolation from social life that comes along with working on a seagoing ship. The current trend towards slower sailing speeds justified by ecologic and economic considerations increases the length of the ship's voyage and with that the time seamen spend on sea even further.

Here, the unmanned autonomous vessel represents a way out of the impasse of a shortage in the supply of seafarer due to the job's perceived unattractiveness and a growing demand for seafarer caused by slow steaming and increasing transport volumes. On the one hand, it could reduce the expected pressure on the labor market for seafarer as it would enable, at least partly, to reduce the labor intensity of ship operation. On the other hand, routine tasks on board would be automated and only the demanding but interesting navigational and technical jobs transferred from ship to a shore side operation center making "seafaring" jobs more attractive and family friendly than today. Furthermore, economic and environmental benefits are also expected when implementing unmanned shipping. [MUNIN(2016)]

The different projects around the world, working on the transition towards autonomous or unmanned vessel, are mentioned with their current status. Thereby should be considered that the projects are working on different levels of automation. These different levels are shown in figure 1.1a. Beside these levels of automation, are there also different types of automation, each with their own challenges. The types are shown in 1.1b.




Figure 1.1: Steps from manned to autonomous ships

1.2 Projects

The research project MUNIN has been one of the major projects by a consortium of ship-builders and scientists. The name is an abbreviation for Maritime Unmanned Navigation

through Intelligence in Networks and originated from WATERBORNE, an initiative from the EU and Maritime Industries Forum, supporting cooperation and exchange of knowledge between stakeholders within the deep and short sea shipping industry. They did an initial research between 2013 and 2016. Focussing on different elements of an autonomous concept:

- The development of an IT architecture.
- Analysis tasks performed on today's bridge and how this will be on an autonomous bridge.
- Examining the tasks in relation to a vessel's technical system and develop a concept for autonomous operation of the engine room.
- Define the processes in a shoreside operation center, required to enable a remote control of the vessel.

Thereby taking into account the feasibility of the developed solution, including legal and liability barriers for unmanned vessels. They concluded that unmanned vessels can contribute to the aim of a more sustainable maritime transport industry. Especially in Europe, shipping companies have to deal with a demographic change within a highly competitive industry, while at the same time the rising ecological awareness exerts additional pressure on them. The autonomous ship represents a long-term, but comprehensive solution to meet these challenges, as it bears the potential to: Reduce operational expenses and environmental impact. A concept was developed for a bulker vessel, enabling the consortium to do a financial analysis. Showing the viability, but admitting the limited scope of the project [MUNIN(2016)]. They have showed the importance of developing a method to determine intentions of other vessels and systems which are needed. But did not yet make the step towards developing such a method, which will be done in this report.

1.2.1 Exploratory projects

Different project worked on the vision about the future of shipping, often these projects have different phases in which the level of automation increases with every iteration. Examples of projects currently running all over the world are:

- One Sea – Autonomous Maritime Ecosystem by DIMECC Ltd.
- Advanced Autonomous Waterborne Applications
- Unmanned Cargo Ship Development Alliance
- ReVolt

Make
own info-
graphic




Figure 1.2: EXAMPLE-infographic: Timeline for autonomous ships by DIMECC

Rolls-Royce Marine is involved in different projects which are in some way follow-ups on the MUNIN project. The videos of the virtual bridge concept and the Electric Blue vessel have had many views, as this showed clearly their vision of how the shipping industry could look like in the future. Electric Blue is a concept ship, based on a standard 1000 Twenty foot Equivalent Unit (TEU) feeder. The ship is very adaptable, it can sail for example on both diesel and electricity. The modularity enables Electric Blue to adapt for specific routes and meet environmental requirements now, and in the future. Keeping in mind the way towards autonomous, will it start with a virtual bridge, housed below the containers. Utilizing the opportunities of sensors for safe navigation, employing radar, camera, IR camera, lidar and Automatic Identification System (AIS). The roadmap for this concept is to have partial autonomy by 2020, remote operation between 2025 and 2030, starting with a reduced passive crew on board. And be fully autonomous in 2035 [Wilson(2017)]. They pinpointed the control room as the nerve center of remote operations. Using an interactive environment with a screen for decision support and improving situation awareness with augmented reality. With these developments does their vision look very promising. However there have not yet been successful prototypes. Since June 2017 is Rolls-Royce also involved in the unmanned cargo ship development alliance, which is initiated by Asian companies and classification bureaus. Combing the roadmaps of these projects, it is known when sub-systems should be developed. In figure 1.2 the timelines of different projects such as One Sea, AAWA and UCSDA are shown.

Update with correct projects in time-line

1.2.2 Industry projects

Where the exploratory projects work on the vision and far future of autonomous. Are some companies working towards prototypes, often funded by customers of shipping companies. The Yara Birkeland is one of the projects ahead of the pack, already building and testing a 120 TEU container ship. This vessel will initially operate as fully electric manned vessel, but plans are that it will sail autonomously in 2020. Operating between different Yara facilities in Norway, transporting fertilizers and raw materials. Meaning the path and quay are always the same, which reduces the amount of challenges. Kongsberg is responsible for the development and delivery of all key enabling technologies. Including the sensors and integration required for remote and autonomous operations, in addition to the electric drive, battery and propulsion control systems [Sames(2017)].

Other smaller projects are the development of Norwegian ferries, which are likely to start sailing automated from 2018, just like an automated shuttle service for offshore installations. A partly Dutch project is the Roboat, where a fleet of small pontoons will be used to solve problems on urban waterways. Such as transportation of people and goods or creating temporary dynamic floating structures like bridges and stages. Which is a collaboration between AMS Institute and MIT.

Where most of the previous projects were focussed around developing a vessel which has to operate in the current environment. Does the smart shipping challenge (SMASH) focus on combining technological developments within different parts of the inland shipping industry in the Netherlands. This will help to steer ships remotely, enable intelligent exchange of information and optimization of waterway maintenance. Good examples are the new vessels from Nedcargo, the Gouwenaar 2 and 3. These vessels will be able to transport more containers, while reducing the fuel consumption. This will not only be acquired by improving the hull shape and machinery, but also by sailing smarter. For example by optimizing the speed, based on opening times for bridges and availability of the quay [SMASH(2017)].

Also did a Joint Industry Project (JIP) start on autonomous shipping under the name Sovereign. In this project did European companies, research institutes and the technical university of Delft partner to develop a technology to deal with difficult environments and complex transport missions within short sea and port traffic situations. Which is also applicable to other autonomous waterborne operations, such as inland waterways transport and coastal/inter-island short range ferry services. This should result in a ship for Amasus.

Based on the above mentioned projects, can the following be seen as possible use cases:

- Local transport between factories and terminals
- Short sea shipping

more
info on
JIP and
Sovereign

add
renders/
artist
impressions
of
vessels

- Tugs as extra actuator in dynamic positioning systems

1.3 Stakeholders

When these ships will sail, does not only dependent on the rate in which the technology can be developed. But there are also regulatory bodies, such as International Maritime Organization (IMO) and classification societies which need incorporate autonomous vessels in their frameworks. For them the exploratory projects are very important, as this will help to know for which ships codes should be developed. These codes include information on autonomy levels and how to certify unmanned vessels.

The next group are the shipbuilders, system integrators and suppliers for subsystems. These are responsible for the technological development. More and more shipyards try to get involved, to gain knowledge on the development process. Thereby are there companies from other industries, which see opportunities for products they already developed for planes or automotive, which could also be used on unmanned vessel. For example to connect ships, computer vision and protocol for testing systems.

The last, but probably most important are the customers, as a technology will only be used if you can make money with it. More and more companies are convinced this is possible. This are not only the chartering companies, but also their customers, such as Heineken, Yara and BHP.

1.4 Challenges when combining unmanned and manned vessel

add
model
from
sovereign

Based on the above mentioned projects it is clear that many project work on different challenges. The challenge of safe operation for unmanned vessels is one of the most important. This is mostly relevant when manned and unmanned vessels meet. As technologies for communication are costly to develop, the aim is to avoid communication when possible. To accomplish this, the first step is to adjust the operational strategies for unmanned ships to avoid complex situations where possible. This means a strategy should be developed on how these ships can avoid complex situations. The most easy way is to take decisions well in advance to make intentions clear. Still some challenges are open, as not all complex situations can be avoided. For these cases there must be a protocol which enables manned and unmanned ships to share the right information.

In the next chapter factors are discussed which influence the decision making process. This is based on challenges from above mentioned projects and current research.

2 | Decision model

In the previous chapter, several projects are discussed, which gave insight in the challenges towards unmanned and autonomous shipping. To solve the challenge of safe operation in a structured way. First insight is gained on where this is placed within the decision making process. This is done using a model for decision making. This model shows which factors influence the decision making process and how this is supported by relevant research.

The decision process within the model is based on Boyd's OODA loop, Endsley model for situational awareness, and combined with models used in the projects as mentioned in chapter 1. The OODA loop has different phases: Observe, orient, decide and act. Similar to Endsley's model: Perceive, comprehend, project, decide and act. The combined model describes how this applies to choosing the right strategy for safe operation and relates to external factors and relevant theory. In figure 2.1 a visual of the decision model is shown. The first step describes what can be observed, to form a mental model. The next step is to orient, in which the situation and hazards are identified. This will result in a set of strategies, which will be evaluated using different criteria, resulting in a decision. After this decision, an action is executed. This chapter will discuss these phases in more detail and how they relate to external factors and relevant theory.

2.1 Decision process

The decision process is the core of this model. The decision process will be used in part II on a less abstract level than described in this chapter. The steps taken in this decision process are similar for manned and unmanned vessels. Although their talents differ for being consistent or handling exceptions.

Mental model

The first phase of the decision process is to form a mental model. A mental model is a representation of the surrounding world, including the relationships between its various parts and a person's intuitive perception about his or her own acts and their consequences. To make this representation sensor data about the environment is used. This raw data must be interpreted, to become information which can be combined into knowledge. These steps require still much research, although large steps are taken within the domains of LIDAR [Oliver Cameron(2017)], computer vision [Bernard Marr(2017)] and sensor fusion [Hoffman(2018)]. In appendix A, the systems which are used currently at manned vessel to form a correct mental model are discussed. For this research only the result of this step is relevant: Is the acquired knowledge

sufficient to identify the situation correctly, or is more information desired via communication? The sensors which in the future will be used is not within the scope of this research, nor how that is combined into information.

Identify situation

The step from information to knowledge, is in the phase where the situation, scenario and hazards are identified. How this would go in practice is discussed in chapter 4. This step is taken to identify critical situations which should be evaluated during the design phase of an autonomous ship. This research will define a method to evaluate these critical situations. The situation and scenario is defined by the lay-out of the waterway, other nearby vessels, relevant regulations, etc.

Predict future states and decide on strategy

Based on the situation different strategies are possible. These strategies have to be evaluated. This done by predicting how the different strategies will influence the path of the different vessels. A trade-off must be made between exact calculations and computation time. For example is the Closest point of approach (CPA) currently determined using linearized formulas in common ARPA systems. Using non-linearized methods with for example a Bézier curve, will already result in a smaller error. Simulations would improve this even more, however do simulation with correct hydrodynamic models cost much more computational time. In chapter 5 the linearized and non-linearized methods are described. The simulation method can be done with the tool as described in appendix B, but this tool is not optimized for such calculations, and will therefore not be able to do these calculations in real-time. The hydrodynamic model used in the simulation also described in appendix B.3.3. After this phase different manoeuvres are evaluated which corresponds to the different strategies. How this will be done for common critical strategies is discussed in chapter 6, this will result in manoeuvring requirements, these requirements can be used by ship designers to ensure the ship can operate safely with minimal need for communication. After the evaluation of these criteria is known which strategy will result in safe operation of the vessel.

2.2 External factors

How easy it is to go through the decision process and end-up at the right strategy depends on the situations. This situations is mostly influenced by the environment. In some cases this environment is too complex to make a mental model for, just based on static sensors and

should information be retrieved by request. This section will describe in more detail how the environment influences the forming of the mental model and how safe operation within this environment would benefit from communication.

2.2.1 Environment

As discussed before is the mental model mostly a representation of the environment in which the vessel acts. The sensors will measure this environment. Many critical situations occurred due to weather conditions. The reason is that the sight is limited during heavy rain or snow. Also might the wind and waves limit the manoeuvring capabilities of a vessel. This is also the reason some vessels are not allowed to enter a port when winds are too high. This is mostly due to the layout of the waterway. Due to currents, operations (e.g. maintenance and fishery) or limited depth, might some area's be restricted. This information is often acquired via communication channels, but communication channels which only allow receiving and not sending, such as Navigational text Messages (Navtex). The same goes for basic information on other ships. They might send their location and speed via AIS, but still key is the ARPA. Due to weather conditions these systems could have worse performance, as heavy rain creates noise at the radar. In the situations where sensors do not function as expected. Communication is needed, even if whole decision process itself is optimized to avoid communication. The same goes for communication with shore based stations such as traffic controllers or in the future remote pilots. These often have information which could not be retrieved via sensors or current systems. Such as a place and time to berth or pick-up a pilot.

2.2.2 Communication

As described are there still cases in which communication is necessary. In part III the case where communication between manned and unmanned vessel is needed is discussed. Using the situated Cognitive Engineering (sCE) method a protocol is defined, based on existing systems and protocols. Thus using AIS to send written messages, or VHF and Standard Maritime Communication Phrases (SMCP) for verbal messages. Other cases such as communication with traffic controllers and pilots could use the same protocol. Although they might need to share more information with unmanned vessels, which could be done with a new system such as VHF Data Exchange System (VDES). This will however not be part of this research.




Figure 2.1: Decision model

Part II

Relevance of criteria for decision making

The previous part described the context of this research and showed steps towards autonomous shipping relevant for this research. This part will focus on the limits due to manoeuvrability in the decision making process. However, the steps taken to get to the right decision are similar, as shown in the model from chapter 2. The insights acquired from the decision process can be used to determine manoeuvrability requirements.

The first phase of observation starts with updating the mental model and is followed by a phase where different chunks of information are connected. This means situations and scenarios can be identified. This is the start of the decision making process in which different trees are used to identify potential hazards and problems which will result in strategies. These strategies are finally narrowed down to the actions. The different nodes and trees are discussed in chapter 3.

More detailed descriptions of the different phases within the decision making process are discussed in the next chapters. First the identification of the situation and scenario is discussed in chapter 4. Which branch to take in the decision trees, is determined by evaluating criteria. These criteria determine if there are hazards and which manoeuvres are feasible. This works in two ways, while sailing this can be used to determine the right strategy. While the designer can use these criteria to ensure a ship can sail safely in specific situations. The criteria to evaluate what kind of problem there is, are described in chapter 5. The criteria used to evaluate if strategies are feasible for critical situations are described in chapter 6. In chapter 6 is also described how designers can use these manoeuvres to determine the manoeuvring requirements for safe operation. To evaluate if these criteria are useful, manoeuvres are simulated with the tool as described in appendix B is used. These are also used to run several scenarios and see how these criteria affect the decision making process.

The result of this part is a design matrix which can be used by designers to determine the manoeuvring requirements and moment when decisions should be made. This is done for some specific manoeuvres, showing the minimal time and distance needed to make decisions in order to have a safe distance between vessels. This depends for example on the manoeuvring characteristics, speed and type of manoeuvrer.

3 | Decision making process

Using a rule-based time-domain decision model, can a general decision process be defined to make insightful: What the situation is and what problem might occur. Nodes in the decision tree are described with keywords to work in a structured way. This white-box approach will cover as much as possible, however is it likely to use machine learning in the final design of a decision algorithm for autonomous and unmanned ships. First the decision phases are described. Followed by lists of nodes used to identify scenarios and situations. Combining this with the rules, will result in the decision model. Also the criteria necessary to go through the steps are discussed. The aim of this decision model is gain insight in the decision process to show what critical situations are when you want to try to avoid communication.

3.1 Decision phases

The decision making process has different phases. As shown in chapter 2. A simplified version of the decision model is shown in figure 3.1. These different phases are described in table 3.1.




Figure 3.1: Decision process

Class	Description
Mental model	Acquire knowledge about the situation, not part of this research
Situation identification	Identify the encountered situation, to determine which criteria are relevant, based on waterway lay-out and other ships.
Predict future states	The second step is to determine if a problem will occur, as there is only a change in strategy needed when this is the case.
Strategy	If there is a problem, a new strategy should be chosen, this is based on the evaluation of criteria.
Action	From this strategy, different actions will follow.
Result	Finally the result is evaluated, using the same criteria to determine a problem in future states.

Table 3.1: Description of phases in decision process

3.2 Nodes in decision making tree

To describe the nodes within the decision trees, short keywords are used. These describe in short what kind of situation, problem, strategy, action or result there is. By using the same terms, confusion is avoided. Definitions for those terms are given in this section.

Encountered situations

This is the first step to limit the amount of strategies which are relevant to evaluate. The nodes within the identification process are described in table 3.2, more details on how this is determined is described in section 4.1.

