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Preface

This report contains the slides of the presentations at the Aeroelastic Workshop held at Risø-DTU for the wind energy industry in Denmark on October 27, 2011. The scientific part of the agenda at this workshop was

- Detailed and reduced models of dynamic mooring system (Anders M. Hansen)
- Bend-twist coupling investigation in HAWC2 (Taeseong Kim)
- QÜIC – A new aerodynamic airfoil tool including rotational effects (Néstor R. García)
- Influence of up-scaling on loads, control and aerodynamic modeling (Helge Aa. Madsen)
- Aerodynamic damping of lateral tower vibrations (Bjarne S. Kallesøe)
- Open- and closed-loop aeroservoelastic analysis with HAWCStab2 (Morten H. Hansen)
- Design and test of a t hick, flatback, high-lift multi-element airfoil (Frederik Zahle)

The presented results are mainly obtained in the EUDP project “Aeroelastic Optimization of MW Wind Turbines (AeroOpt)” funded under contract no. 63011-0190.
1 Dynamic mooring systems
Detailed and reduced models of dynamic mooring system

Anders M. Hansen and Bjarne S. Kallesøe
Outline

• Introduction
• Full dynamic mooring model
• Load implications of using full model compared to existing QS on floating WT.
• Method to extract reduced ODE model.
• What’s in it for You!
Full dynamic model

- Element outline
  - Elastic bar, 3 DOFs/node
  - External forces from
    - Gravity
    - Buoyancy
    - Added mass
    - Damping (quadratic).
  - Non-linear node
    springs/dampers model bottom contact.
- Discrete mass/buoyancy element
- Constraints to couple it all together
- Implemented in external DLL HAWC2 format
- Wave/current forces missing
Line Animation
Load implications of using dynamic model compared to existing QS on floating WT.

- Compare extreme and fatigue loads for 3 different model complexities:
  - Q-S: Quasi-static model.
  - M1: Dynamic without delta lines.
  - M2: Dynamic with delta lines.
- Normal operation.
- 5 to 23 m/s in 2 m/s steps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ws</th>
<th>[m/s]</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hs</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tp</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>[h]</td>
<td>22460</td>
<td>26068</td>
<td>25102</td>
<td>23340</td>
<td>18958</td>
<td>14123</td>
<td>9708</td>
<td>6182</td>
<td>3657</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1200 seconds simulations, skip first 300 seconds for transients
- 6 different seeds for wind and waves for each wind speed.
Blade Loads

Extreme

Fatigue

All loads are normalized with respect to the quasi-static result.
**Tower Loads**

All loads are normalized with respect to the quasi-static result.
Reduction method

- What does it do and how/where can the result be used
  - Reduces (and linearises) the full model (with many DOFs) to a set of ODEs (with few DOFs), capturing only frequency response up to a user specified threshold. The ODEs can be used in, e.g.
    - Modal based methods, e.g. HAWCStab2
    - Distribution to external parties
    - Simulation models, e.g. HAWC2
Input/output relation derived from HAWC2 simulations

Mooring model in HAWC2

Non-dim displacement of interface point

Non-dim force at interface point
Step 0: Target FRF estimated directly from input/output relation.

Impulse response function estimated by least square + FFT
Step 1: ID of discrete state space model based on input/output relation.

\[ x_{n+1} = A_D x_n + B_D u_n \]

\[ y_n = C_D x_n \]

Amplitude of displacement/force transfer function

Phase of displacement/force transfer function
Step 2: Conversion from discrete state space to continuous time.

\[ x_{n+1} = A_D x_n + B_D u_n \]
\[ y_n = C_D x_n \]

MATLAB, d2c

\[ \dot{x} = A_C x + B_C u \]
\[ y = C_C x \]

Amplitude of displacement/force transfer function

Phase of displacement/force transfer function
Step 3: Modal reduction of NOF states AND similarity transformation – Final form!

\[ \dot{x} = A_C x + B_C u \]
\[ y = C_C x \]

\[
D_f\alpha_f - A_f\alpha_f = \begin{bmatrix} u \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}; \quad \alpha_f = \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}
\]

Amplitude of displacement/force transfer function

Phase of displacement/force transfer function
So, What’s in it for You!

