Germanischer Lloyd

Consideration of Appendages for Roll Damping in the Weather Criterion

Tobias Zorn, Vladimir Shigunov, Boris Altmayer

2013-09-23



Contents

1. Introduction WeC & roll damping
2. A_k-factor for central skeg
3. Scale effects for bilge keels

The Weather Criterion (2/2)

- Roll-back angle due to wave action:

$$\varphi 1 = 109 * k * X1 * X2 * \sqrt{r * s} \ [°]$$

Empirical formula based on results from a ships built or planned before 1977.

factor k depends on

$\frac{Ak*100}{LWL*B}$; with Ak = bilge keel area

$\frac{A_k \times 100}{L_{WL} \times B}$	k
0	1.0
1.0	0.98
1.5	0.95
2.0	0.88
2.5	0.79
3.0	0.74
3.5	0.72
≥ 4.0	0.70

What Appendages Contribute to A_k?

- Uncertainty within the community of naval architects about constructional elements to be considered in the calculation of A_k
- IS Code: *total overall area of bilge keels, or area of the lateral projection of the bar keel, or sum of these areas*
- Other appendages, such as centerline keels, skegs, rudder etc. also contribute to damping, so it seems reasonable to include them into A_k
- Whether or not to include, depends on the design and approval practice; question:
  - how different hydrodynamic characteristics of different appendages should be taken into account when A_k is calculated

Example: Central Skeg

- First, to take into account the difference in the lever between the skeg and bilge keel, the “equivalent” bilge keel area was calculated as

$$A_{bk} = A_{skeg} l_{skeg} / l_{bk}$$

where A_{bk} = area of the „equivalent“ bilge keel, l_{skeg} = lever of skeg and l_{bk} = lever of bilge keel

- This reduces the “equivalent” bilge keel area by about 48% of the projected skeg area
- Second, how difference in hydrodynamics can be taken into account?



Central Skeg: Roll Decay Simulations

- RANSE-CFD simulation of roll decay test
- Post-processing: logarithmic decrement

$$\ln\delta = \ln\frac{\phi_{a+}^{(i)}}{\phi_{a+}^{(i+1)}} \text{ vs. } \phi_{a-}^{(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \ln\frac{\phi_{a+}^{(i)}}{\phi_{a-}^{(i+1)}} \text{ vs. } \phi_{a+}^{(i+1)}$$

and damping as percentage of critical damping:

$$\zeta_{\%} = \frac{\ln\delta}{2\pi}100\%$$



Central Skeg: Results

- Skeg does not add any distinguishable roll damping compared to the bare hull
- whereas the bilge keel with the reduced “equivalent” area increases roll damping sufficiently
- Thus, skeg area cannot be taken completely into A_k
- Approval should be done on case-by-case basis



Roll damping as percentage of critical damping for bare hull (○), hull with skeg (■) and hull with “equivalent” bilge keel (▲)

Scale Effects: Introduction (1)

- For ships with parameters outside of applicability limits of weather criterion, MSC.1/Circ.1200 (Interim Guidelines for Alternative Assessment of the Weather Criterion) can be used alternatively
- The *standard alternative procedure* is to define roll-back angle in regular waves $\phi_{1r} \Rightarrow$ no correction for scale effect is possible
- Because direct measurement may require very steep to breaking waves, two alternative methodologies can be used:
  - *three-step methodology* (roll damping defined from roll decay tests or forced roll tests)
  - *parameter-fitting methodology* (customised tests to fine-tune parameters of numerical model, including damping)

  $\Rightarrow$ Both alternative methodologies allow for correction for scale effects: roll damping due to frictional forces on hull can be reduced
- However, none of the procedures considers scale effects for bilge keels

Scale Effects: Introduction (2)

- To reduce scale effect of roll damping due to bilge keels, their breadth should be in model scale greater than 7.0 mm
- In some cases, bilge keels are made deeper than those in full-scale ship to minimise scale effects
- The assumption is that *bilge keels are less efficient in model scale* than in full scale due to relatively larger thickness of boundary layer in model scale
- In the present study, this assumption is checked using RANSE-CFD simulations for an FPSO at zero forward speed for three scales:
  - 1/1 (full scale)
  - 1/85 (model scale)
  - 1/50 (model scale)

Scale Effects: Solution

- To reduce computational effort, 1 m-long cylindical section of the hull was used
- k-ω turbulence model without wall functions was used
- Free surface was not modelled
- Roll motion with 10°-amplitude was imposed; total moment *M*x with respect to rotation axis was computed
- Inertial part of total moment was computed by Fourier transform and subtracted to derive roll-damping part



Geometry

Scale Effects: Moment on Hull
(no integration over bilge keel)



Total moment on hull with respect to *x*-axis vs. time for different scales

Damping part of the moment on hull with respect to *x*-axis vs. time for different scales

Scale Effects: Moment on Bilge Keel alone



Total moment on bilge keel with respect to *x*-axis vs. time for different scales



Damping part of the moment on bilge keel with respect to *x*-axis vs. time for different scales

Scale Effects: Conclusions

- Damping contributions from bilge keel are in this case substantially larger in the model scale than in the full scale
- Reason: the influence of viscosity and vortex separation is more significant in the model scale than in full scale

Scale	Equivalent linear roll damping of bilge keel, N·m·s/rad	Equivalent linear roll damping of bilge keel, % deviation from reference
full scale	$3.017 \cdot 10^8$	0.0
model 1/50	$3.667 \cdot 10^8$	21.5
model 1/85	$3.622 \cdot 10^8$	20.0

Thank you for your attention.

Questions?

Contact:

vladimir.shigunov@gl-group.com