Tag	Description
Passing	The paths of both ships are in opposite direction, and do not cross.
Crossing	The final direction of both ships differs, but they do cross.
Over-taking	The paths of both ships are the same but at different speeds.
Merge	The final direction of both ships is the same.

Table 3.2: Tags for different situations

Predict future states

To identify if a problem will occur, different criteria are being evaluated. These criteria are described in chapter 5. In table 3.3 the nodes within the decision tree are discussed to evaluate if there is a problem, and what kind of problem there is.

Tag	Evaluation
Closest point of approach	Good; Too close
Crossing point	In front; Behind
Crossing distance	Good; Too close
Passing position	Port side; Starboard side
Relative speed	Faster; Same speed; slower

Table 3.3: Criteria and result of evaluation to determine problem

Possible strategies

Using the identification of the situation and prediction of future states. A limited number of strategies might be possible. The strategies will result in actions, but can be categorized in the groups as described in table 3.4.

Tag	Description
Follow planned path	By doing planned actions
Move away from other path	Change path, in order to increase CPA
Stay parallel for longer	Change path, to sail parallel to other vessel
Adjust speed	Slow-down or speed-up
Abort over-taking	Lower speed and stay behind other vessel
Move away from other position	Check if this is to starboard, otherwise communicate
Communicate	If other (also) has to take action to avoid a problem

Table 3.4: Tags for different strategies

Possible actions

From the chosen strategy, different actions will follow. These actions are a combination of an action type, and a moment to execute action. In table 3.5 and 3.6 these are described. The criteria to determine if an action is possible are described in 3.7.

Tag	Description
Continue without change	Do not change speed or rudder
Evasive manoeuvrer	Steer to starboard or port side first and end at same course
Change speed	Reduce speed or speed-up
Emergency stop	Turn ship side-ways and set propulsion in reverse
Communicate	Discuss required actions with other vessel(s)

Table 3.5: Types of actions

Tag	Description
Now	When action can be undertaken as soon as possible
In ... minutes/seconds	Wait for a period of time to ensure bold movement
After action ...	Wait with action till you or other has done another action

Table 3.6: Time-domain for action

Tag	Evaluation
Closest point of approach	Good; Too close
Time till problem	... minutes/seconds
Distance till problem	... meter

Table 3.7: Criteria to determine if action is possible

Result

Using the evaluations from the action phase, can the eventual solution be evaluated. Herein is the human factor on board of other vessels taken into account, in the form of perceived risk. Evaluations and criteria are shown in table 3.8.

Tag	Evaluation
CPA	Good; Too close
Perceived risk	Safe; Uncomfortable; Close encounter; Too close
Safe situation	Yes; Uncomfortable; No
Communicate	Yes; No

Table 3.8: Tags for safe situation criteria

3.3 Critical paths in decision trees

When combing the nodes as described in the previous section, very large decision trees are obtained. For specific situations and scenarios the eventual decision tree is much smaller than a tree covering all possibilities. Although a generalized model of the tree is drawn, based on the previously described nodes. This model is shown in figure 3.2. Where the purple show decision and grey are choices. Thereby should be considered that the actions are evaluated in a similar manner compared to predicting future states.

When all possible paths are considered, this will result in a very big decision tree. Which does not result in more insight in the critical paths. In appendix C different examples of sub-trees are shown. Using identification and evaluation criteria several common critical paths can be identified . These paths will be identified and evaluated in the next chapters.




Figure 3.2: Generalized model for decision tree

4 | Identification of situation and scenarios

The start of the decision tree as described in chapter 3 is the identification of the situation and scenario. This identification aims to narrow down possible strategies in the next phases of the decision making process. In this chapter, the first steps of classifying the situation are discussed. Followed by the steps taken in the orientation phase to form strategies. Which will help to determine which paths are common and critical, thus are good to be used while evaluating manoeuvring criteria.

4.1 Situation identification

Based on the environment, can situations be classified into four types. These are also discussed in chapter 3, as these are the same as the nodes in the decision tree:

Passing Ships do get close, but the paths are not crossing

Crossing Paths of ships are crossing

Over-taking Two ships following the same path with different speeds.

Merge Two ships from different directions, heading in the same direction, strategy might lead to an over-taking or crossing situation, depending on the relative position.

It depends on the type of waterway which situation is likely. To determine this, a classification of paths is used. To do this systematically paths will be based on figure 4.1 and can be written as: [current position, direction].

To classify a situation where two vessels encounter each other, the paths are considered. Key is to determine the angle between those paths. This way it is possible to classify them using table 4.1.

Own ship	Other ships	Situation
[A,D]	[D,C] [D,B] [D,A] [C,B] [C,A] [B,A] [B,C]	Passing
[A,C]	[C,A] [C,B] [B,A]	Passing
[A,B]	[D,C] [C,D] [B,A]	Passing
[A,C]	[D,B] [D,A] [C,D] [B,D]	Crossing
[A,B]	[D,A] [C,A] [B,D] [B,D]	Crossing
[A,D]	[C,D] [B,D]	Merge
[A,C]	[D,C] [B,C]	Merge
[A,B]	[D,B] [C,B]	Merge
[A,D]	[A,D]	Over-taking
[A,C]	[A,C]	Over-taking
[A,B]	[A,B]	Over-taking




Table 4.1: Standardized paths for situations

Figure 4.1: Path description

The boundaries to determine if the other ship comes from direction A, B, C or D are based on COLREGs. Direction A is between 112.5 and 247.5 degrees, as shown with the dotted line in figure 4.1. While sailing this angle can be observed using the mast-head lights. Which are seen as red when the vessel comes from B, green when from D and green and red from C. While from direction the color of the light will be white. The other situation which might be difficult is when a ship comes from the front with an angle. When in doubt if it is a head-on situation or a crossing situation. Always assume a head-on situation, as this stated in rule 14.

4.2 Situations which limit possible strategies

Beside this first identification of the situation. More details must be taken into account to eventually form the right strategies, as these details might limit the possible strategies. Below the effect of the waterway and actors are discussed on possible strategies.

4.2.1 Type of waterway

To determine which strategies can be chosen. The type of waterway is the first to consider. As this might restrict the area where can be sailed, which influences the possible strategies. For example is it common to over-take ships in open-water on starboard side. While on restricted waterways ships will sail as far as possible to starboard already. This means the ship which is over-taking will have to pass on the port side of the other vessel, at the center of the waterway.

In the next step other static hazards are considered to check if the chosen strategy does not

lead to a collision. Or if there are specific regulation frameworks for this waterway. These are however not part of the first iteration of the decision model, as this will introduce much more complexity, without improving the result in most cases. Examples of static hazards which could be evaluated in future iterations are bridges, buoys, forbidden zones, quays, port mouth or shallow waters. As possibilities for over-taking or evasive manoeuvres are limited in those cases for example. This means the strategies are limited.

Another limiting factor related to waterways are the difference in regulations between waterways. Most obvious are traffic separation schemes, or other road marks such as signs which forbid to over-take or meet. But others are for example to not create wash or no turning. Or more directive signs on obligated directions or speed limits. This is mostly relevant for coastal and inland waterways.

4.2.2 Dynamic objects

The second major step is the identification of dynamic objects. Those are all relevant moving objects. Most obvious are off course other ships which do come close. But in future developments of the decision model, objects which are not under any control of a human should also be considered, such as floating containers. The major difference between static hazards are of course that the 'forbidden zone' around these objects changes over time. Which makes it harder to determine if you are operating safely.

To predict the path, first the general information about the object should be acquired. Such as manoeuvrability, speed, course, type of object, under control, etc. Thereby might it be possible in future developments to take into account the human factor to improve the path prediction. This could be based on the experience of the crew, availability of a pilot or if the vessel is completely unmanned.

Examples of such dynamic objects which limit the possible strategies are for example fishery vessels. As they might have long nets behind them while in operation. Ferries in inland waters which have priority over other shipping traffic. Other ships with limited manoeuvrability or forbidden zones around them. As these all could force to act on a specific strategy.

4.3 Scenarios

Using the information on type of waterway, location and actors, the scenario can be identified. Based on the scenarios, can be determined which rules to apply and what their implications are on the possible strategies. The same goes for the estimated path of dynamic objects. This might also narrow down the possible strategies.

Using the above mentioned information in the decision model, the strategies can be narrowed down. This can be used to simplify the decision tree and select the right criteria to evaluate. Different scenarios for the same situation could be that the ship turns to port or starboard. For both does a probability exist. Using a probability index for the decision of other vessels will in this case improve the eventual decision making. This can be taken into account by for example the safe motion parameters as described by Szlapczynski [Szlapczynski and Szlapczynska(2017a)].

In the next chapter the criteria are defined to evaluate the situations and scenarios. This evaluation shows if a problem might occur. These criteria are eventually used to determine the most critical common situations.

5 | Definition of criteria

The first step of the decision tree was to identify the situation and scenario. In order to determine if a problem might occur in those situations or scenarios, different criteria are evaluated. Most of these criteria are already calculated by the current systems, such as ECDIS and ARPA. However do they use linearized algorithms, which do not predict the closest points of approach and crossing distance correctly while turning for example, often resulting in many dismissed alarms. The different methods to evaluate criteria are discussed. First the current and proposed algorithms to calculate the Closest point of approach (CPA) and crossing distance. Later in the process, these criteria can be used again. To ensure that the chosen strategies ensures safe operation with low perceived risk.

5.1 Calculations based on current systems

Within ARPA and ECDIS, different calculations are already being made, which can be used to evaluate if there is a problem in the current scenario. These calculations often use linearized algorithms, which results are not correct when turning. Below these calculations are discussed for the Closest point of approach (CPA) and crossing position. How this is implemented in the simulation tool is discussed in appendix B.

5.1.1 Closest point of approach (CPA)

The CPA refers to the positions at which two dynamically moving objects reach their closest possible distance. This is an important calculation for collision avoidance. The linearized form uses two points moving at fixed speed and fixed direction. An example is shown in figure 5.2. Where P and Q are the moving points, with corresponding direction vectors u and v, which include the speed and direction.




Figure 5.1: Example for Closest point of approach (CPA)

A formula can be derived for the closest point of approach. With the motion equations for P

and Q , the distance can be calculated. Where P_0 and Q_0 are the current positions:

$$P(t) = P_0 + t \cdot u; \quad Q(t) = Q_0 + t \cdot v \quad (5.1)$$

$$d(t) = |P(t) - Q(t)| = |P_0 - Q_0 + t(u - v)| \quad (5.2)$$

Since $d(t)$ is a minimum when $D(t) = d(t)^2$ is a minimum:

$$D(t) = d(t)^2 = (u - v) \bullet (u - v)t^2 + 2(P_0 - Q_0) \bullet (u - v)t + (P_0 - Q_0) \bullet (P_0 - Q_0) \quad (5.3)$$

$$\frac{dD(t)}{dt} = 0 = 2t[(u - v) \bullet (u - v)] + 2(P_0 - Q_0) \bullet (u - v) \quad (5.4)$$

This can be solved for t to calculate the moment where CPA is the smallest:

$$t_{CPA} = \frac{-(P_0 - Q_0) \bullet (u - v)}{|u - v|^2} \quad (5.5)$$

$$d_{CPA}(t_{CPA}) = |P_0 - Q_0 + \frac{-(P_0 - Q_0) \bullet (u - v)}{|u - v|^2} \bullet (u - v)| \quad (5.6)$$

If t_{CPA} is smaller than 0, the CPA is in the past, else it is in the future.

5.1.2 Crossing distance

The crossing distance is the distance between two ships if they pass each others path. This can be both in front or behind a vessel. This distance is mostly relevant for how safe a crossing situation feels. The crew on manned ships do not want to have ships too close in front of them, as they can't do an evasive manoeuvre in those situations. The same motion equation as for CPA can be used (equation 5.1).




Figure 5.2: Example for crossing point and distance

In this case the distance is calculated between two points at a certain moment in time. The first step is to calculate the crossing point (cp) of the two lines:

$$P(t_{cp,p}) = Q(t_{cp,q}) \rightarrow P_0 + t_{cp,p} \cdot u = Q_0 + t_{cp,q} \cdot v \quad (5.7)$$

$$t_{cp,P} = \frac{(Q_0 - P_0) \times v}{u \times v} \quad (5.8)$$

$$t_{cp,Q} = \frac{(P_0 - Q_0) \times u}{v \times u} \quad (5.9)$$

$$cp = P_0 + \left[\frac{(Q_0 - P_0) \times v}{u \times v} \right] \cdot u = Q_0 + \left[\frac{(P_0 - Q_0) \times u}{v \times u} \right] \cdot v \quad (5.10)$$

The next step is to determine where each vessel is, when the other vessel is at the crossing point. To determine finally what the crossing distance is:

$$P(t_{cp,Q}) = P_0 + \left[\frac{(Q_0 - P_0) \times v}{u \times v} \right] \cdot u \quad (5.11)$$

$$Q(t_{cp,P}) = Q_0 + \left[\frac{(P_0 - Q_0) \times u}{v \times u} \right] \cdot v \quad (5.12)$$

$$d(t) = |P(t) - Q(t)| \quad (5.13)$$

The crossing distance (cd) for when P crosses Q and vice versa, can be calculated using the following formulas:

$$d_{cd,PQ}(t_{cp,P}) = |P(t_{cp,P}) - Q(t_{cp,P})| \quad (5.14)$$

$$d_{cd,QP}(t_{cp,Q}) = |P(t_{cp,Q}) - Q(t_{cp,Q})| \quad (5.15)$$

5.2 Proposed algorithm based on planned path

To improve the evaluation of criteria, better non-linearized methods are necessary for the calculation of the CPA and crossing point. By predicting the likely path of a vessel, better estimations can be made. Which first uses a first order change, based on rate of turn and course. This can be extended with a combination of expected location, using the probability that another ship is choosing a specific strategy.

Although it will result in better evaluations, is the disadvantage that much heavier computations are needed, while also introducing uncertainty with the numerical solver. Therefore a combination can be made based on the expected route to use the linearized or non-linearized methods. The calculations have to be done for every combination of your ship and another ship which is nearby.

The Bézier curve is used to describe the paths in a non-linearized manner. The definition of a Bézier curve is first given. Followed by the same criteria as in the previous section: Closest point of approach (CPA) and crossing distance. This time describing the algorithm using to calculate it in a non-linearized manner.

5.2.1 Bézier curve

The first iteration of the algorithm is semi-linearized. Where the path of own ship is represented by a Bézier curve, based on its waypoints and strategy. To describe the Bézier curve, points have to be fitted along the planned path. This is similar to the method as described by Taams [Taams(2018)]. While the other ship is still linearized, as not enough information on the strategy and waypoints is known without introducing new systems and protocols.

For the calculation does the distance function not change. This is still $d(t) = |P(t) - Q(t)|$. However is P taken as own ship and gets a new formula using the Bézier curve. This curve has a degree of n , which depends on the way-points and can be described using the following equations:

$$P(t) = \sum_{i=0}^n b_{i,n}(t) \cdot P_i \quad \text{and} \quad (5.16)$$

$$b_{i,n}(t) = \binom{n}{i} t^i (1-t)^{n-i}, i = 0, \dots, n \quad (5.17)$$

5.2.2 Closest point of approach (CPA)

The numerical algorithm used to calculate the CPA is shown below. Herein is the Bézier curve thus used for making a representation of own vessel, while other vessels are represented with the linearized function as described earlier.

1. Check if situation (course, speed, other vessels) has changed since last calculation:
 - (a) No, break
 - (b) Yes, continue
2. Use waypoints to determine expected path for own ship (Bézier curve).
3. Use path to determine location for each time-step.
4. Use course and speed other ships to determine their location for each time-step
5. Calculate distance between ships for each time-step:
 - (a) If smaller than stored CPA, update stored CPA with calculated CPA

- (b) If larger than stored CPA, do not update
- 6. Return CPA

5.2.3 Crossing distance

The algorithm to calculate the crossing distance will require much less computational power, as not all time-steps have to be calculated. Just the ones where the path cross. The following algorithm can be used. It should be noted that some calculations from the CPA calculation can be reused.

1. Check if something has changed since last calculation:
 - (a) No, break
 - (b) Yes, continue
2. Use waypoints to determine expected path for own ship (Bézier curve).
3. Determine crossing point(s) between linear path and Bézier curve.
4. Check if crossing points exist:
 - (a) No, break
 - (b) Yes, determine location for crossing point(s)
5. Calculate time when ships are at crossing point(s).
6. Calculate distance between ships at time of crossing.
7. Return crossing distances.

In the next chapter criteria will be described which depend on the manoeuvrability characteristics of a ship. Using the calculations for CPA and crossing distance, it can be determined if the chosen strategy without communication will result in safe operation.

6 | Dependence of manoeuvrability on decision criteria

The criteria as described in the previous chapter are aimed to determine if there is a problem. In the case there is a problem. Different actions can be undertaken to mitigate the risk. To determine which actions are feasible different criteria are used. As these manoeuvres are complex it is useful to develop a database with thresholds upfront. To determine these thresholds, simulations are performed for different ships and scenario's. In this chapter is described how these thresholds are calculated, using the simulation environment as described in appendix B.