- The external mooring system DLL will be included in the HAWC2 distribution asap. Source code distribution is still an open issue.
- The reduction method (MATLAB m-file) can be forwarded on request – send an email to anmh@risoe.dtu.dk
- The reduction method is general and can be used for other systems than mooring systems – component models based on experiments, perhaps!?  
- We can offer to make reduced models on commercial basis.
2 Bend-twist coupling investigation
A New Beam Element in HAWC2 for Investigating Blade Bending-Twist Coupling Effects

Taeseong Kim
**Introduction**

- All of composite blades have anisotropic material properties due to different layup angles.
- It introduces additional bending-bending and bending-twist couplings.

\[ S_{11} \begin{bmatrix} F_x \\ F_y \\ F_z \\ M_x \\ M_x \\ M_x \end{bmatrix} - S_{12} \begin{bmatrix} M_x \\ M_x \end{bmatrix} = 0 \]

\[ S_{22} S_{33} S_{44} S_{55} S_{66} \]

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_x \\ \varepsilon_y \\ \varepsilon_z \\ \kappa_x \\ \kappa_y \\ \kappa_z \end{bmatrix} \]

±45deg layup angle
Couplings

- A classical Timoshenko beam model (HAWC2)
  - Geometric couplings
    - The offset between elastic axis and shear center
    - Sweep blade
Objective & Method

• Objective
  • Developing a new beam element which can consider anisotropic characteristics
  • Implementing a new beam model into HAWC2
  • Investigating an effect of a structural coupling

• Method
  • General FEM approach
  • 2 nodes element, higher order of the polynomial shape function
  • Importing a cross-sectional stiffness and a mass information
## New structural format

- New structural format (-st file format) is introduced for HAWC2 analysis

### Old format

1 main data sets available

```plaintext
#1 Main data set number 1
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>x_cg</th>
<th>y_cg</th>
<th>z_i</th>
<th>r_i</th>
<th>x_sh</th>
<th>y_sh</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>I_x</th>
<th>I_y</th>
<th>I_p</th>
<th>k_x</th>
<th>k_y</th>
<th>k_pitch</th>
<th>x_e</th>
<th>y_e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[kg/m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[N/m²]</td>
<td>[N/m²]</td>
<td>[N/m⁴]</td>
<td>[N/m⁴]</td>
<td>[N/m⁴]</td>
<td>[N/m⁴]</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>[m²]</td>
<td>[deg]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New format

1 main data sets available

```plaintext
#1 Main data set number 1
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>x_cg</th>
<th>y_cg</th>
<th>z_i</th>
<th>r_i</th>
<th>x_sh</th>
<th>y_sh</th>
<th>El1</th>
<th>El2</th>
<th>El3</th>
<th>El4</th>
<th>El5</th>
<th>El6</th>
<th>El7</th>
<th>El8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[kg/m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>[kN/m]</td>
<td>[kN/m]</td>
<td>[kN/m]</td>
<td>[kN/m]</td>
<td>[kN/m]</td>
<td>[kN/m]</td>
<td>[kN/m]</td>
<td>[kN/m]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Where Exx represents the sectional stiffness matrix element
Results (Case 1)

- Case 1: Blasques et al (2011)
  - $[0^\circ]_T$ Solid square cross section with an arbitrary material

- Purpose: validating whether the new beam model is correctly implemented into HAWC2 or not
Comparisons of the natural frequencies (Case 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>New beam element [Hz]</th>
<th>HAWC2 [Hz]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2.87262 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>$2.87262 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2.87262 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>$2.87262 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1.80466 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$1.80466 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1.80466 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$1.80466 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5.09409 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$5.09409 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$5.09409 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$5.09409 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Results are exactly identical.
Results (Case 2)