6.1 Manoeuvrer descriptions

The COLREGs prescribe to have single bold movements, thus alterations of course or speed, should be clearly observable. To acquire this, do strategies often result in actions which can be categorized in different types of manoeuvres. Most common in critical situations are the evasive manoeuvrer and emergency stop. The time needed to do these manoeuvres depends on the manoeuvring characteristics. These characteristics are measured using different types of manoeuvres. Most relevant in this case are the zig-zag test and turning circle of the ship. In this section these different manoeuvres are described.

6.1.1 Sea-trial

Manoeuvring capabilities of a ship are determined during the sea-trial. Using the same manoeuvring tests and metrics as currently used by ship designers, will make the results most relevant. Different tests are performed to ensure the vessel complies with regulations and its contract on manoeuvring capability. The manoeuvres used to determine this are the zig-zag test, turning circle and emergency stop. In this section these will be described. The resulting metrics are discussed section 6.2.

Turning circle manoeuvrer

The first test is to determine the turning circle of the vessel. The rudder is given a maximum angle of 35 degrees. The ship will start turning. After some time the ship will turn at a steady speed and course change. The results of this test are an advance distance, which is the distance from starting to give rudder, till the ship has turned 90 degrees. The tactical diameter, which is the distance between the starting point and maximum distance the ship

traveled to the side. And finally the steady turning diameter, which is the diameter of the turning circle when speed and course change are constant. An example path for a 140m cargoship is shown in figure 6.1, together with the given rudder and resulting acceleration and drift during the first part of the test.

Zig-zag test

The second test is the zig-zag test. Herein is the overshoot tested when changing course. This is done by putting the rudder at an angle of 10 or 20 degrees to port side, till the course change is also 10 or 20 degrees, than the rudder is changed to starboard side. This is repeated several times to get a good measurement of the overshoot. The overshoot is determined by measuring the course changes. In figure 6.2 the zig-zag test is shown. In figure 6.2b the rudder, course and heading changes are shown during a zig-zag test. The measured overshoot is a key metric for the manoeuvrability of a vessel, as it shows how easy it is to rotate the vessel. The larger the overshoot, the better the yaw checking ability, but this will result in a lower path changing-ability. Using this metric can be validated how well the manoeuvring model works, compared to existing sea-trials with the same ship using for example the trial database of Damen.

Emergency stop

6.1.2 Evasive manoeuvrer

Not yet implemented

The evasive manoeuvrer aims to increase the Closest point of approach (CPA). Based on COLREGs is there a stand-on and give-way vessel. The stand-on vessel is supposed to keep course and speed the same, while the give-way vessel is supposed to manoeuvrer. There are many ways an evasive manoeuvrer can be done. However, the most critical situation is when maximum rudder is given and the crossing situation is perpendicular. Thereby is the aim of the give-away vessel to end the manoeuvrer with the same course as it started with. In figure 6.3 an example of such manoeuvrer is shown for the give-way vessel. Figure 6.3b shows how the rudder is used during the evasive manoeuvrer. Also can be seen that the speed reduces, mostly due to the drift angle. The manoeuvrer is simulated for different speeds and with different maximum course changes.




Figure 6.1: Turning circle test




Figure 6.2: Zig-zag test

6.2 Trial results

During the tests as described in the previous section, different results can be acquired. Using the simulation tool as described in appendix B different metrics can be calculated. These results depend on the following input variables: Ship manoeuvrability, starting speed, speed other vessel, crossing angle. These can be related to the criteria which determine if a vessel can safely act in a specific situation. The metrics acquired from the manoeuvring tests are:

- Sea-trials
 - Advance distance
 - Tactical diameter
 - Steady diameter
 - Steady drift angle
 - Overshoot angle
- Evasive manoeuvrer
 - Closest point of approach (CPA) or passing distance
 - Time needed for manoeuvrer
 - Distance before problem occurs

Describe why this evasive manoeuvrer (90 deg) is most common critical

Results of trials showing the dependency of passing distance on distance till CPA and current speed are shown in figure 6.4 on page 37.

As can be seen does there exist an asymptote at a distance for every ship and speed. This distance is equal to the distance needed to turn 90 degrees. As in this case the ship can sail parallel to the course of the other vessel. Therefor no simulations are done for these distances. Only the minimal distance till a possible problem is needed, which results in a passing distance.

Also other the course change, time to execute and advance distance are plotted. But less conclusions can be drawn from this. Examples are shown in figure 6.5 on page 38. From this plots can be concluded that the distance before the accident and current speed influences the maximum passing distance. Where should be considered that the line also shows where the previously mentioned asymptote is.

6.3 Dependency analysis

Result of varying input: Ship manoeuvrability, starting speed, speed other vessel, crossing angle. –*i* Common critical situation

Variables relevant for simulation model

- Time used to limit overshoot (changetime)
- dt

- hydro input values




Figure 6.3: Evasive manoeuvrer




Figure 6.4: Dependency of passing distance on distance till CPA and current speed




Figure 6.5: Other plots

7 | Analysis of scenarios

Example scenarios will be discussed in this chapter. This is done to determine the relevance of criteria in different situations and scenarios. The same steps as described in the previous chapters will be taken to determine the right strategy. Situation sketches are used to support the descriptions. The results will be a list of tags for the specific scenarios, which can be used to identify a situation. These tags can than be linked to the different criteria.

Evaluate scenarios using decision process as described in previous chapter
niet zeker dat dit nuttig is

7.1 Entering Maasgeul towards North Sea, Rotterdam

The first scenario which will be analyzed, is from the viewpoint of a crude oil tanker, which will leave the port of Rotterdam. To enter the traffic lane towards the Maasgeul, it has to cross the path of another vessel coming from port-side. While taking another ship from starboard into account, which is already heading towards the Maasgeul.

The decisions which have to be taken are to change course and/or speed. This must be done multiple times. Different snapshots are taken throughout, including information on criteria which the crew uses to make their decisions. This example case is made up, but is based on real situations as described by pilots and AIS-recordings. First a description of the situation is given, which is the starting point of this example. The aim of this description is to enable the reader to understand the situation. Next relevant rules are discussed which should be taken into account when deciding on the strategy. Followed by the different snapshots, which will give insight in the decision making process and relevant criteria. This is concluded with a calculations for the relevant criteria.

7.1.1 Situation description

The location of the situation is the junction between the Beerkanaal, Maasgeul, Nieuwe Waterweg and Callandkanaal. A map with more details is shown in figure 7.1. Quays restrict the possible paths ships can sail to avoid each other, there is however no traffic separation scheme. In this example case there will be three vessels involved.

GULF VALOUR 249 meter crude oil tanker. Coming from the Yangtsekanaal, heading to the Maasgeul, via the Beerkanaal. Just rounding the pier of 8e Petroleumhaven with 7.8 knots.

ASTRORUNNER 142 meter container ship. Coming from the Maasgeul with 13.4 knots heading towards the Calandkanaal.

ANGLIA SEAWAYS 142 meter ro-ro cargo carrier. Leaving Rotterdam via Nieuwe Waterweg towards the North-Sea with 10.3 knots.

All ships have licensed pilots on board, thereby do traffic controllers monitor the traffic and might give directions.

In order to classify a situation, tags are used. Example tags for this situation are: *junction*, *harbour*, *restricted waterways*, *multiple vessels*, *traffic controller*




Figure 7.1: Situation sketch 12:00, with area which can be observed by Gulf Valour

7.1.2 Relevant COLREGs

The rules relevant for the situation are discussed, these should be taken into account during the decision making process, ordered in a chronological manner, on the moment it becomes relevant.

Rule 7a: Every vessel shall use all available means appropriate to the prevailing circumstances and conditions to determine if risk of collision exists. If there is any doubt such risk shall be deemed to exist.

This is particularly relevant in this case, as both ships can't be observed by the Gulf Valour by sight or radar at the start, due to port terminals and landmasses.

Rule 19d: A vessel which detects by radar alone the presence of another vessel shall determine if a close-quarters situation is developing and/or risk of collision exists. If so, she shall take avoiding action in ample time, provided that when such action consists of an alteration of course, so far as possible the following shall be avoided:

- (i). *an alteration of course to port for a vessel forward of the beam, other than for a vessel being overtaken;*
- (ii). *an alteration of course towards a vessel abeam or abaft the beam.*

Determining the 'ample time' for different scenarios is the purpose of this research.

Rule 9a: A vessel proceeding along the course of a narrow channel or fairway shall keep as near to the outer limit of the channel or fairway which lies on her starboard side as is safe and practicable.

This might limit the options to avoid a collision, or an exception should be made and communicated.

Rule 15: When two power-driven vessels are crossing so as to involve risk of collision, the vessel which has the other on her own starboard side shall keep out of the way and shall, if the circumstances of the case admit, avoid crossing ahead of the other vessel.

It should be determined if the Gulf Valour indeed crosses the Astrorunner in a way, such that this rule applies. It might also be that the Beerkanaal is ranked lower and therefore not really a crossing.

Rule 13c: When a vessel is in any doubt as to whether she is overtaking another, she shall assume that this is the case and act accordingly.

This is mostly relevant when the Gulf Valour comes close to the Anglia Seaways.

7.1.3 Snapshots

To get insight into the decision making process, the first step is to know the situational awareness at different moments in the process. Snapshots are taken from these moments. Giving a summary of the information based on observations and communication. This is used to validate or form strategies and eventually take decisions. Thereby is discussed which criteria are most important and example tags are used to identify the situations.

12:00 Start

The traffic controller has radar images of the whole harbour. He uses them to inform all ships about the position and intention of other ships. In this case the Gulf Valour is told there are two other ships. One at the Nieuwe Waterweg heading for the Maasgeul and one at the Maasgeul heading for the Calandkanaal.

Communication,
Observations,
Strategy
based on
current
information,
Key
criteria

The crew at the Gulf Valour sees both vessels on the ECDIS. However is not sure where the ships are exactly, as was mentioned in section A.3, is the ECDIS not reliable enough. Due to the height of the bridge, it is possible to look over the land a bit, to make an estimation of the position of the other vessels. The ARPA has however too much noise to make the desired calculations.

Currently there is not enough information available to decide which strategy works best. There are no hazards nearby, thus the planned path will be followed. Where the Gulf Valour will make the turn into the Beerkanaal, which will reduce the speed.

Tags: missing information, restricted waterways, multiple vessels, turning

12:03 Ships are visible by sight

To avoid an overload of the communication channels, the communication between ships is kept to a minimum. The most important communication comes from the traffic controller. As the situation did not change significantly, no updates are given.

Both vessels are now also visible on the ARPA and by sight. A closest point of approach is calculated, however this is based on the current heading and speed. As the Gulf Valour is still turning, this information is not of any use. Based on the speed of both vessels, it is possible though to make an estimation where the closest point of approach will occur.

Based on this estimation, a strategy can be chosen. The first choice which should be made is if a tight or wider turn is made through the Beerkanaal. As COLREGs prescribe to keep starboard, and thus a wider turn. Might it be more convenient to end in the middle or even at port side, by making the turn more tight. As there is no traffic coming into the Beerkanaal. But will make it more easy for the Gulf Valour to pass behind the Astrorunner, considering the Gulf Valour will slow down due to the tighter turn. To determine the right strategy, several key criteria are relevant. The first to consider is the moment both ships enter the crossing, relative to each other. The Gulf Valour can influence this by reducing the speed. This will also influence the path taken during the long turn trough the Beerkanaal. If it is better to make a tight turn on port side, or make it wider to end at starboard side of the Beerkanaal. In this case both enter at a similar time, therefor is chosen to have contact with traffic control. They decide to reduce speed a little bit more, by reducing engine speed and making a tight corner.

Tags: restricted waterways, junction, crossing, turning

12:06 Crossing with Astrorunner

At this point the strategy determined at the previous snapshot is executed. Thus the Gulf Valour passes the Astrorunner first starboard-starboard, and crossing the path at stern side. This means they deviated from the standard COLREGs, but with consent of the traffic controllers.

As the Gulf Valour passes at the stern side, it is easy to have a low rate of turn while crossing. This means a good estimation on relative speed to the Anglia Seaways can already be made by sight and via the ARPA.

Thereby should be considered which speed the Gulf Valour has to travel according to the schedule, which is higher than the current speed of the Anglia Seaways. This means the Gulf Valour has to act like it is overtaking the Anglia Seaways, while also entering the Maasgeul shipping lane. They have to move to starboard side of this shipping lane, to avoid head-on-head collisions with oncoming future traffic, which is not part of this example. Thus the final strategy is to go to the planned speed of 16.2 knots. While sailing in the centre of the shipping lane, leaving enough room to have the Anglia Seaways between the Gulf Valour and the Pier.

[add screenshot of simulation](#)

Tags: restricted waterways, junction, traffic-lane, crossing, over-taking, turning

12:11 Under control

After crossing behind the Astrorunner the path is continued to the middle of the Maasgeul. To ensure a safe overtaking manoeuvre around the Anglia Seaways. While overtaking the situation is under control and the Gulf Valour is underway to its next destination, without having the risk for close encounters. A few miles further out the pilot will leave and contact with traffic control is not necessary anymore.

Tags: shipping-lane, over-taking

7.1.4 Criteria check

At every step, several criteria determine the strategy. At the different snapshot moments these criteria are calculated, in order to validate them. The results are shown in table .

[make table](#)

7.2 Relevant lessons

[summarize relevant lessons, and what NOT should be forgotten](#)

8 | Lessons learned

Summarize results of verification and validation and if it can be used in the next step. Thereby also explaining which strategies could be communicated to pilots, seafarers and traffic controllers. To make shipping safer. But on the other hand also show where it lacks support.

8.1 Method to define design criteria

8.2 Examples of resulting design matrix

Proefvaarten met schepen om draaicirkel en zigzag te bepalen.

Van schepen is bekend hoeveel tijd en afstand kan worden gewonnen met welke manouvre.

Dit combineren kan worden gebruikt tijdens scheepsontwerp.

8.3 Factors not taken into account

Germans for example do sometimes alter the off-set of AIS to avoid confusing with radar image. As captains should use radar instead of AIS information to navigate. AIS is not reliable enough, but with small errors captains still do it, so giving it a large off-set will force captains to use radar.

other factors equipment, flagstate, origin of crew, etc.

8.4 Result

The model developed in this part will start with a sensory information on a situation, it will classify this situation and make a decision based on the evaluation of criteria. The result is an advise to execute a specific strategy, or if the model can't evaluate criteria sufficiently a subset of possible strategies and the remark it needs more information to narrow it down further.

Part III

**Necessity of a protocol to enable
teamwork between manned and
unmanned ships**

In the previous part a decision model is described which tries to avoid communication between vessels by taking the right decision at the right moment to ensure safe operation. However this is not always possible. This is often the case due to missing information, or a lack of understanding about the intentions of other vessels. With manned ships, verbal communication via VHF is used to acquire the missing information or discuss strategies with other ships. This is likely also necessary when unmanned vessel operate between manned vessel. In this part the development process of such a protocol is discussed and the relevance will be proved using an experiment.

A protocol defines the format and the order of messages exchanged between two or more communicating entities, as well as the actions taken on the transmission and/or receipt of a message. Where it is most straight forward to use verbal communication, will it not be limited to this, as it might result in better situational awareness for both the manned and unmanned to use other means, such as visible signals or text messaging.

The communication which currently happens between vessels is most common when COLREGs do not result in clear strategies, or when intentions are not clear. Other communication which will not be within the scope of this research, such as the communication with traffic controllers and how conversations are interpreted by other vessels. Thus this research is a starting point to develop a full protocol needed for the acceptance of unmanned vessels.

Using the situated Cognitive Engineering (sCE) method, this protocol can be developed using an iterative process, where a requirement baseline is continuously refined by reviews and prototype evaluations. How to apply sCE is described by Neerincx and Linderberg [Neerincx and Linderberg(2012)].

The first step is to create a foundation. The current situation of the problem is discussed, which have to be solved. Thereby considering existing knowledge which might be relevant to solve the problem and finally in short the envisioned technology. The next step is to define the system design specification. In which scenarios are described which show how the problem is solved. From this can be extracted what should be designed and why this is done. Using this a design is made which is being evaluated to make improvements in next iterative steps.

9 | Foundation

The foundation segment in the sCE methodology describes the design rationale in terms of operational demands, relevant human factors knowledge, and envisioned technologies. Together, these three constituents describe the problem to be solved, the existing knowledge on ways to solve the problem, and the technology needed to implement that solution.

9.1 Operational demands

The operational demands describe the current practice as it is, i.e. without the envisioned technology. For the operational demands, the sCE method prescribes as main components the stakeholders and their characteristics, and the problem description and analysis thereof.

9.1.1 Problem scenario

Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (COLREGs) have been developed long before bridge-to-bridge voice communications became available. They are supposed to be unambiguous. It is the responsibility of all bridge watch keepers to know how to apply them instinctively, on the basis of observation primarily by sight and radar. They work effectively when ships in an interaction obey them; they also specifically address circumstances where one ship does not.

However, as shown in the previous parts, are COLREGs not always sufficient to decide on the right strategy. For example due to missing information. This happens already more often due to larger ship, more complex manoeuvres and more traffic. In those cases the VHF radio can be used for verbal bridge-to-bridge communication. Leading here are the Standard Maritime Communication Phrases (SMCP). The primary task of this protocol is to diminish misunderstanding in safety related verbal communications. Beside this verbal communication, non-verbal communication might be used, such as light signals, sound signals and text messaging.

Reasons for safety related verbal communication are: when you will deviate from the rules, deviant behavior is registered, or more information is needed to decide on the right strategy. This is often necessary due to lack of visual information. For example due to bad weather, obstacles like bridges and terminals, or the information received via AIS is not reliable. This does not only impact the information you get by looking out of the window, but also the quality of the ECDIS and ARPA is worse.

When using SMCP, marker words are used to introduce the content and purpose of the

communication. In appendix A.1.4 the SMCP are described in more detail. Examples for all marker words are given below.

Advice Stand by on channel 6 - 8.

Information The fairway entrance is: position: bearing 1-3-7 degrees true from North Point Lighthouse, distance: 2 decimal 3 miles.

Warning Buoy number: one - five unlit.

Intention I intend to reduce speed, new speed: eight knots.

Question What are your intentions?

Instruction You must alter course to starboard.

Request Immediate tug assistance.

After this message there is a confirmation that the message is received, followed by a repetition of the send message, or an answer to the question. Indicated with the corresponding marker word.

The different ways for communication are not developed to be used by unmanned vessels. On the other hand, is it not feasible to require all manned vessel to install new systems for communication, before introducing unmanned vessels. As this will require many more new regulations, development time and time to train seafarers.

When using the current systems in a way they are not designed for. This might result in misunderstanding and problems with communication. Due to for example information overload of the crew and communication channels. This can be caused by the way the VHF is designed. As it is a receiver or a transmitter, but can't be both at the same time, which means that in case two messages are send at the same time, both senders will not receive the others message.

9.1.2 Problem analysis

To avoid misunderstanding which could result in hazardous situations. It is important that manned and unmanned vessels are able to communicate. To solve this problem, a more extensive analysis is made. Describing the values of the different actors and discussing their related problems.

Primary actors

The focus of this research will be on bridge-to-bridge communication. This means the most important actors for unmanned and manned vessel are:

- Manned vessel
 - *Officer of watch.* He is the responsible person. He might work together with a helmsman and a lookout. He has to ensure a proper functioning of all available systems. Thereby does he discuss with other crew members if there are any unusual activities. He is responsible to follow a proper navigation plan, while having his own safe passage plan, to avoid collisions. He will use sight, ARPA and ECDIS. Thereby is he aware of the ship's speed, turning circle and other handling characteristics to decide on the right strategy. He will monitor the VHF radio all the time while underway to assist in emergencies if necessary, to hear Coast Guard alerts for weather and hazards or restrictions to navigation, and to hear another vessel hailing you.

He wants to avoid information overload, while being aware of the situation. This is only possible when he stays concentrated, to acquire this, the tasks must be challenging and he needs to have a form of autonomy.

- *Helmsman and lookout.* Both monitor the situation and execute commands from the officer of watch. A risk for them is information overload or underload [Neerincx(2008)].
- Unmanned vessel
 - *Controller agent.* This agent is responsible for situational awareness. Thus getting safely from A to B. It will decide on the navigational strategy, it will do this based on the information it can acquire via all different means. Including newly developed communication protocols, computer vision and algorithms to transform sensory data to useful information. His duties are similar to the duties of the officer of watch as described for the manned vessel.
- Other vessels
 - *Crew and pilots on nearby vessels.* They might want to know the intentions of other vessels to base their strategy on. However do not want to receive all discussions. As this will result in an information overload.

Secondary actors

Beside the first group of actors, others could also be influenced by the new protocol. Although they are not within the scope of this first design cycle, they should be considered to avoid problems such as information overload on current communication channels or confusion.

- Only recipients
 - Crew on vessels which are not traveling.
 - Shipowners of unmanned vessels, monitoring vessel from remote location.
- Not within scope of the research
 - Vessel traffic controllers
 - Crew which are in distress and require assistance

Goals

The main goal is to ensure reliable sharing of information, without the risk for information overload or misunderstanding. Such that manned ships will trust unmanned ships to choose the right strategy. As manned ships can be informed, using natural language describing the reasoning of unmanned vessels.

This means that manned vessels should be updated only when requested or in case of an unusual activity which could affect their strategy. And manned vessel should be aware when unmanned vessels desire more information to decide on the right strategy.

Using the same philosophy, it might be possible to develop a protocol for communication with traffic controllers in later iterations. This becomes more important when the time needed to develop a new systems for traffic controllers also takes too much time to develop and/or implement.

Infeasible solutions

The easiest solution for unmanned ships would be to just install a new system. This is however not feasible as mentioned before. To implement this, it would mean that all ships which could encounter an unmanned ship will have to install this too. It might be possible to make it obligatory via regulations, this will however cost a lot of time and money. Making the introduction of unmanned ships less likely. This is also the reason to use a Non-visual User Interface (no-UI), as a GUI will require new screens or changes to the ECDIS which are only possible when regulations are changed.

9.2 Human factors

When designing technology, there are two driving questions that need to be well-thought out: (1) What tasks and/or values is the user trying to accomplish and how can the technology support the user in doing so?, and (2) How can the technology be designed such that the user is able to work with the technology?

The Human Factors segment of the sCE method describes the available relevant knowledge about, for instance, human cognition, performance, task support, learning, human-machine interaction, ergonomics, etc. Note that we emphasize that this knowledge should be relevant for the problem and its design solution: the knowledge described here should lead to a better understanding of either (1) or (2). The three elements important to the human factors analysis are: The human factors knowledge, measures, and interaction design patterns.

Human factor knowledge

Human factors knowledge describes available knowledge coming from previous research about how to solve the problems that have been identified in the problem analysis. The key problems relevant for human factors are the information overload, situational awareness, autonomy, and learning a new protocol. Thus the following questions should be answered:

Is dit vol-doende?

- When does information overload occur?
 - In case of divided attention there is a high risk for information overload and distraction by low priority messages. Therefor the developed system should be context aware so it can limit this risk by adapting the message to the situation [Arimura et al.(2001)].
 - Overload might appear due to a competition for the operator's attention that is going on between different information items. If many tasks are handled by automated systems, the operator can deal with high workload circumstances, but will suffer from severe underload during quiet periods, probably losing his or her situational awareness [Neerincx(2008)].
 - The information acquired at one particular moment does not necessarily serve for high-level situation awareness, for the user needs to recall the previous related information to understand the situation thoroughly. But constantly providing information might not be the solution because there will be a huge risk of information overloading. Admittedly it is plausible to deliver needed information for the coming task by task detection, the user might still fail to keep pace to the rapid changing system and fulfill multi-threaded tasks[Porathe et al.(2014)].

- Which information is needed for situational awareness?
 - Situational awareness can be enhanced by feedback, perceived information from the environment, information from other agents, as well as remote sensors. [Carver and Turoff(2007)]
 - Understanding the current picture is not enough for full situational awareness. Expert decision makers must be able to project their understanding into the future. This enables them to make the decision they must take now to create the best options in the future. Projection requires to have good mental models of the dynamic relationships between the relevant parts of the environment over time. Experts focus a lot on creating their own futures via present decisions. In turn, these decisions are formed out of their comprehension of the likely interactions of all the elements they deem both relevant and important [Gregory and Shanahan(2010)].
 - A large part of sensors, automation, and operators, are used to build a common operational picture. Providing different agents with the information required to make sense of the situation [Neerincx(2008)].
- How is information perceived when acquiring it passively or actively?
 - Attention profoundly modulates the activity of sensory systems and this can take place at many levels of processing. Imaging studies, in particular, have revealed the greater activation of auditory areas and areas outside of sensory processing areas when attending to a stimulus [Palmer et al.(2007)].
 - Good teamwork involves anticipating the needs of teammates and that means pushing information before it is requested. Therefore, if things are going well, there should be little need for pulling information. In this study's task, participants were instructed to push information to others, and over time master the specific timing of information sharing to the intended recipient. Findings indicate that pushing information was positively associated with TSA and team performance, and human-autonomy teams had lower levels of both pushing and pulling information than all-human teams [Demir et al.(2017)].
- What is needed for successful teamwork between human and a computer?
 - People need to understand what is happening and why when a teammate tends to respond in a certain way; they need to be able to control the actions of an agent even when it does not always wait for the human's input before it makes a move; and they need to be able to reliably predict what will happen, even though the agent may alter its responses over time [Bradshaw et al.(2003)].
 - Effective team communication, a fundamental part of team coordination, is crucial

for both effective team situation awareness and team performance [Demir et al.(2017)].

- Do people trust automated systems?
 - When using automation, the role of the human changes from operator to supervisor. For effective operation, the human must appropriately calibrate trust in the automated system. Improper trust leads to misuse and disuse of the system. [Walliser(2011)].

Human factor measures

Measures describe how to operationalize the quality of the intended behavior or performance, i.e. how well is a user working with the design able to reach his/her objectives and what is the quality of the collaboration between the human worker and the technology?

- Is the system used correctly?
- Does the protocol act as expected?
- Will it solve the problem of missing information?
- Do people perceive it as easy to use and useful?
- What is the impact on attitude towards unmanned ships?

Interaction design patterns

Interaction design patterns (IDPs) focus on the human-computer interaction, such as usable interface design and control options. IDPs offer generic solutions to recurring HCI design problems that have been proven to be effective. IDPs are often made available in repositories.

-
- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Radio communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Usage of message markers – Conversational agent
 ● Visible signals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Light signals – Mast head signals – Flags | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Audible signals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Horn – Speakers
 ● Distress, urgency and safety signals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Flares – Smoke |
|---|--|

create visual, instead of list

9.3 Envisioned technology

The envisioned technology describes the available options of using existing technology and/or the need to develop novel technology in order to come to a system solution. The sCE method asks designers to specify what devices (hardware) and software could be used in the system design. In addition, for each type of technology, an argument should be provided as to why this technology might be of use and what the possible downsides might be of that particular type of technology.

The envisioned technology will use only existing systems to develop a Non-visual User Interface (no-UI). Different systems which are currently used, are described in appendix A. Below different systems and protocols are mentioned which can be used in the new protocol. Using these already existing systems will shorten the development, learning and implementation time.

- Radio communication
 - Conversational agent
 - Negotiating agent
 - Usage of message markers
 - Availability on VHF
 - Natural language variations on SMCP
 - NATO phonetic alphabet and numbing
 - Addressed AIS message to exchange information or interrogate
- Visible signals
 - Light signals
 - Mast head signals
 - Flags
 - Heading, position and movements
- Audible signals
 - Horn
 - Speakers

Using already existing protocols makes it more easy to learn, such as Standard Maritime Communication Phrases (SMCP) and COLREGs. This also makes it recognizable, which

means that users will understand the benefits quicker. Show that it is easy to use and useful are key for the acceptance of technology [Davis(1989)].

The type and amount of information presented to users must be tailored to the unique situation in which the information is to be used. Prior research on trust in automation found that providing human operators with information related to the reliability of an automated tool promoted more optimal reliance strategies on the tool. Further, information related to the limitations of an automated tool aids in trust recovery following errors of the automation. This added information appears to be useful in deciphering the boundary conditions under which the tools are more or less capable. Thus, providing human operators with information related to the performance of an automated tool, appears to be beneficial [Lyons and Havig(2014)]. Therefor it is beneficial for the cooperation between manned and unmanned vessels to clearly show if it is an unmanned vessel. This will firstly be done using visible signals, and also at the start of radio communication. This also happens in industry projects such as Google Duplex [Nieva(2018)].

In the next chapter the system design specification will be given for the envisioned technology. Most important will be the definition of the usage of radio communication and how this should be supported with other forms of communication, such as visible and audible signals.

10 | System design specification

The system design specification describes the solution to the problem in the form of a system design that makes use of the identified relevant human factors knowledge, and the envisioned technology. The system specification consists of design scenarios, use cases, requirements, claims, and ontology.

10.1 Design scenarios

The sCE method prescribes the specification of design scenarios. Design scenarios are short stories that provide a clear description of how the user will work with the technology thereby enjoying the solution offered to one of the problem scenarios. Together, the problem and design scenarios provide a contextualized view on:

1. The problem the design aims to solve.
2. The people that are currently affected by this problem.
3. The way in which the current system design aims to solve this problem.
4. How people will use the system.

Manned ships are able to understand intentions of unmanned ships, resulting in good situational awareness. In cases they desire more information, they are able to acquire this using current systems. Without the risk for an information overload. Thereby are the additions to existing protocols for those systems easy to understand, as they use the same philosophy as current protocols.

Trust in autonomous ships is formed, as the information is reliable, the interaction is similar to the interaction with other manned ships. This resulted in acceptance of unmanned ships on the general waterways. Where the risk for collisions and perceived risk reduces, or at least does not increase.

Information extraction from problem scenario

In the previous chapter the problem is described which has to be solved with the envisioned technology. To solve the problem, the following issues have to be tackled:

1. Different actors are afraid of information overload.
2. Officer of watch is afraid to lose situational awareness.
3. Officer of watch is afraid to lose autonomy.

4. Current systems are not designed to be used by unmanned vessels.
5. Manned ships want to ask for support or information.
6. Unmanned ships want to ask for support or information.

Envisioned effect of system implementation

How the above mentioned problems are tackled are shortly discussed below. This shows what the result is after implementing the envisioned technology:

1. The system will send only on demand or when it has tried any other solution. This will reduce the probability for information overload. As a threshold to check if the system is successful in solving the problem of information overload, the current amount of communication can be used.
2. The protocols which are currently used by the officer of watch are the same. The purpose is to make it more easy to get information. This means that the situational awareness will minimally be affected by the system on board of the manned vessel. Also here the current level of situational awareness can be used as a threshold.
3. By introducing an negotiating agent, decisions can be made in a similar manner to current ships. Using the decision tree it will have a favorite strategy, but it might be possible to use others if this is better for the encountered manned ship. This will ensure that the officer of watch at the manned ship, still has a feeling of autonomy, similar to that of the current situation.
4. Although the current systems are not designed to be used by unmanned vessels. Are there major developments on conversational agents in the last few years. This means that voice communication is starting to become more easy to develop. Certainly when considering that a lot of radio conversations are recorded. Thus it will be more easy to train the agent. Thereby must still be considered the importance of transparent communication. Thus also being open about being a robot.
5. Using addressed AIS messages and a conversational agent at unmanned vessels. Manned ships will be able to ask for support or information at all time. It is even likely they will receive the information faster compared to manned-manned ship communication.
6. The conversational agent is most relevant for unmanned ships when they want to ask for support or information. As addressed messages are not often used at the moment. They will use the SMCP in a similar way to how it is currently used. So not much will change compared to the current situation for manned ships.

10.2 Use case

Scenarios are used to create more specific descriptions of step-by-step interactions between the technology and its users (i.e. use cases). Use cases include actors, to specify which stakeholders/agents are interacting with each other in a given action sequence. Use cases make the design scenario more concrete by describing exactly how the technology makes sure that the problem is solved. Use cases are informed by human factors theories as described in the previous chapter.

The purpose of the use cases, as described in this section are: To give insight in all interactions during a common critical situation at sea. Tags are used to relate them to the situations and scenarios as described in chapter 3. By making it very specific, better insight is acquired in factors which should be taken into account when defining functional requirements.

Autonomous fast crew supplier crossing shipping lane in front of cargo ship

Tags: Crossing, Move away from other, Evasive manoeuvrer now, Crossing distance, CPA, Intention, Messaging

A 26 meter autonomous fast crew supplier (FCS2610) is heading towards a wind farm at the north sea with a speed of 22 knots. To get there, she has to cross a busy traffic lane. In which she will pass a 150 meter container ship (Reefer), sailing at 14 knots. The FCS2610 noticed the Reefer late and has to make an evasive manoeuvrer to pass in front of the Reefer with a distance of 900 meter or 0.5 Nautical mile. Which is just accepted according to the safety domains [Szlapczynski and Szlapczynska(2017b)], using criteria from chapter 5. To ensure the Reefer understands the intentions of the FCS2610, communication is necessary. This will take place in the following manner:

- The AIS, masthead and flags are showing the vessel is sailing autonomously. This means there is no crew, but the autonomous systems listens to the VHF.
- A conversation is started by the FCS2610, calling the station on board of the Reefer and updating status in AIS to communicate intention.

Reefer, C-6-Z-G-7

Reefer, C-6-Z-G-7

This is unmanned FCS2610, 2-F-F-P-4

Unmanned FCS2610, 2-F-F-P-4

Switch to VHF channel seven-two

over.

- The FCS2610 waits for a response from

Unmanned FCS2610, 2-F-F-P-4

This is Reefer

Agree VHF channel seven-two

over.

- At VHF channel 72, FCS2610 communicates her intentions.

Reefer, C-6-Z-G-7

This is unmanned FCS2610, 2-F-F-P-4

Intention. I intend to pass in front with a distance of 0.5 Nautical mile.

over.