- 5MW RWT
- Natural frequency comparisons
  - The new data format is obtained from the original structural data.
  - $E_{11} = kxGA$, $E_{22} = kyGA$, $E_{33} = EA$, ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whole turbine natural frequency (structure)</th>
<th>Blade natural frequency (body)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old version</td>
<td>New version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old version</td>
<td>New version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2.99499E-01</td>
<td>2.99489E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 3.01766E-01</td>
<td>3.01745E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 5.88521E-01</td>
<td>5.88366E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 6.10445E-01</td>
<td>6.09750E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 6.36840E-01</td>
<td>6.36079E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 6.67130E-01</td>
<td>6.66403E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 9.66966E-01</td>
<td>9.66564E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 9.78581E-01</td>
<td>9.78093E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 1.58169E+00</td>
<td>1.57891E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1.69090E+00</td>
<td>1.68696E+00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Small discrepancies occur due to data converting process.
Results (Case 3)

- Objective
  - To check a load reduction potential with whole turbine configuration by considering the structural couplings
  - 5MW RWT

- Assumptions
  - Coupling effects are arbitrarily assigned (No real layup angles)
  - Other stiffness values, diagonal terms, are kept its own values while coupling effects are assigned.
  - Same amount of couplings along the blade span
  - Only flapwise bending – twist coupling is newly added.
  - Nothing changes !!

- Considered wind speed: 7 m/s

- Wind shear, Turbulence (TI: 0.217), Tower shadow
Results (Case 3)

- Producing bending-twist coupling
  - Coupling value

\[ E_{BT} = \alpha \sqrt{EI_f GJ} \quad -1 \langle \alpha \rangle 1 \]


- Example

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
E_{11} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & E_{22} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & E_{33} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & EI_f & 0 & \alpha \sqrt{EI_f GJ} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & E_{55} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha \sqrt{EI_f GJ} & 0 & GJ & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]
Results (Case 3)

- Two examples (1st example case)
  - $\alpha = -0.05$: 1 m flapwise bending (toward tower) results in approximately 0.3deg twist (toward feather) at the blade tip
  - Static analysis with only a blade (cantilevered beam)
Results (Case 3)

- Two examples (2nd example case)
  - $\alpha=-0.17$: 1 m flapwise bending results in approximately 1 deg twist at the blade tip
Results (Case 3)

- Blade equivalent fatigue loads comparison (flapwise and edgewise fatigue loads)
  - **Blue**: -0.3 deg coupling case
  - **Red**: -1 deg coupling case

![Flapwise equivalent fatigue load comparisons](image)

![Edgewise equivalent fatigue load comparisons](image)
Results (Case 3)

- Blade torsional equivalent fatigue load measured from non-pitching axis and blade maximum tip deflection comparisons
  - **Blue**: -0.3\(^\circ\) coupling case
  - **Red**: -1 \(^\circ\) coupling case

![Torsional equivalent fatigue load comparisons (non-pitching axis)](image1)

![Maximum tip deflection comparisons](image2)
Results (Case 3)

- Mechanical power (mean value) comparisons
  - **Blue**: -0.3deg coupling case
  - **Red**: -1 deg coupling case
Results (Case 4)

- Tuned pre-twist
  - Objective: keep the same amount of power production
    check load reduction potential
  - Linear scaling manner

\[
\theta_{new} = \theta_{PT} + (\theta_{PT} \times \beta_{SF})
\]

where \(\theta_{new}\): new pre-twist, \(\theta_{PT}\): given pre-twist, and \(SF\): scaling factor
\(\beta_{SF}=0.35\)
Results (Case 4)

- Tuned pre-twist
Results (Case 4)