- At VHF channel 72, Reefer confirms intention.

Unmanned FCS2610, 2-F-F-P-4

This is Reefer, C-6-Z-G-7

Intention received. You intend to pass in front. Distance is 0.5 Nautical mile.

over.

- Close communication and pass in front.

Reefer, C-6-Z-G-7

This is unmanned FCS2610, 2-F-F-P-4

Nothing more. Have a good watch.

Over.

Unmanned FCS2610

This is Reefer

Thank you.

Over and out.

- Update AIS status of FCS2610 to show it has no questions, and is listening.

Fishery vessel gets close to traffic lane with unmanned VLCC

Tags: Question

describe
use case

10.3 Functional requirements and claims

In the sCE method, use cases are used to derive functional requirements and claims, i.e. specific functionalities the technology should provide to its user followed by the system's

objectives, and the hypotheses to be tested during system evaluations. This is accomplished by annotating all functional requirements with their underlying objectives (called claims).

This explicit linking of requirements to claims enables designers to formulate hypotheses that need to be tested in system evaluations to justify the adoption of the functional requirement. If the claim cannot be proven to be valid through system evaluations, the designers need to refine their system design, for instance, by trying to improve the functionality, replacing the functionality with a different one, or dropping the functionality and the claim altogether (i.e. by deciding that the objective is not reachable at this point). Either way, there is no use of including a functionality that does not achieve its underlying claims. User stories are used to do this, these are usually in a form: "As an *<actor>*, I want to *<what?>*, so that *<why?>*". Followed by an acceptance criteria, to determine when this part is correctly implemented.

Actors

The primary actors who will be taken into account in this first iteration are:

- Officer of watch
- Unmanned vessel
- Nearby vessel

User stories

- As an officer of watch, I want to know if there are unmanned ships in the area, so that I know if I have to adapt my way of communication. AIS shows if ship is manned, and what its status is.
- As an officer of watch, I want to validate if information received via AIS is correct, so that I can base my decision on correct information. When officer of watch asks unmanned ship via VHF, the answer should be reliable and based on current information.
- As an officer of watch, I want to make my intentions clear towards all other ships, so that they can anticipate to this. Shared intentions should be incorporated into the decision making process of unmanned ships.
- As an officer of watch, I want to be able to make small mistakes when following a protocol, so that I can still act fast when I do not know the exact SMCP sentence. The unmanned vessel should understand the message, even if it's not exactly the SMCP sentence.

- As an officer of watch, I want to use existing protocols, so that the extra effort to communicate with unmanned vessels will be kept to a minimum. Current seafarers should be able to understand what they should be doing without an explanation on the protocol.
- As an unmanned vessel, I want to initiate communication, so that I can exchange information or ask questions to another specific ship. The unmanned ship needs situational awareness based on a digital model of the reality to know which ship sails where and what the interactions could be in order to make the right decision.
- As an unmanned vessel, I want to validate if acquired information is correct, so that I can base my decision on correct information. Check via communication if digital model is correct.
- As an unmanned vessel, I want to be able to check if they understand my intentions when other ships do not act as expected, so that I know if I should change my strategy. The communication should be incorporated in the decision making process and unexpected actions by others ships should be registered.
- As a nearby vessel, I want to receive only information which is relevant to me, so that the risk for information overload is limited. By switching VHF channels for full conversations this is similar to the current way of working.

add more user stories?

10.4 Ontology

Lastly, the sCE method prescribes the construction of an ontology, i.e. a vocabulary describing a common language to be used throughout the system specification to avoid miscommunication, misunderstanding, and inconsistencies. Furthermore, the ontology can serve as the basis for the technology's data structure. By specifying important concepts in the ontology and also choosing to use only one word instead of various ambiguous synonyms, communication becomes clearer and misunderstandings can be reduced to a minimum. The terms specified in the ontology are consistently used throughout the entire project. For this project they are categorized in status, messages and situations.

10.4.1 Status

By defining different states for the system, does the system know which functions and protocols should be executed. The different states are described below:

Listening Listening to the radio without taking action.

Waiting Waiting for a response by other ship.

Negotiating Deciding on the right strategy by discussing this with other ship(s).

Messaging Sending a message. While sending it is not possible to receive a message.

Updating Adjusting the information stored within the system, which will consecutively be send to others ships via AIS.

Unavailable There is a problem with the system, which makes it unable to communicate.

These states will also be communicated via AIS, to ensure transparency between different agents and avoid confusion.

10.4.2 Types of messages

Both in the messaging and negotiation states, will there be messages send. These messages form the conversation. In the different phases of the conversation, different messages will be send. These are described below:

Call Start of conversation, in which a ship only requests contact with another ship.

Acknowledge Accept invitation for conversation.

Message Starts with "marker word" to clarify communication purpose, followed by the actual message and ended by a request for confirmation. In the SMCP the following marker words are used:

- *Advice*
- *Information*
- *Warning*
- *Intention*
- *Question*
- *Instruction*
- *Request*

Response Response to the previous message in conversation.

Close End conversation with greeting.

As mentioned before the Standard Maritime Communication Phrases (SMCP) will be used, as this is a known protocol for seafarers. This protocol has its own ontology. This is described by IMO in the regulations.

10.4.3 Situation

To make the link with the decision model and problem identification as described in part II. Will the protocol use the same identifiers for situations.

Passing Ships do get close, but the paths are not crossing

Crossing Paths of ships are crossing

Merge Two ships from different directions, heading in the same direction, strategy might lead in many cases to a take-over.

Take-over Two ships following the same path with different speeds.

These situations are described in more detail in section 4.1, using path descriptions.

11 | Design evaluation

The last part of the sCE method is the design evaluation. The design evaluation aims to test and validate the system's design, or to discriminate between multiple design options, such that the current design can be improved upon in incremental development cycles. The sCE method describes three parts that are relevant with respect to the system evaluation: (1) the artefact, (2) the evaluation method, and (3) the evaluation results.

The artefact gives a short summary of the developed protocol and its workings, together with the tool in which it can be simulated. The evaluation method will be interviews with experienced seafarers. The aim of the interviews is to answer the following question:

Will a protocol based on existing maritime systems and communication protocols be sufficient to ensure safe navigation while manned and unmanned vessels encounter each other?

Different measures are used for validation and verification. Key variables are: Trust, situation awareness, effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction. In this chapter these will be described in more detailed and what the results of the evaluation are.

11.1 Artefact

The artefact is an implementation or prototype that incorporates a given set of requirements, interaction design patterns, and technological means. This first iteration will aim at finding flaws based on expert knowledge. To acquire this a simplified prototype will be used. This means that there is no implementation using hardware which might be used in latter stages. But a simulation environment is created to test situations with experts. Where is checked if experts believe that the protocol as described in chapter 10 is sufficient to get to the right decision.

To get the right feedback, several situations will be simulated. These situations are based on the accidents as described in chapter ??, common situations around the port of Rotterdam and cases used in literature. The situations are simulated and visualized using the tool as described in chapter ?. This will enable the experts to gain situational awareness and give useful feedback on the protocol. The protocol itself is mostly knowledge based and not automated during the evaluation. Thus the interviewer has to know the Standard Maritime Communication Phrases (SMCP) and usage of systems like Automatic Identification System (AIS).

add
description and printscreencapture of tool
add

11.2 Evaluation method

The evaluation method can take many forms, such as a human-in-the-loop study, a use-case-based simulation, or an expert review. In this case a so-called Wizard of Oz evaluation is used. This technique enables unimplemented technology to be evaluated by using a human to simulate the response of a system. As the technology itself has not yet been implemented. The "wizard" simulates the system's responses in real-time.

11.2.1 Experiment design

To do the experiment, a participant is needed to have the role of Officer of Watch (OoW) and tools to execute. During the experiment there will be different variables, which have to be taken into account to be able to draw the right conclusions. These are described in this section.

Participants

The participant is in this case the Officer of Watch (OoW). The experiment will be done with at least 10 different participants. The formal requirements are as follows:

- Nationality: Dutch, due to location of experiment.
- License: Completed training as a maritime officer.
- Experience: At least 3 years of experience as seafarer.
- Attitude towards autonomous shipping: Both positive and negative.
- Age: 25-60

The different participants will receive different scenarios of the same situation in different orders. Such that they are counter-balanced.

Tools

Beside the participants, tools are needed to do the experiment. The tools needed are:

- Laptop to show a visual of situation and show what happens during the simulation.
- Questionnaire to be used before, during and after the experiment.
- Room without distractions to do the experiment.
- Recording device to store and later process actions during the experiment.

Dependent variables

During the experiment different variables will be evaluated. These determine if indeed the system act as expected and will result in safe navigation when using existing protocols. The first variables relate to experiment:

Trust The system is safe en reliable. This is measured using a questionnaire.

Situation awareness The perception of environmental elements and events with respect to time or space, the comprehension of their meaning, and the projection of their status. This is measured by asking if the participants have noticed some changes in the simulation.

Performance Simple evaluation if the participant acted correctly. Thus did he safely navigate the vessel by making the right decisions. For more detailed results, the Closest point of approach (CPA) can be used.

Satisfaction Pleased feeling, as the participant likes the way he acted and how the system works. This will also be measured using a questionnaire.

Based on the variables measured in the experiment, can conclusions be drawn about the used protocol for communication. These are based on the following variables:

Effectiveness The protocol is prompt and thorough.

Efficiency The protocol is easy to understand and use. Thereby does it not cost much effort and time to use it during operation.

11.2.2 Key performance indicators

The performance indicators are similar to the human factor measures as described in section 9.2. This will be a combination of both quantitative and qualitative measurements. Thus combining numerical values with non-numerical arguments.

- Is the system used correctly?
 1. System is not understood and actions of participant are random.
 2. System is not understood, but by experience with other systems the results are good.
 3. System is understood, but does not help to get the good result.
 4. System is understood, and results are as expected.


5. System is understood, and improves situational awareness compared to existing way of working.
 - Does the protocol act as expected?
 - Will it solve the problem of missing information?
 - Do people perceive it as easy to use and useful?
 - What is the impact on attitude towards unmanned ships?

11.2.3 Experiment task

During the experiment will the participant act as an Officer of Watch (OoW) in different situations. The duties of the OoW are to keep watch and navigate the vessel. While keeping a watch on the bridge he is the representative of the ship's master and has the total responsibility of safe and smooth navigation of the ship. This means he has to follow a proper navigation plan to avoid any kind of collision according to COLREGs. Thereby is he aware of ship's speed, turning circles, and ship handling characteristics. He also communicates with other vessels when that is necessary.

More specific will he sail a vessel in different scenario's. It depends on the scenario how and if the participant can communicate with other vessels. He will do this by directing a vessel on a 2D-map as shown in the simulation environment. He will have access to the same information as any other bridge, also presented in a similar way, except for the visual 3D-view. But this lack of information is compensated by more reliability for the ECDIS and Radar. Within the experiment, tests will be done for different situations and scenarios:

1. Collision between MV ARTADI and MV ST-Germain
 - (A) Same decisions as reality
 - (B) Do what Artadi expected
 - (C) Do what St-Germain expected
2. Entering Maasgeul towards North Sea at port of Rotterdam.
 - (A) Crossing in front
 - (B) Crossing at the back
 - (C) Passing



These different scenarios will be described in more detail below. This does not only include the location of vessel, but also traffic, weather conditions and other information which is shared during watch take-overs.

Describe situations in more detail

Collision between MV ARTADI and MV ST-Germain

- Ship's position, course and speed
- Traffic density
- Weather condition and night vision
- Logbooks, checklist and daily orders

Entering Maasgeul towards North Sea at port of Rotterdam.

- Ship's position, course and speed
- Traffic density
- Weather condition and night vision
- Logbooks, checklist and daily orders

11.2.4 Experiment procedure

To execute the experiment. Several steps are taken together with the Officer of Watch (OoW):

1. Explain how the OoW can take actions, such as steering, change speed, set way-points or engage in communication.
2. Ask general questions on attitude and basic information.
3. Explain situation to OoW in a similar way to common hand-over. Only describe relevant issues for navigational duties.
4. Start playing simulation.
5. Depending on the simulation, let autonomous ship take actions or wait for the OoW to engage in communication.
6. End simulation.
7. Question OoW why which decision was made.

8. Question OoW on several "what if"-scenarios and how that would have changed its actions.
9. Repeat step 3-7 for more situations.
10. Question OoW about advantages and challenges of protocol.
11. Question OoW about human factors.

Explanation (1, 2)

The participant is not explicitly informed about the exact purpose of the research. It will however get a short introduction on how to use the tool during the simulation. It should be easy to use, as similar action should be executed when operating a vessel. Thereby is some information about the participant acquired:

- Which licenses do you have?
- What is your experience?
- What is your attitude towards unmanned and autonomous shipping?
- What do you see as the biggest challenge for introducing autonomous and unmanned vessels?

Situations and scenarios (3, 4, 5, 6, 9)

The next steps are repeated several times for the different situations. The situations are described in section 11.2.3:

1. Collision between MV ARTADI and MV ST-Germain
2. Entering Maasgeul towards North Sea at port of Rotterdam.

For these situations and scenarios, the following are described:

- Ship's position, course and speed
- Traffic density
- Weather condition and night vision
- Logbooks, checklist and daily orders

add summary of description when using the tool, reference to chapter tool

add pictures of what is exactly happening in each sit-

Relevant questions for situation (7, 8, 9)

To gain insight into the quality of the experiment and effectiveness of the protocol, the following questions will be asked:

- Why did you do *<action>*?
- Did the autonomous vessel act as you expected?
- Did you have the feeling, you were in control of the situation?
- Did you miss any information to choose the right strategy?
- Did you feel the urge to communicate?
- Why did you or didn't you feel the urge to communicate?
- Was the communication as you expected it to be?
- Would you have acted differently if you knew there was a human officer of watch?
- ...

Is this enough?

General questions on protocol and human factors (10, 11, 12)

After running the different situations an interview is held. This interview is intended to answer the following questions from the participant perspective and explain the purpose of this research:

- Should a protocol like this pass the turing test?
- Would you like to know beforehand if it is an unmanned vessel?
- Are horns still commonly used to show intentions?
- Did you find the protocol easy to use?
- Is the protocol useful?
- Is the protocol transparent, thus do you understand why steps are taken?
- Do you feel differently about introducing unmanned and autonomous vessels?

11.3 Evaluation results

The evaluation results describe the outcomes of the test. Because of the iterative and rapid research cycles, the evaluation does not necessarily include all requirements/claims/use cases

available in the system specification. Oftentimes the evaluation investigates a subset of the system specification. Therefore, it is often useful to also specify what claims were tested, with the use of what evaluation method, and what artefact was used during the evaluation (i.e. which requirements, technology, interaction design patterns were included in the artefact).

11.3.1 Outcomes

11.3.2 Conclusions

Part IV

Wrap-up

12 | Results

Describe results when both researches are combined. Do they support each other. Relate this to the model

Is the acquired knowledge sufficient to identify the situation correctly, or is more information desired via communication? from chapter 2

13 | Conclusion

13.1 Answers to research questions

13.2 Recommendations for future research

Part V

Appendices

A | Current systems for safe navigation

Before developing new systems and procedures to improve safety, the first step is to know what is currently available. Thereby should be considered how different types of information can be supplied. Nowadays decisions on navigation are taken from the bridge. Thus all information must be available there. In this chapter these elements will first be discussed, how they are in theory. This is followed by a discussion on the differences between this theory and practice. Which results in a conclusion on relevant systems for the communication between manned and unmanned ships.

A.1 Bridge system elements

To gain insight in a structured way, the bridge is split into four elements as described by DNV-GL. The human operator, procedures, technical system and the human-machine interface [DNV GL(2011)], as shown in figure A.1. This section describes every element in more detail.




Figure A.1: Bridge system elements

A.1.1 Technical system

The first element which will be discussed are the instruments and equipment at the bridge, the technical system. The different classification societies prescribe the equipment which is obligated to have at the bridge. These are based on the regulations for navigational equipment on board of ships from the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), a modern ship should at least have:

- Magnetic compass
- Gyro compass
- ECDIS
- Transmitting heading device
- Automatic Identification System (AIS)
- Receiver for Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS)
- Internal communication system
- Bridge Navigational Watch Alarm System (BNWAS)
- Telephone for external communication
- Radar
- Radar beacon
- Daylight signaling lamp
- Speed and distance measuring device
- Echo sounding device
- Rudder, propeller, thrust, pitch and operational mode indicators
- Rate of turn indicator

Based on this list, DNV-GL demands at least the following equipment shall be installed at the bridge [DNV GL(2011)]. The equipment may have different roles. To control the ship, to present information, or to communicate:

- Propulsion control
- Emergency stop machinery
- Manual steering device
- Steering mode selector switch
- Heading control
- Window wiper and wash controls
- Control of dimmers for indicators and displays
- Steering gear pumps
- Gyrocompass selector switch
- Navtex receiver
- Automatic Radar Plotting Aid (ARPA)
- Electronic Chart Display Information System (ECDIS)
- Automatic Identification System (AIS) transceiver
- General alarm control
- Very High Frequency radio (VHF) unit
- Whistle and manoeuvring light push buttons
- Internal communication equipment
- Central alert management system

Some of these systems will be highlighted to show the relevance for the development of unmanned vessels, as these systems are currently the most important systems while navigating. Thereby should be considered that more details on underlying procedures are given later in this chapter.