- Mechanical power (mean value) comparisons
  - **Blue**: -0.3deg coupling case
  - **Red**: -1 deg coupling case *before tuned*
  - **Green**: -1 deg coupling case *after tuned*
Results (Case 4)

- Blade equivalent fatigue loads comparison after pre-twist tuned (flapwise and edgewise fatigue loads)
  - Blue: -0.3deg coupling case
  - Red: -1 deg coupling case **before tuned**
  - Green: -1 deg coupling case **after tuned**
Results (Case 4)

• Blade torsional equivalent fatigue load measured from non-pitching axis and blade maximum tip deflection comparisons
  • Blue: -0.3deg coupling case
  • Red: -1 deg coupling case before tuned
  • Green: -1 deg coupling case after tuned
Conclusions

- A new beam element is successfully developed and implemented into HAWC2.
  - The beam element is validated before and after implementation.
    - Simple square beam model and 5MW RWT are used for the validations.
    - A new structural format is introduced for the new beam model.

- Bend-Twist coupling parametric studies are performed.
  - 5MW RWT
  - A good potential for load reduction is observed.
  - Higher couplings produce the reduction of the bending stiffness in the real world.
  - Blade re-design process is necessary in order for using bending-twist coupling blade such as pre-twist along the blade span.
  - The coupling effects may result in improving wind turbine performances
    - Increasing the life time of turbine.
    - Reduce materials for blade.
    - Etc.
Thank you for your attention
3 Q³UIC – A new aerodynamic airfoil tool
Q3UIC – A new aerodynamic airfoil tool including rotational effects

Néstor Ramos García
Jens Nørkær Sørensen
Wen Zhong Shen
• INTRODUCTION

• VISCOUS-INVISCID INTERACTION

• COMPUTATIONS AND BENCHMARKING
  o STEADY 2D.
  o UNSTEADY 2D.
  o STEADY 2D WITH VG.
  o STEADY QUASI3D

• POTENTIAL DOUBLE WAKE SOLVER

• CONCLUSIONS
INTRODUCTION

• **Blade-Element Momentum** theory is often used for the design of wind turbines. Required Input: Lift and Drag force coefficients.

• Computer resources are getting more powerful with the years, but it is still behind our limits to realize an active design of wind turbine blades using Navier-Stokes solvers. High cost in computational time.

• **Blade Inboard regions** are producing more power than predicted.

• Rotor is producing more power at high angles of attack due to secondary outward flow, caused by centrifugal pumping.
• A code has been developed during the last three years that can fit our needs:
  – It has to compute accurately steady/unsteady airfoil forces.
  – It has to be fast in order to use it as a design method.
  – It has to take into account rotational effects. Centrifugal and Coriolis forces.

• The code uses the already known concept of UNSTEADY VISCOUS-INVISCID STRONG INTERACTION via transpiration velocity.
  • **Inviscid** flow $\rightarrow$ Unsteady potential flow, panel method.
  • **Viscous** flow $\rightarrow$ Quasi 3-D integral BL equations + Closures.
• **ASSUMPTION OF AN EQUIVALENT FLOW**, where the effects of real flow can be added. Transpiration velocity will take into account the effects of the real flow in the potential flow solver.

\[
v_T = \frac{d}{dx} \int_0^\infty (u_e - u) dz = \frac{d}{dx} (u_e \delta_1)
\]
STEADY VISCOUS
INVISCID SOLVER
**STEADY VI COMPUTATIONS**

- **FFA-W3-211**
- **Re = 1.8x10^6**
- Low Speed Wind Tunnel L2000, KTH.
NACA 63-2xx: 15 %, 18 % and 21 % thickness

$Re = 3.0 \times 10^6$

NASAs low-turbulence pressure tunnel.

NACA 4412

N.A.C.A Variable-Density Wind Tunnel.

Pinkerton, 1938
UNSTEADY VISCOSOUS INVISCID SOLVER SINGLE WAKE
• NACA 0015
• Re = 1.5x10^6
• k_A = 0.1
• α_m = 13.37° A = 7.55°

- University of Glasgow, G.U Aero Report 9221.