Navigational text Messages (Navtex)

Navtex (Navigational Telex) is an international automated medium frequency direct-printing service for delivery of navigational and meteorological warnings and forecasts, as well as urgent maritime safety information to ships. Navtex was developed to provide a low-cost, simple, and automated means of receiving this information aboard ships at sea within approximately 370 km (200 nautical miles) off shore. Transmissions are typically transmitted from the National Weather Authority, Coast Guard or other navigational authority. The system is an important element in the Global Maritime Distress Safety System (GMDSS). Therefore does SOLAS mandate certain classes of vessels must carry Navtex. Examples of messages which can be received are:

- Navigational warnings
- Meteorological warnings
- Meteorological forecasts
- Search & rescue information
- Piracy information
- AIS messages

The receiver automatically prints the messages. The officer of watch keeps track of the received messages, and anticipates on them when necessary.

Very High Frequency radio (VHF)

Marine VHF radio refers to the radio frequency range between 156 and 174 MHz. In the official language of the International Telecommunication Union the band is called the VHF maritime mobile band. A marine VHF set is a combined transmitter and receiver and only operates on standard, international frequencies known as channels. For example is channel 16 (156.8 MHz) the international calling and distress channel. Transmission power ranges between 1 and 25 watts, giving a maximum range of up to about 60 nautical miles (111 km) between aerials mounted on tall ships and hills, and 5 nautical miles (9 km) between aerials mounted on small boats at sea level (figure A.2). Frequency modulation (FM) is used, with vertical polarization, meaning that antennas have to be vertical in order to have good reception.




Figure A.2: Very High Frequency radio (VHF)

Modern-day marine VHF radios offer not only basic transmit and receive capabilities. Permanently mounted marine VHF radios on seagoing vessels are required to have certification of some level of "Digital Selective Calling" (DSC) capability, to allow a distress signal to be sent with a single button press.

Marine VHF mostly uses "simplex" transmission, where communication can only take place in one direction at a time. A transmit button on the set or microphone determines whether it is operating as a transmitter or a receiver. Some channels, however, are "duplex" transmission channels where communication can take place in both directions simultaneously when the equipment on both ends allow it (full duplex), otherwise "semi-duplex" is used. Each duplex channel has two frequency assignments. Duplex channels can be used to place calls on the public telephone system for a fee via a marine operator. When full duplex is used, the call is similar to one using a mobile phone or landlines. When semi-duplex is used, voice is only carried one way at a time and the party on the boat must press the transmit button only when speaking. This facility is still available in some areas, though its use has largely died out with the advent of mobile and satellite phones. Marine VHF radios can also receive weather radio broadcasts, where they are available.

Automatic Radar Plotting Aid (ARPA)

Radars have been playing a vital role in ship navigation for several decades now, assisting in collision avoidance and early detection of obstacles. The history of marine radars goes a long way back to the time of World War II, when radars were introduced and effectively used by war ships for tracking and detection. Radar technology has improved immensely from post-WWII period to the present and the application of computer technology to commercial marine radar sets resulted in the introduction of Automatic Radar Plotting Aids (ARPA). A print-screen of an ARPA systems can be seen in figure A.3.




Figure A.3: Automatic Radar Plotting Aid (ARPA)

Automatic radar plotting aids are essentially utilized to improve the standard of collision avoidance at sea. Primarily designed as anti-collision radar, the ARPA technology removed the chore of plotting targets manually on a reflection plotter or separate plotting aid. The system is able to acquire automatically and constantly monitor number of targets, plot their speeds and courses, present these as vectors on the display screen, updated with each sweep of the antenna, and calculate their closest points of approach to own ship and the time before that will occur.

Electronic Chart Display Information System (ECDIS)

The Electronic Chart Display Information System (ECDIS) is a development in the navigational chart system used in naval vessels and ships. With the use of the Electronic Navigational Chart (ENC) system, it has become easier for a ship's navigating crew to pinpoint locations and attain directions. ECDIS equipment complying with SOLAS requirements can be used as an alternative to paper charts. Besides enhancing navigational safety, ECDIS greatly eases the navigator's workload with its automatic capabilities such as route planning, route monitoring, automatic ETA computation and ENC updating. In addition, ECDIS provides many other sophisticated navigation and safety features, including continuous data recording for later analysis. How the ECDIS is integrated in the bridge can be seen in figure A.4.



Figure A.4: Electronic Chart Display Information System (ECDIS) integrated in bridge console

The ECDIS utilises the feature of the Global Positioning System (GPS) to successfully pinpoint the navigational points. It also has to be noted that the ECDIS adheres to the stipulations set by the International Maritime Organisation, and thus it adds to the trustworthiness of the electronic chart system. ECDIS is basically a navigational information system, interfaced with other navigational equipments such as the GPS, Gyro, RADAR, ARPA, Echo Sounder etc.

Automatic Identification System (AIS)

AIS is designed to be capable of providing information about the ship to other ships and to coastal authorities automatically. The SOLAS regulations require AIS to be fitted aboard all ships of 300 gross tonnage and upwards engaged on international voyages, cargo ships of 500 gross tonnage and upwards not engaged on international voyages and all passenger ships irrespective of size. The requirement became effective for all ships by 31 December 2004, this means there are still ships which do not have AIS. Ships fitted with AIS shall maintain AIS in operation at all times except where international agreements, rules or standards provide for the protection of navigational information.

The regulations require the AIS to provide information on ship's identity, type, position, course, speed, navigational status and other safety-related information. Which will be automatically send to appropriately equipped shore stations, others ships and aircrafts. While also being able to receive such information automatically from similarly fitted ships, to monitor and track them. Lastly they should be able to exchange data with shore-based facilities.

Originally the messages were send regularly via a VHF transmitter. The information originates partly from ship's navigational sensors. Other information, such as the vessel name and VHF

call sign, is programmed when installing the equipment. Some information must be filled in by hand, such as the status or destination, which is often forgotten. The received information can be displayed on a screen or chart plotter, showing the other vessels' positions in much the same manner as a radar display. Data is transmitted via a tracking system which makes use of a Self-Organized Time Division Multiple Access (SOTDMA).

There are different types of transmitters. Depending on the object it is installed on. This determines what kind of messages can be send and which protocol is used to access AIS slots. Below relevant types are described:

- Class A, the most common type of AIS transceiver for large merchant vessels.
- Class B, AIS for smaller vessels.
- Base station, shore-based AIS transceiver, able to manage AIS slots.
- Aids to navigation, shore- or buoy based transceiver operating in fixed time-slots. Designed to collect and transmit data related to sea and weather conditions, or forward AIS messages to extend reach.
- Search and rescue transceiver, designed to function as an emergency distress beacon, with high probability of success for transmission.

As mentioned before, there are different types of AIS messages, identification numbers are used to identify the type of message within the NMEA string. The following types of messages are relevant for this research and the development of unmanned ships [US Coast Guard(2018)]:

- Position report, reports navigational information.
- Standard class B equipment position report, less detailed report for vessels using class B transmitters.
- Base station report, used by base stations to indicate presence.
- Static and voyage related data, gives information on a ship and its trip
- Binary addressed message and acknowledgment, an addressed point-to-point message with unspecified binary payload.
- Binary broadcast message, broadcast message with unspecified binary payload.
- Standard Search and Rescue Aircraft Position Report, used by an aircraft (helicopter or airplane) which is involved with search and rescue operation on the sea (i.e. search for and recovery of survivors of an accident at sea).
- Addressed Safety-Related message and response, used to send text messages to a specified vessel.

- Interrogation, used by a base station to get the status of up to 2 other AIS devices.
- Aids-to-navigation report, used by an (AtN) aid to navigation device (buoys, lighthouse, etc.).
- Multiple slot binary message with communications state, used to transmit binary data from one device to another.

A.1.2 Man/machine interface

Previously all information was plotted by hand on navigational charts. With the developments of integrated bridge systems and for example the ECDIS, this is not necessary. This also means that a digital representation of the environment is already being made. Including calculations, relevant for navigational safety. These also give warnings to avoid collisions or represent information received via VHF. This is done in a way which is more easy to interpret by the officer of watch, as for example AIS, ENC and the radar are combined. Examples of the different systems can be found in figure A.5.

These screens are all integrated in some way into the bridge console. Depending on the size of the vessel, the lay-out may differ. Although, there are also regulations for the placement of systems in SOLAS. Examples of these bridge layouts can be found in figure A.1.

A.1.3 Human operator


The human operator has two sides, to formal straight forward role as an operator. Which can be described with a list of tasks depending on their function. And the more difficult and unpredictable side of being a human. Which relates to the situational awareness and decision making ability.

Role as operator

To give more insight into the different roles on board of a merchant's vessel, is the structure shown for officers in figure A.7. At smaller vessels, roles are combined where possible. The Navy has in some cases even more operational crew members. Apart from the licensed officers who manage the vessel, does the crew also consist of ratings who have hands-on skills within their own domain. [Nedcon(2013)]

For this research the Deck crew is most relevant, as they are in charge of the vessel navigation, watch keeping, maintaining the ship's hull, cargo, gear and accommodation, taking care of


How is information used.
Mention parts on information overload.
Thereby also the difference between ships.
Officer walking around on big ship, vs small bridge on a tug for example.



(a) Separate screens for ECDIS and Radar

(b) Radar overlay

Figure A.5: Electronic Chart Display Information System (ECDIS)



(a) Alphatron AlphaBridge

(b) DAMEN ASD Tug 2310 (Patriot)

(c) BIBBY WAVEMASTER 1

(d) DAMEN Stan Patrol 5009

Figure A.6: Various examples of bridge designs




Figure A.7: Crew structure basic

the ship's lifesaving and firefighting appliances. The deck department is also the one in charge of receiving, discharging and caring for cargo. According to the vessel's hierarchy, the deck officers are as follows: Master, Chief Officer, Second Officer, Third Officer and Deck Cadet (deck officer to be).

The supreme authority on board a merchant's vessel is the Master or Captain. The entire crew is under his command. He is responsible for the safety, use and maintenance of the vessel and makes sure that every crew member carries out his work accordingly. He is also in charge of the following: payroll, ship's accounting, inventories, custom and immigration regulations, and the ship's documentation. In order to become Master, a seafarer must first have several years of experience as a deck officer and as Chief Officer. According to the vessel's hierarchy, the first deck officer and the head of the deck department after the Master is the Chief Officer. He is in charge of the vessel navigation, watch duties, charging and discharging operations. The Chief Officer also directs all the other officers on deck, creates and posts watch assignments and implements the Master's orders in order to maintain safe operations and maintenance of the vessel. Second Officer or Second Mate is the next in rank after the Chief Mate and is the ship's navigator, focusing on creating the ship's passage plans and keeping charts and publications up to date. Apart from watchkeeping, the Second Officer may also be designated to train the cadets on board or to fulfill the rank of security, safety, environmental or medical officer. The Third Officer or Third Mate is the fourth deck officer in command and is usually the Ship's Safety Officer, responsible for ensuring the good functioning of the fire-fighting equipment and lifesaving appliances. He undertakes bridge watches and learns how to become a Second Officer. A Cadet on board a merchant's vessel receives structured training and experience on board and learns how to become a deck officer.

Apart from the officers, the deck department crew also consists of ratings, such as AB (Able Body Seaman), OS (Ordinary Seaman) and Boatswain. The AB is part of the deck crew

and has duties such as: taking watches, steering the vessel, assisting the Officer on watch, mooring and un-mooring the vessel, deck maintenance and cleaning. The AB also secures and un-secures the cargo and carries our deck and accommodation patrols. OS is the crew member whose main duty is to maintain the cleanliness of the whole ship and serves as an assistant for the AB. Being an OS is considered to be an apprenticeship, a period called "sea time" in order to be allowed to take courses and training for AB. Both AB and OS are usually supervised by a Boatswain, who is also a rating, in charge of examining the cargo-handling gear and lifesaving equipment as well. The Boatswain usually holds an AB certificate as well. The structure for the deck department on board merchant vessels is mainly the same on all vessel types. [Nedcon(2013)]

Human factor

At unmanned autonomous vessels the human operator will be replaced by a computer. This means that the duties as described above will be executed by a computer. This automation step has unknown consequences for the ability to observe and decision making. While it has clear advantages when it comes to memory and reduced concentration due to fatigue.

Situational awareness is a model to determine the ability to observe and make decisions. How well humans perform is determined by their (learning) experience [Underwood et al.(2013)]. Hereby is important to notice that situational awareness is not limited to perceiving, but has multiple levels. This is described using the Endsley model (figure A.8).




Figure A.8: Endsley model for situational awareness

The first step is to acquire situational awareness. This is based on three different levels of

information processing [Kalloniatis et al.(2017)]:

Perception Data is merely perceived.

Comprehension Interpretation of data, enabling understanding of relevance in relation to tasks performed and goals to be attained. Forming a holistic picture of the operational environment. Identifying the significance of objects and events in that environment.

Projection Making a forecast for likely future states of the situation. This is based on the interpreted data, experience and knowledge.

Based on the situational awareness, a decision is being made which results in an action. Changing the system and repeating the whole process. However there are factors which influence the effectiveness of this process. These can be internally or from the environment. Where automation is less prone to environmental factors, will it have a disadvantage when it comes to setting goals, preconceptions, acquiring knowledge or learning from experience. As many of the machine learning techniques are too much of a black box approach, or are not yet effective for the assignments where ships have to navigate for example. There's also that indefinable matter of common sense that humans have but robots lack. Hundreds of thousands of years of evolution have provided us with a pretty good ability to recognize and make sense of things.

Whereas the human operator is more prone to environmental factors. Where workload is a big factor in the ability to concentrate and thus the ability to forecast future states and thus make the right decisions. The workload might be too high due to an overload of information [Speier et al.(1999)], when tasks are too easy [Washburn and Putney(2001)], or when limited attention is desired for a long time, and something unexpected happens [McMorris et al.(2018)].

These factors do only consider the single individual within the human operator team. But with larger ships there are multiple persons at the bridge, all with their own responsibilities. Research has shown that many of these crews have multiple cultures and nationalities work next to each other. Which often have a agreed working language which is not their first. This leads not only to minor irritations. But in some cases to hazardous situations [Hetherington et al.(2006)]. Certainly when conversations happen via a radio with some noise.

A.1.4 Procedures

To become a certified seafarer, different skills and knowledge must be acquired. The IMO has developed several conventions to standardize this knowledge globally, the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW) is leading here. This ensures that ships sailing in international waters have skilled crew which

know what they can expect from other vessels. This also means they have navigational abilities such as plotting on a radar. But they also have knowledge of the conventions and systems used for safe navigation. Below some of these are explained in more detail. Followed by a description of known flaws of these systems and differences when compared to procedures used in practice.

Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (COLREGs)

The COLREGs set out the navigational to be followed by ships and other vessels at sea, to prevent collisions between two or more vessels. Although rules for navigating vessels inland may differ, the international rules specify that they should be as closely in line with the international rules as possible. In most of continental Europe, the Code Européen des Voies de la Navigation Intérieure (CEVNI, or the European Code for Navigation on Inland Waters) apply. In the United States, the rules for vessels navigating inland are published alongside the international rules.

Prior to the development of a single set of international rules and practices, there existed separate practices and various conventions and informal procedures in different parts of the world, as advanced by various maritime nations. As a result, there were inconsistencies and even contradictions that gave rise to unintended collisions. Vessel navigation lights for operating in darkness as well as navigation marks also were not standardised, giving rise to dangerous confusion and ambiguity between vessels at risk of colliding. Different nations already came up with their own set of rules. But the first version was amended together with SOLAS in 1960. Additions were made including traffic separation schemes in 1972.

The COLREGs includes 41 rules divided into six sections: Part A - General; Part B - Steering and Sailing; Part C - Lights and Shapes; Part D - Sound and Light signals; Part E - Exemptions; and Part F - Verification of compliance with the provisions of the Convention. There are also four Annexes containing technical requirements concerning lights and shapes and their positioning; sound signalling appliances; additional signals for fishing vessels when operating in close proximity, and international distress signals.

Where part B is most relevant for this research, with subject like safe speed, obligation to determine risk of collision and take action with all means available, how to act in different situations with other ships, or in restricted waterways.

Standard Maritime Communication Phrases (SMCP)

As navigational and safety communications from ship to shore and vice versa, ship to ship , and on board ships must be precise, simple and unambiguous, so as to avoid confusion and

error, there is a need to standardize the language used. This is of particular importance in the light of the increasing number of internationally trading vessels with crews speaking many different languages since problems of communication may cause misunderstandings leading to dangers to the vessel, the people on board and the environment.