- Unsteady Viscous-Inviscid strong coupling code.
VG MODELLING
VG MODELLING WITH Q³UIC

\[ u_e \]

\[ y \]

\[ x \]

\[ VG \]

\[ C_F \]

\[ 5 \times 10^{-3} \]

\[ 0 \]

\[ 0.2 \]

\[ 0.4 \]

\[ 0.6 \]

\[ 0.8 \]

\[ 1 \]

\[ 0 \]

\[ 0.2 \]

\[ 0.4 \]

\[ 0.6 \]

\[ 0.8 \]

\[ 1 \]

\[ 0 \]

\[ 0.2 \]

\[ 0.4 \]

\[ 0.6 \]

\[ 0.8 \]

\[ 1 \]

\[ 1 \]

\[ 1.2 \]

\[ 1.4 \]

\[ 1.6 \]

\[ 1.8 \]

\[ 2 \]

\[ x/c \]

\[ x/c \]

\[ H \]

\[ Plain \]

\[ VG 0.03c \]
 VG MODELLING WITH $Q^3$UIC

![Graphs showing C_L and C_D vs. angle of attack (α) for different conditions and models.](image)

- **GAW(2) Re 2.2x10^6**
  - EXP PLAIN
  - EXP VG x/c = 0.3
  - $Q^3$UIC PLAIN
  - $Q^3$UIC VG x/c = 0.3

- **FFA-W3-241 Re 1.6x10^6**
  - EXP PLAIN
  - EXP x/c = 0.2
  - EXP x/c = 0.1
  - $Q^3$UIC PLAIN
  - $Q^3$UIC x/c = 0.2
  - $Q^3$UIC x/c = 0.1
Q3D STEADY VISCOUS INVISCID SOLVER
• Dimensional variables of interest in rotational study: \( c, r, \Omega, V_w \)

• In order to proceed with a parametric study of the rotational effects in a wind turbine blade, two variables are defined:

1. The ratio between the chord length and the radial position,

\[
ls = \frac{c}{r}
\]

2. The ratio between the rotational speed and the relative velocity,

\[
RO = \frac{\Omega r}{U_{rel}}
\]

Where \( \Omega \) is the blade angular velocity, \( U_{rel} \) is defined typically,

\[
U_{rel} = \sqrt{((1 + a')\Omega r)^2 + ((1 - a)V_w)^2}
\]

The four dimensional variables of interest are reduced to two adimensional parameters \( ls \) & \( RO \), base for our parametric study.
QUASI-3D BOUNDARY LAYER

RO = 0.6

RO = 0.7

RO = 0.8

RO = 0.9

$C_L$ vs $\alpha$

$2D$ EXP

$c/r = 0.1$
$c/r = 0.6$
$c/r = 0.7$
$c/r = 0.8$
$c/r = 0.9$

$C_L$ vs $\alpha$

$2D$ EXP

$c/r = 0.1$
$c/r = 0.6$
$c/r = 0.7$
$c/r = 0.8$
$c/r = 0.9$

$C_L$ vs $\alpha$

$2D$ EXP

$c/r = 0.1$
$c/r = 0.6$
$c/r = 0.7$
$c/r = 0.8$
$c/r = 0.9$
• Artificial rotor.
• S809 Airfoil.
• Re 1e6.
• R = 10 m.
• Ω = 70 rpm.