In 1973 IMO started to develop the Standard Marine Navigational Vocabulary (SMNV), which was replaced by the SMCP in 2001. The ability to understand and use the SMCP is required for the certification of officers in charge of a navigational watch on ships of 500 gross tonnage or more. To assist in greater safety of navigation and of the conduct of the ship. To standardize the language used in communication for navigation at sea, in port-approaches, in waterways, harbours and on board vessels with multilingual crews. Which is all instructed at maritime training institutions. These are not intended to supplant or contradict COLREGs or special local rules or recommendations made by IMO concerning ship routeing. Just as radiotelephone procedures should be followed strictly as set out in the ITU Radio Regulations.

It is a collection of phrases used to standardize and simplify the communication, where synonyms and contracted forms are avoided. Some examples of the usage of SMCP are shown below, including message markers to indicate the type of message:

Advice Stand by on channel 6 - 8.

Information The fairway entrance is: position: bearing 1-3-7 degrees true from North Point Lighthouse, distance: 2 decimal 3 miles.

Warning Buoy number: one - five unlit.

Intention I intend to reduce speed, new speed: eight knots.

Question What are your intentions?

Instruction You must alter course to starboard.

Request Immediate tug assistance.

A.2 Difference between theory and practice

Certainly in inland water or near coast conversations might be in natural language, instead of SMCP.

Mention the problems with ECDIS/AIS (old information, not correct as mentioned bylood-swezen), as I refer to this in snapshots scenario description.

How does it go in practice, experience.

A.3 Relevant systems for autonomous shipping

Not everything is relevant to other ships, in order to determine the possible decisions. This is only: information from radar, information available in AIS (where reliability must be considered), warning systems, etc...

-
- Radio communication
 - Conversational agent using Standard Maritime Communication Phrases (SMCP)
 - Availability on Very High Frequency radio (VHF)
 - Automatic Identification System (AIS) messages
 - Visible signals
 - Light signals
 - Flags
 - Mast head signals
 - Heading, position and movements
 - Audible signals
 - Horn
 - Speakers
 - Distress, urgency and safety signals
 - Flares
 - Smoke

Write
into a
story

e.g: VDES

B | Simulation environment

In the next parts, situations will be simulated. For part II this is done to evaluate criteria for the decision model and problem identification. While part III aims to get expert feedback on the protocol.

The different scenarios will be simulated using a tool. This tool will be able to simulate the scenarios to give more insight why decisions are made. Full scale testing will cost much more money, time and effort, as it is harder to control. Small scale testing will introduce many unknown factors. Therefore is chosen to build an application in which models can be simulated and tested. A start is made with a basic tool, which will continuously be improved. Changes in requirements might appear through out the whole process, to deliver a better tool. The code is written in such a way that it is easy to maintain and improve by using different modules.

B.1 Foundation

The first step is to set the goals or requirements of the tool. This doesn't mean it is a full description of the tool, but features it should at least have to be able to answer the research questions. The most important requirement is that ships within the simulation behave similarly to ships in reality. This does not necessarily mean that all hydromechanics should be known. But ships should have similar behaviors when turning or changing speed. This can be based on sea-trials and done using a mapping from current speed, current rotation, rudder angle and throttle to future speed and turning speed. The second requirement should be that it is flexible, in a way that different scenarios can be added, tested and visualized easily. Thereby changing ship characteristics, shared information and other inputs. Thirdly, it must be possible to show the register of possible decisions for the different vessels. To be able to validate this with seafarers. Meaning it will be a white box model.

B.1.1 User stories

The next step is to define user stories from the requirements. User stories are in a form: "As a [user] I want [action] so that [result]". Extending them with an acceptance criteria this will result in the features which should be implemented.

Within the tool there will be different roles. For which these user stories can be used. These can be split between users and objects. Below these are described:

- *Operator*. The person who set-up the simulation and fills in the different properties for the ships and specific scenario.
- *Viewer*. Someone who uses the application to view a specific scenario. Thereby trying to answer the research questions.
- *Ship*. Object in the map which is used by the simulation. But to work correctly it also had needs for information.

Some examples of those user stories are given below. All users stories can be found in appendix XXX..

- As an operator, I want to add vessels to the map, by selecting them in a list, so that they become part of the simulation.
Acceptance criteria: Ship visualized and other ships start receiving information.
- As a viewer, I want to be able to get the belief state, intention and next action of a ship, so that I can verify if it is what I expected it to be.
Acceptance criteria: Belief state, intention and next action are shown.
- As a ship, I want to be able to predict the path of other vessels, so that I can make my decisions based on this.
Acceptance criteria: correctly updated belief state about other vessels.

add user stories to appendix

B.1.2 Requirements

The acceptance criteria for the application is: The ability to insert a model for decision making for a ship, which depends on information collected from other ships closeby, its own ship characteristics and the environment it acts in.

There must also be considered that several assumptions are made to create a system which works in a practical manner, as not all input data is available or calculations might be very hard and slow down the simulation too much. The assumptions made are: ...

Extend with more specific requirements

describe different modules

B.2 Architecture

B.3 Design specifications

B.3.1 Ship description

B.3.2 Environment description

B.3.3 Hydrodynamic model

This can be based on sea-trials and done using a mapping from current speed, current rotation, rudder angle and throttle to future speed and turning speed.

Turning rate rudder: 2,3 deg/s in regulations, 2,5 based on [Artyszuk(2016)], 3 deg/s based on [Molland and Turnock(2007)]. $a_H = 2.5$ empirical amplification factor of (effective) rudder force due to hull-rudder interaction [0.6]

B.3.4 Radio

The area in which situations are tested are not larger than the radius of an VHF radio (about 20 NM - IMO regulations)

http://solasv.mcga.gov.uk/m_notice/mgn/mgn324.pdf - p8

B.3.5 Controller

Based on the waypoints there is a simple controller to adjust the rudder angle. This controller steers based on the relative angle between the waypoint and the current position. This is done in the *adjustRudder* function. The distance and relative angle is calculated, this is used in a simple decision tree to decide on the rudder angle, which is similar to a so-called "proportional controller". For this simulation it will give enough accuracy. For a better result, a "PID-controller" could be implemented:

Relative angle (°)	Rudder angle (°)
25-180	35
10-25	25
0-10	Relative angle * 8/10

Table B.1: Rudder angle based on relative angle

B.3.6 Criteria evaluation

Describe how cpa and crossing distance is implemented.

B.4 Build

printscreens

User interface

Graphs

Quality/Dependency analysis (dt vs runtime)

Currently implemented (level of intelligence) Currently is a hydro model implemented, you are able to steer the ship or use waypoints and a background image can be used to show the map.



Figure B.1: Example of evaluation tool

C | Decision trees

Show decision trees relevant to determine critical path




Figure C.1: Decision tree when merging




Figure C.2: Decision tree when over-taking




Figure C.3: Decision tree when passing




Figure C.4: Decision tree when crossing

D | Accidents

In the last centuries much have changed to improve the safety of vessel and decrease the risk for collision. Some were reactions to major accidents which occurred. Such as the disaster with the TITANIC in April 1912, which triggered the development of SOLAS. But also new innovations, such as the introduction of Global Positioning System (GPS), ARPA and AIS. But still accidents occur. To get insight what could result in hazardous situations. Four accidents are discussed, showing the importance of proper communication on different levels. The accidents which will be discussed are:

- Collision between MV AL ORAIQ and MV FLINTERSTAR
- Collision between MV ARTADI and MV ST-GERMAIN
- Collision between USS FITZGERALD and MV ACX CRYSTAL
- Collision between USS JOHN S MCCAIN and MV ALNIC MC
- Collision between MV CONTI PERIDOT and MV CARLA MAERSK

Are these
really
relevant
acci-
dents,
add
more/other?

Add im-
ages of
resulting
damages

D.1 MV AL ORAIQ and MV FLINTERSTAR

During the night between 5 and 6 October 2015 on the Northsea near Zeebrugge, a collision occurred between the LNG tanker AL ORAIQ, sailing under the Marshall Islands flag, and the FLINTERSTAR cargo ship, sailing under the Dutch flag. The FLINTERSTAR sank almost immediately as a result of the collision, an illustration of the accident is shown in Figure D.1. The captain of the FLINTERSTAR was badly injured in the incident but the other ten people on board and the pilot were rescued out of the water unharmed.



Figure D.1: Illustration map of approximate collision location

The collision occurred because the bridge team on board of the AL ORAIQ wrongly assessed the traffic situation, vessel's speed and distance from the S3 buoy, prior to contacting the nearby vessel Thorco Challenger. After informing the Thorco Challenger, did they pass on the starboard side. On board of AL ORAIQ were coastal pilots which did not receive feedback from the watch keepers, nor was there feedback from other vessels via VHF radio. The communication which went via VHF radio was mostly in dutch, the officer on duty at AL ORAIQ did not request the Coastal pilots to translate. Also did the bridge watch team not assess the situation properly, leading to very little situational awareness. On board of the FLINTERSTAR there was insufficient attention for watch keeping duties. As several VHF radio communications between Traffic Centre Zeebrugge and other participants within the area monitored by Traffic Centre Zeebrugge, concerning or involving the presence of an inbound LNG carrier were missed by the Pilot and other crew at the bridge on board the FLINTERSTAR. The pilots on board of AL ORAIQ did not attempt to work together. Thereby making decisions without consulting the crew, such as overtaking other vessels. Thus the coastal pilot did not act consistently with international understanding, where a pilot is an advisor to the ship's master. Which means mutual understanding for the functions and duties of each other, based upon effective communication and information exchange. The sea pilot

on board of the FLINTERSTAR got engaged in a casual conversation with the officer of the watch, drawing his attention away from monitoring the traffic situation. The Sea Pilot was advising the officer of the watch from what appeared to be routine. [Backer(2015)]

D.2 MV ARTADI and MV ST-GERMAIN

An example where the COLREGs were followed but still resulted in two persons killed is the collision between MV ARTADI and MV St-Germain on 21 February 1979. The Liberian bulk carrier ARTADI collided with the passenger ferry ST-GERMAIN in the Dover Strait, killing two people and injuring four more. An illustration of the accident is shown in figure D.2. Both ships followed COLREGs according to the accident report. Due to a lack of communication and wrong presumptions on the intentions, did the accident occur.




Figure D.2: Illustration map of approximate collision location

The ferry was spotted in good time on the radar of the ARTADI. Coming from starboard, ST-GERMAIN was the stand-on ship according to rule 15 of the COLREGs. The pilot and master of the ARTADI expected her to keep speed and course and started to make a starboard turn to give way. However, on-board the ST-GERMAIN the intention was not at all to cross the traffic separation scheme diagonally in front of ARTADI, but instead to turn port and follow outside the boarder of the NE going traffic lane until the traffic cleared and she could make the crossing at a right angle (according to rule 10c) [Porat et al.(2013)].

D.3 USS FITZGERALD and MV ACX CRYSTAL

A more recent well-known collision was between the USS FITZGERALD and ACX CRYSTAL on 17 June 2017. The US destroyer hit the larger Philippines container vessel resulting in the death of 7 US Sailors. An illustration of the accident is shown in figure D.3. According to the accident report did failures occurred on the part of leadership and watch-standers. There were failures in planning for safety, adhere basic navigational practice, execute basic watchstanding practice, proper use of available navigation tools and wrong responses.




Figure D.3: Illustration map of approximate collision location

In accordance with international rules, the USS FITZGERALD was obligated to manoeuvre to remain clear from the other crossing ships. The officer of the deck responsible for navigation and other crew discussed whether to take action but choose not to, till it was too late. While other crew members also failed to provide more situational awareness and input to the officer of the deck. Did the officer of the deck, exhibit poor seamanship by failing to manoeuvre as required, failing to sound the danger signal and failing to attempt to contact CRYSTAL on Bridge to Bridge radio. In addition, the Officer of the Deck did not call the Commanding Officer as appropriate and prescribed by Navy procedures to allow him to exercise more senior oversight and judgment of the situation. This was prescribed to an unsatisfactory level of knowledge of the international rules of the nautical road by USS FITZGERALD officers. Thereby were watch team members not familiar with basic radar fundamentals, impeding effective use. Thereby were key supervisors not aware of existing traffic separation schemes and the expected flow of traffic, as the approved navigation track did not account, nor follow the Vessel Traffic Separation Scheme. Secondary was the automated identification system not used properly. [US Navy(2017)]

D.4 USS JOHN S MCCAIN and MV ALNIC MC

Even more recent is the collision between the USS JOHN S MCCAIN and ALNIC MC on 21 August 2017. The US Destroyer hit the Liberia flagged oil and chemical tanker. Resulting in the death of 10 US Sailors. An illustration of the accident is shown in figure D.4. According to the accident report did the US Navy identify the following causes for the collision: Loss of situational awareness in response to mistakes in the operation of the USS JOHN S MCCAIN's steering and propulsion system, while in the presence of a high density of maritime traffic. Failure to follow the international nautical rules of the road, which govern the manoeuvring of vessels when risk of collision is present. Watchstanders operating the JOHN S MCCAIN's steering and propulsion systems had insufficient proficiency and knowledge of the system.




Figure D.4: Illustration map of approximate collision location

Leading up to the accident did the commanding officer notice that the helmsman had difficulties maintaining course, while also adjusting the throttles for speed control. In response, he ordered the watch team to divide the duties of steering and throttles, maintaining course control with the Helmsman while shifting speed control to another watchstander. This unplanned shift caused confusion within the watch team, which led to wrong transfers of control, where the crew was not aware of. Watchstanders failed to recognize this configuration. The steering control transfer caused the rudder to go amidships (centerline). Since the Helmsman had been steering less than 4 degrees of right rudder to maintain course before the transfer, the amidships rudder deviated the ship's course to the left. Additionally, when the Helmsman reported a loss of steering, the Commanding Officer slowed the ship to 10 knots and eventually to 5 knots. Due to the wrong transfer did only one shaft slow down, causing an un-commanded turn to the left (port). The commanding officer and others on the ship's bridge lost situational awareness. They did not understand the forces acting on the ship, nor did they understand the ALNIC's course and speed relative to USS JOHN S MCCAIN. Three minutes after the reported loss of steering, was it regained, but already too late to avoid a collision. No signals of warning were sent by neither ship, which are required by international rules of the nautical road. Nor was there an attempt to make contact through the VHF bridge-to-bridge communication. Many

of the decisions made that led to the accident were the result of poor judgment and decision making of the commanding officer. That said, no single person bears full responsibility for this incident. The crew was unprepared for the situation in which they found themselves through a lack of preparation, ineffective command and control. Deficiencies in training and preparations for navigation were at the base of this. [US Navy(2017)]

D.5 MV CONTI PERIDOT and MV CARLA MAERSK

The last accident which will be discussed is the collision between MV CONTI PERIDOT and MV CARLA MAERSK on 9th March 2015. At 12:30 central daylight time, the inbound bulk carrier CONTI PERIDOT collided with the outbound tanker CARLA MAERSK in the Houston Ship Channel near Morgan's Point, Texas. The collision occurred in restricted visibility after the pilot on the CONTI PERIDOT was unable to control the heading fluctuations that the bulk carrier was experiencing during the transit. As a result, the CONTI PERIDOT crossed the channel into the path of the CARLA MAERSK. No one on board either ship was injured in the collision, but an estimated 2,100 barrels (88,200 gallons) of methyl tert-butyl ether spilled from the CARLA MAERSK, and the two vessels sustained about \$8.2 million in total damage. In figure D.5 the fluctuations in heading can be seen of the CONTI PERIDOT.




Figure D.5: Illustration map of approximate collision location

Several safety issues were identified by the National Transportation Safety Board. Inadequate bridge resource management: Despite the pilot's difficulty controlling the CONTI PERIDOT's heading leading up to the collision, he and the master did not work together to solve the problem. The pilot did not involve the master because he was unsure whether the master could do anything to help; the master said nothing because he was likely unaware of the vessel's heading fluctuations and may have been generally reluctant to question

the pilot. Insufficient pilot communications: Although the pilot on the CONTI PERIDOT was having difficulty controlling the vessel and had an earlier near-miss meeting with an oncoming ship, he did not alert the pilots on subsequent oncoming vessels, including the CARLA

MAERSK. Lack of predetermined ship movement strategies during restricted visibility in the Houston Ship Channel: On the day of the accident, local pilot associations determined that the increasing fog was significant enough to suspend pilot boardings of inbound ships. However, piloted vessels already under way continued the transit in the fog. Investigators found no existing predetermined ship movement strategy for piloted vessels already under way at the onset of hazardous weather conditions.

The National Transportation Safety Board determines that the probable cause of the collision between bulk carrier Conti Peridot and tanker Carla Maersk in the Houston Ship Channel was the inability of the pilot on the Conti Peridot to respond appropriately to hydrodynamic forces after meeting another vessel during restricted visibility, and his lack of communication with other vessels about this handling difficulty. Contributing to the circumstances that resulted in the collision was the inadequate bridge resource management between the master and the pilot on the Conti Peridot. [NTSB(2016a)][NTSB(2016b)]

D.6 Lessons learned

For example: Proper bridge resource management is key, warning surrounding vessels if there is limited control is important, strategies for movements in failure modes should be predetermined.