• Tip speed ratio, \( \lambda = \frac{\Omega R}{Q_w} \)
  
  • \( Q_w = 12.20 \text{ m/s} \rightarrow \lambda = 6 \)
  • \( Q_w = 8.14 \text{ m/s} \rightarrow \lambda = 9 \)
  • \( Q_w = 6.11 \text{ m/s} \rightarrow \lambda = 12 \)
QUASI-3D BOUNDARY LAYER

\[ \lambda = 6 \]

\[ \alpha = 12 \]
\[ \alpha = 8 \]
\[ \alpha = 4 \]

\[ CL \]

\[ \frac{r}{R} \]

\[ \lambda = 12 \]

\[ \frac{r}{R} \]

\[ CL \]

\[ \frac{x_{SEP}}{r} \]

\[ \lambda = 12 \]

\[ \frac{x_{SEP}}{r} \]
DOUBLE WAKE
POTENTIAL SOLVER
DOUBLE WAKE MODEL
DOUBLE WAKE MODEL

SINGLE WAKE MODEL
- **ATTACHED BL.**
- **LIGHT STALL**

DOUBLE WAKE MODEL
- **FULLY SEPARATED BL.**
- **DEEP STALL**
CONCLUSIONS

• VISCIOUS INVISCID SOLVER IMPLEMENTED
  – STEADY 2D
  – UNSTEADY 2D
  – STEADY 2D VG
  – STEADY Q3D

• DOUBLE WAKE POTENTIAL SOLVER IMPLEMENTED
  – DEEP STALL CONDITIONS
THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION.
4 Influence of up-scaling
Influence of up-scaling on loads, control and aerodynamic modeling

Loading from turbulence

Helge Aagaard Madsen
Flemming Rasmussen
Torben J. Larsen
Vasilis Riziotis (NTUA, Greece)

Wind Energy Division
Programme of Aeroelastic Design
Risø DTU

hma@risoe.dtu.dk
The subject

Shear and turbulence in inflow

Ratio between rotor size and the atmospheric boundary layer height and turbulence scales increases
Rotational sampling of turbulence

Do we model the 1p, 2p etc. aerodynamics accurately?

- 1p, 2p ... variations in induction not modeled in some BEM codes used by industry

The BEM model is based on the Galuert propeller theory - probably not originally intended to be used on rotors of 100m D or more in atmospheric turbulent flow.
Rotational sampling of turbulence

Test of turbulence

pos: (0,0,-153) -- 0 deg.
pos: (-63,0,-90) -- 90 deg.
pos: (0,0,-27) -- 180 deg.
pos: (63,0,-90) -- 270 deg.
v_y -- radius 63 m
rot/pos.
Objectives

Study the influence of up-scaling of rotors operating in turbulent inflow on:

- the aerodynamic loading characteristics
- control aspects
- aerodynamic and aeroelastic modeling requirements
Approach

- Four turbines with a rotor size of 25m, 50m, 100m and 200m were modeled in HAWC2aero (no structural dynamics) based on a direct scaling of the 5MW reference wind turbine rotor. The tip speed was kept constant at 60.5 m/s.
- A turbulence box with the dimension of 200m x 200m x 11200m was generated with number of points equal to 64 x 64 x 4096 and a wind speed of 8 m/s.
- A tower height of 120 m was used for all turbines and no wind shear.
- A simulation time of 1300 sec. was used and the first 100 sec. excluded.
- Only one wind speed at 8 m/s was simulated at a turbulence intensity of 15%.
- No turbine speed and pitch control was used.
Analysis

- Rotational sampling of turbulence
- Rotor thrust and power
- Flapwise blade root moment
- Control aspects
- Impact on model requirements
The rotational sampling of the turbulence concentrates part of the turbulent energy on 1p, 2p etc.
The contribution comes from frequencies below 1p due to the spatial averaging of the turbulence over the rotor area.
The effect will thus increase with increasing rotor size and a considerable part of the total turbulent input for the 200 m rotor is now on 1p.
Results - thrust

Spectra of thrust (normalized with their mean value squared) for the different rotors.

The thrust load input is found on 3p, 6p etc. and the concentrated energy is from frequencies below 3p.
Results – flapwise moment

Spectra of flapwise moment (normalized with their mean value squared) for the different rotors.