Summaries
all
lessons
learned
from the
above
men-
tioned
accidents

E | Experiment questionnaire

- Toestemmings verklaring formulier
-

Part VI

TEMPORARY: Old text

Manoeuvring capability

Ship manoeuvring is the ability to keep course, change course, keep track and change speed. Minimal requirements are given by IMO standard. However, shipowners may introduce additional requirements. Ship manoeuvrability is described by the following characteristics:

- Initial turning ability (start turning)
- Sustained turning ability (keep turning)
- Yaw checking ability (stop turning motion)
- Stopping ability (in rather short distance and time)
- Yaw stability (ability to move straight ahead)

During sea-trials these capabilities can be determined. However this project will aim at predicting manoeuvrability while using limited input. Thereby is there a difference between the maximum limits and what a ship is likely to do. This will eventually lead to the possible movements of the vessel.

IMO standard

The manoeuvrability of a ship is considered satisfactory if the following criteria are complied:

1. *Turning ability.* The advance should not exceed 4.5 ship lengths (L) and the tactical diameter should not exceed 5 ship lengths in the turning circle manoeuvre.
2. *Initial turning ability.* With the application of 10° rudder angle to port or starboard, the ship should not have traveled more than 2.5 ship lengths by the time the heading has changed by 10° from the original heading.
3. *Yaw-checking and course-keeping abilities.*
 - (a) The value of the first overshoot angle in the $10^\circ/10^\circ$ zig-zag test should not exceed:
 - i. 10° if L/V is less than 10 seconds
 - ii. 20° if L/V is 30 seconds or more
 - iii. $(5 + 1/2(L/V))$ degrees if L/V is between 10 and 30 secondswhere L and V are expressed in m and m/s, respectively.
 - (b) The value of the second overshoot angle in the $10^\circ/10^\circ$ zig-zag test should not exceed:

- i. 25° if L/V is less than 10 seconds
 - ii. 40° if L/V is 30 seconds or more
 - iii. $(117.5 + 0.75(L/V))$ degrees if L/V is between 10 and 30 seconds
- (c) The value of the first overshoot angle in the $20^\circ/20^\circ$ zig-zag test should not exceed 25° .
4. *Stopping ability.* The track reach in the full astern stopping test should not exceed 15 ship lengths. However, this value may be modified by the Administration where ships of large displacement make this criterion impracticable, but should in no case exceed 20 ship lengths.

Limits

These standards give guidance during sea trials, but won't help much. What are maximum values for manoeuvring capability. Based on trial run are values found for Nomoto (other theories?)

Wat is constant? Versnelling/vertraging of de afgeleide daarvan

Clarke, D., Gedling, P. and Hine, G. (1983). The application of manoeuvring criteria in hull design using linear theory. The Naval Architect, pp. 45–68

Desired capability

What are normal movements for a ship of a specific size

Expected route

Ship will most likely keep sailing straight and on same speed

Input

Nomoto, more detailed is Norrbin equation

describe formula to determine crossing-point of line

CPA calculation

Detailed capability

Key equipment for the manoeuvrability are rudders, fixed fins, jet thrusters, propellers, ducts and waterjets. However it is not practical to determine this for every ship which is nearby. Therefore a more statistical approach is taken using comparable ships.

Prediction with limited data

Own vessel input comes from sea-trial, other vessels based on received information via AIS. DWT, L, B, speed, etc.

Filter situation

Input from static objects shown on the map

COLREGs

most important COLREG criteria are:

- minimal crossing angle
- minimal distance starboard
- minimal distance portside
- minimal distance rear
- voorkeur port-port side crossing

Traffic separation schemes

input from local authorities

Navigational aids

map/radar/etc.

Accepted probabilities

Which probabilities can be ignored to speed-up calculation

Other filters

Significant wave height/ weather/ windspeed

Abstract model

Ship characteristics

The main block on manoeuvring capability depends on the ship characteristics. Where there is an influence on both feeling of safety, and the physical limitations. For example a ship crossing another vessel could keep sailing straight as long as possible and than make a hard turn, but it rather changes its course earlier in a way where less loss of speed occurs. With a small ship these hard turns are much easier and will most likely occur more often.

Therefore the capability of the ship is split up in three categories, expected location, likely change of course and physically possible route based on physics laws. As a full CFD simulation is hard to do for every ship which is encountered, models will be used to make estimations quickly. Thereby is it important to notice that a high accuracy is not necessary, as those extreme movements have a very low probability to occur. Being a bit conservative here will help to allow for all different scenario's to be tested.

Influencing factors

The same goes for the safe motion parameters. There are regulations on minimal passing distances and how close you should come to others. But good seamanship would be to make intentions clear earlier, so that critical situations can be avoided. Applicability of rules depends on the ship characteristics. Just as with the natural laws, the probability of getting into the extreme situations where regulations are followed but still problems might occur are not likely. The model from Szlapczynski is used, to set the estimated safety domains for each ship. Leading to courses and speeds which are safe to sail [Szlapczynski and Szlapczynska(2017a)]. While also incorporating COLREGs and arbitrary distances for well-clear, which is the distance where everyone feels safe. The COLREGs are also relevant in areas around ports, where traffic separation schemes are used. These should be followed by different types of vessels. This will influence the most likely position for a vessel to be. Incorporating information from traffic controllers will thereby lead to the most likely expected route. The same goes for areas with multiple objects on the map, where ships should follow lanes marked by buoys, and avoid quays, fishing area's, no-go zones, etc. Combining this with ship characteristics will lead to a map where for each vessel is shown, where another ship will likely be. When looked at the highest probability this will show the most likely route for each vessel. Which can be used to advise on the route planning of the own vessel. As the probabilities combined with a threshold will result in a set of possible decisions.

Information and communication

Already mentioned is the impact of other vessels and objects on the probability that a ship will be at a specific location. But to know this impact, information has to be gathered from different parameters. Thereby should be looked if the current parameters are sufficient and can be trusted, or if other equipment or instruments should be installed.

Currently vision and radio communication are very important ways to gather information. These types of information are difficult to gather using computers, currently many researches happen on for example Lidar and other methods. Therefore this research will focus on what information is needed, not how it is gathered. Although developments within technologies to gather this information will be taken into account to develop eventually the strategies. For example related to AIS, VDES and different protocols.

Situational awareness

When combining information, communication, characteristics and possible decisions an image of the situation can be formed. This will be interpreted in a way which enables the right decision making for route-planning. This planned route can be used on autonomous vessels, or be used to advise the crew which decision they should make and what information they should share with others. Mental models will be used to validate if indeed the different vessel have the right information and if enough information is shared. The results from these blocks will be verified with seafarers to validate that the theory corresponds with operations.

Bibliography

- [Arimura et al.(2001)] Hiroki Arimura, Hiroshi Sakamoto, and Setsuo Arikawa. *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence*, volume 2225. 2001. ISBN 3540679154. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-29066-4{-}11.
- [Artyszuk(2016)] Jaroslaw Artyszuk. Inherent Properties of Ship Manoeuvring Linear Models in View of the Full-mission Model Adjustment. *TransNav, the International Journal on Marine Navigation and Safety of Sea Transportation*, 10(4):595–604, 2016. ISSN 2083-6473. doi: 10.12716/1001.10.04.08. URL http://www.transnav.eu/Article{_}Inherent{_}Properties{_}of{_}Ship{_}Manoeuvring{_}Artyszuk, 40,683.html.
- [Backer(2015)] Philippe D E Backer. Report on the joint investigation of the collision between the LNG Carrier mts AL ORAIQ and the mv FLINTERSTAR. Technical Report October, 2015.
- [Bernard Marr(2017)] Bernard Marr. Rolls-Royce And Google Partner To Create Smarter, Autonomous Ships Based On AI And Machine Learning, 2017. URL <https://www.forbes.com/sites/bernardmarr>.
- [Bradshaw et al.(2003)] Jeffrey M. Bradshaw, Maarten Sierhuis, Alessandro Acquisti, Paul Felтовich, Robert Hoffman, Renia Jeffers, Debbie Prescott, Niranjan Suri, Andrzej Uszok, and Ron Van Hoof. Adjustable Autonomy and Human-Agent Teamwork in Practice: An Interim Report on Space Applications. pages 243–280, 2003. ISSN 978-1-4613-4833-7. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4419-9198-0_11. URL http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4419-9198-0{_}11.
- [Carver and Turoff(2007)] Liz Carver and Murray Turoff. Human-computer interaction: The human and computer as a team in emergency management information systems. *Communications of the ACM*, 50(3):33–38, 2007. ISSN 00010782. doi: 10.1145/1226736.1226761.
- [CCNR(2017)] CCNR. Inland AIS devices and electronic chart display systems on the river Rhine. pages 1–94, 2017.
- [Davis(1989)] Fred D. Davis. Perceived Usefulness , Perceived Ease of Use , and User Acceptance of. *Management Information System Research Center*, 13(3):319–340, 1989.
- [Demir et al.(2017)] Mustafa Demir, Nathan J. McNeese, and Nancy J. Cooke. Team situation awareness within the context of human-autonomy teaming. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 46:3–12, 2017. ISSN 13890417. doi: 10.1016/j.cogsys.2016.11.003. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cogsys.2016.11.003>.

- [DNV GL(2011)] DNV GL. Special equipment and systems - nautical safety. *Rules and regulations*, 2011. ISSN 0028-0836. doi: 10.1038/147264c0.
- [Eriksen(2017)] Remi Eriksen. Technology Outlook 2025, 2017. URL <https://to2025.dnvg1.com/>.
- [European Commision(2017)] European Commision. No Title, 2017. URL https://ec.europa.eu/maritimeaffairs/policy/blue{_}growth{_}en.
- [Gregory and Shanahan(2010)] Dik Gregory and Paul Shanahan. *The Human Element*, volume 60. The Stationery Office, 2010. ISBN 9780115531200.
- [Hetherington et al.(2006)] Catherine Hetherington, Rhona Flin, and Kathryn Mearns. Safety in shipping: The human element. *Journal of Safety Research*, 37(4):401–411, 2006. ISSN 00224375. doi: 10.1016/j.jsr.2006.04.007.
- [Hoffman(2018)] Ryan W Hoffman. Sensitivity Analyses of Optimized Attitude Estimators Using Sensor Fusion Solutions for Low- Cost MEMS Configurations. 2018.
- [IMO(1972)] IMO. Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972 (COLREGs), 1972. URL <http://www.imo.org/en/About/conventions/listofconventions/pages/colreg.aspx>.
- [Kalloniatis et al.(2017)] Alexander Kalloniatis, Irena Ali, Timothy Neville, Phuong La, Iain Macleod, Mathew Zuparic, and Elizabeth Kohn. The Situation Awareness Weighted Network (SAWN) model and method: Theory and application. *Applied Ergonomics*, 61:178–196, 2017. ISSN 18729126. doi: 10.1016/j.apergo.2017.02.002. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2017.02.002>.
- [Lyons and Havig(2014)] Joseph B. Lyons and Paul R. Havig. Transparency in a human-machine context: Approaches for fostering shared awareness/intent. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 8525 LNCS(PART 1):181–190, 2014. ISSN 16113349. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-07458-0_18.
- [McMorris et al.(2018)] Terry McMorris, Martin Barwood, Beverley J. Hale, Matt Dicks, and Jo Corbett. Cognitive fatigue effects on physical performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis, 2018. ISSN 00319384. URL <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0031938418300441>.
- [Molland and Turnock(2007)] Anthony Molland and Stephen Turnock. *Marine Rudders and Control Surfaces*. 2007. ISBN 9780750669443. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-7506-6944-3.X5000-8.

- [MUNIN(2016)] MUNIN. About MUNIN, 2016. URL <http://www.unmanned-ship.org/munin/about/>.
- [Nedcon(2013)] Nedcon. Crew structure on board merchant vessels, 2013. URL <http://www.nedcon.ro/crew-structure-board-merchant-vessels-engine-department/>.
- [Neerincx(2008)] M.A. Neerincx. Situated cognitive engineering: Developing adaptive track handling support for naval command and control centers. pages 1–18, 2008.
- [Neerincx and Linderberg(2012)] Mark Neerincx and Jasper Linderberg. Applying the Situated Cognitive Engineering Method - A Comprehensive Guide. 2012. URL http://scetool.nl/sce{_}manual{_}v1.0.pdf.
- [Nieva(2018)] Richard Nieva. Google says it's designing Duplex with 'closure built-in' - CNET, 2018. URL <https://www.cnet.com/news/google-says-its-designing-duplex-with-disclosure-built-in/>.
- [NTSB(2016a)] NTSB. Executive Summary public meeting about collision between bulk carrier Conti Peridot and Tanker Carla Maersk. 2016a.
- [NTSB(2016b)] NTSB. Marine Accident Report - Collision between Bulk Carrier Conti Peridot and Tanker Carla Maersk. *Marine Accident Report*, 2016b.
- [Oliver Cameron(2017)] Oliver Cameron. An Introduction to LIDAR: The Key Self-Driving Car Sensor, 2017. URL <https://news.voyage.auto/an-introduction-to-lidar-the-key-self-driving-car-sensor-a7e405590cff>.
- [Palmer et al.(2007)] A. R. Palmer, D. A. Hall, C. Sumner, D. J K Barrett, S. Jones, K. Nakamoto, and D. R. Moore. Some investigations into non-passive listening. *Hearing Research*, 229(1-2):148–157, 2007. ISSN 03785955. doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2006.12.007.
- [Porathe et al.(2013)] Thomas Porathe, Margareta Lützhöft, and Gesa Praetorius. Communicating intended routes in ECDIS: Evaluating technological change. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 60:366–370, 2013. ISSN 00014575. doi: 10.1016/j.aap.2012.12.012. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2012.12.012>.
- [Porathe et al.(2014)] Thomas Porathe, Johannes Prison, and Y Man. Situation awareness in remote control centres for unmanned ships. *Human Factors in Ship Design & Operation*, (February):1–9, 2014.
- [Rolls-Royce(2015)] Rolls-Royce. Unified Bridge, 2015. URL <https://www.rolls-royce.com/innovation/unified-bridge.aspx{#}overview>.
- [Sames(2017)] Pierre C Sames. Unmanned ships on the horizon - DNV GL, 2017. URL <https://www.dnvgl.com/article/unmanned-ships-on-the-horizon-94273>.

- [SMASH(2017)] SMASH. Elektrisch containerschip Gouwenaar 2, 2017. URL <https://smartshippingchallenge.nl/initiatieven-en-innovaties/elektrisch-containerschip-gouwenaar>.
- [Speier et al.(1999] Cheri Speier, Joseph S Valacich, and Iris Vessey. The Influence of Task Interruption on Individual Decision Making : An Information Overload Perspective. *Decision Sciences*, 30(2):337–360, 1999.
- [Szlapczynski and Szlapczynska(2017a] Rafal Szlapczynski and Joanna Szlapczynska. A method of determining and visualizing safe motion parameters of a ship navigating in restricted waters. *Ocean Engineering*, 129(September 2016):363–373, 2017a. ISSN 00298018. doi: 10.1016/j.oceaneng.2016.11.044. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2016.11.044>.
- [Szlapczynski and Szlapczynska(2017b] Rafal Szlapczynski and Joanna Szlapczynska. Review of ship safety domains: Models and applications. *Ocean Engineering*, 145(August): 277–289, 2017b. ISSN 00298018. doi: 10.1016/j.oceaneng.2017.09.020. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2017.09.020>.
- [Taams(2018)] Hugo Taams. Guidance, Navigation and Control of Autonomous Vessels. Technical report, TU Delft, Delft, 2018.
- [Underwood et al.(2013] Geoffrey Underwood, Athy Ngai, and Jean Underwood. Driving experience and situation awareness in hazard detection. *Safety Science*, 56:29–35, 2013. ISSN 09257535. doi: 10.1016/j.ssci.2012.05.025. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2012.05.025>.
- [US Coast Guard(2018)] US Coast Guard. AIS Messages, 2018. URL <https://www.navcen.uscg.gov/?pageName=AISMessages>.
- [US Navy(2017)] US Navy. Report on the collision between USS Fitzgerald and motor vessel ACX Crystal. Technical report, 2017.
- [Walliser(2011)] James Walliser. *Trust in automated systems the effect of automation level on trust calibration*. PhD thesis, 2011.
- [Washburn and Putney(2001] David A. Washburn and R. Thompson Putney. Attention and task difficulty: When is performance facilitated? *Learning and Motivation*, 32(1):36–47, 2001. ISSN 00239690. doi: 10.1006/lmot.2000.1065.
- [Waterborne(2016)] Waterborne. Waterborne Vision 2030. 2016.
- [Wilson(2017)] Jonathan Wilson. Rolls-Royce Marine unveils 'Electric Blue' modular smart shipping concept, 2017. URL

[https://eandt.theiet.org/content/articles/2017/02/
rolls-royce-marine-unveils-electric-blue-modular-smart-shipping-concept/.](https://eandt.theiet.org/content/articles/2017/02/rolls-royce-marine-unveils-electric-blue-modular-smart-shipping-concept/)