The flapwise load input is found on 1p, 2p, 3p etc. and as for the wind speed the concentrated energy is from frequencies below 1p.
The ratio (std.dev./mean) denoted intensity is seen to decrease for the power and thrust and to some degree also for flapwise moment, due to the spatial averaging of the instantaneous forces over the swept area.
Results – time trace of thrust

200m rotor

25m rotor
Results – rotor power

200m rotor

25m rotor
Results – flapwise moment

200m rotor

![Graph of flapwise moment for 200m rotor]

25m rotor

![Graph of flapwise moment for 25m rotor]
Loads on upscaled wind turbines – full aeroelastic simulations from NTUA

1Hz equivalent loads

- Pitch controller parameters not tuned
- Reduction of tower moment with increasing size
- Pitch controller parameters tuned

Better power quality
The influence on control is that a cyclic pitch control system, which alleviates 1p loads, will be relatively more efficient for increasing rotor size.
Results – impact on aerodynamic model requirements
Results – impact on aerodynamic model requirements

**Impact on loading:** slightly reduced fatt. loading with dynamic induction -- increased impact for e.g. half wake simulations with the Dynamic Wake Meandering model
Conclusions

- The upscaling of rotors has the influence that a bigger and bigger part of the turbulence is concentrated at 1p, 2p and 3p and the energy is taken from the spectrum at frequencies below 1p due to the spatial averaging effect of the rotor.

- This means that it becomes more important to simulate more accurate the 1p, 2p variations of e.g. induced flow better as a bigger part of the total turbulence is centered on the p’s.

- The quantities such as power and thrust which are integrated values over the rotor swept area show a decrease in dynamic content relative to the mean value as function of up-scaling due to this filtering effect.

- Impact on control is that control algorithms directed to reduce 1p loads (cyclic pitch) should be better and better for increased rotor size.
THANK YOU
5 Aerodynamic damping of tower vibrations
Aerodynamic damping of lateral tower vibrations

Bjarne S. Kallesøe
Niels N. Sørensen
Niels Troldborg
Outline

- Motivation
- Aerodynamic damping of lateral rotor oscillations
- Aerodynamic damping of lateral tower mode
Motivation

- First lateral tower mode is excited by waves in some simulations cases leading to design giving loads
- Aeroelastic codes are based on BEM
- BEM predicted the aerodynamic damping of the lateral tower mode to be very low
- It has been questioned if BEM gives the correct aerodynamic forces for these lateral motions of the rotor
- **In this work** the aerodynamic work on lateral harmonic rotor motions are computed by both BEM and CFD (full rotor and actuator line)
Computational setup

- NREL 5 MW Reference turbine
- Pure lateral harmonic motion of the rotor
- 1 m amplitude, 0.3 Hz
- Three different wind speeds: 6 m/s, 12 m/s and 22 m/s
- Computational methods:
  - BEM, as implemented in HAWC2 (BEM)
  - Full rotor CFD in EllipSys3D (CFD)
  - Actuator line in EllipSys3D (AL)
- Integrating the lateral aerodynamic forces from each blade
Lateral aerodynamic forces

6 m/s

12 m/s

22 m/s

Aerodynamic work per cycle

Wind speed [m/s]
Aerodynamic work per cycle

- Large relative differences for low wind speeds
- Good agreement for higher wind speeds
- Much smaller aerodynamic work for low wind speed than for high wind speed
- The added mass has no influence on the results!
Relating aerodynamic work to damping

Considering an one DOF modal description of the tower mode: \( m\ddot{x} + c\dot{x} + kx = 0 \)

The aerodynamic work is given by: \( W = \int_{x}^{x+\Delta x} c \dot{x} dx \)

Assuming harmonic oscillations: \( x = A \sin(\omega t) \Rightarrow W = \int_{t}^{t+2\pi/\omega} c A^2 \omega^2 \cos^2(\omega t) dt = A^2 c \omega^2 \pi \)

Whereby the relation between aerodynamic work and damping can be established: \( \beta / W = 16A^2 f^3 m \pi^4 = A^2 C \)
Aerodynamic damping of pure lateral tower mode

\[ \beta = A^2 CW^{-1} \]

- The damping at 6 m/s is so small that the relative large difference between methods are of no particle interest.
Aerodynamic damping of real lateral tower mode

- Longitudinal component in the lateral tower mode
- Rotation of the rotor has a large contribution to the damping, this may be different with a free-free drive train model
Conclusion

- Some differences in lateral aerodynamic forces at low wind speeds
- But forces and damping is so low, so differences has no practical implications
- All computational method agree well for higher wind speeds, where force level is higher
- Aerodynamic damping of lateral tower vibrations are low (1-2 %)
6 Closed-loop aeroservoelastic analysis
Open- and closed-loop aero-servo-elastic analysis with HAWCStab2

Morten Hartvig Hansen and Ivan B. Sønderby

Outline:
• Aero-servo-elastic model in HAWCStab2
• Example: Tuning of collective and cyclic pitch controllers
• Reduced order models from HAWCStab2
Aeroelastic model

• Nonlinear kinematics based on co-rotational Timoshenko elements.

• Blade Element Momentum coupled with unsteady aerodynamics based on Leishman-Beddoes.

• Uniform inflow to give a stationary steady state that approximates the mean of the periodic steady state.

• Analytical linearization about the stationary steady state that include the linearized coupling terms from the geometrical nonlinearities.
Linear open-loop aeroelastic equations

\[
M \ddot{x}_s + (C + G + C_a) \dot{x}_s + (K + K_{sf} + K_a) x_s + A_f x_a = F_s
\]

\[
\dot{x}_a + A_d x_a + C_{sa} \dot{x}_s + K_{sa} x_s = F_a
\]

\(x_s = \) elastic and bearing degrees of freedom
\(x_a = \) aerodynamic state variables
\(F_s, F_a = \) forces due to actuators and wind disturbance

Open-loop first order equations

\[
\dot{x} = Ax + B_{act} u + B_{wind} \begin{bmatrix} v_{\text{mean}} \\ v_{\text{ver}} \\ v_{\text{hor}} \end{bmatrix}
\]
Closed-loop aero-servo-elastic equations

Additional output matrices

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= Ax + B_{act}u + B_{wind} \begin{bmatrix} v_{\text{mean}} \\ v_{\text{ver}} \\ v_{\text{hor}} \end{bmatrix} \\
y &= Cx + Du
\end{align*}
\]

Additional (PID) controller states

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_c &= A_c x_c + B_c y \\
u &= K_g x_c
\end{align*}
\]

Closed-loop equations

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x} \\ \dot{x}_c \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} A & B_{act} K_g \\ B_c C & A_c + B_c D K_g \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ x_c \end{bmatrix} + B_{wind} \begin{bmatrix} v_{\text{mean}} \\ v_{\text{ver}} \\ v_{\text{hor}} \end{bmatrix} \\
y &= Cx + DK_g x_c
\end{align*}
\]

Risø DTU, Technical University of Denmark
Aeroelastic Workshop, October 27
2011
Example: Collective and cyclic pitch controllers
Closed-loop aero-servo-elastic equations

\[
\dot{x} = Ax + B_{\text{act}} \begin{pmatrix} Q_{\text{gen}} \\ \theta_{\text{col}} \\ \theta_{\text{cos}} \\ \theta_{\text{sin}} \end{pmatrix} + B_{\text{wind}} \begin{pmatrix} v_{\text{mean}} \\ v_{\text{ver}} \\ v_{\text{hor}} \end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
\dot{x}_c = A_c x_c + B_c y
\]

\[
y = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta \Omega \\ m_{\text{tilt}} \\ m_{\text{yaw}} \end{pmatrix} = C x
\]

\[
x_c = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta \tilde{\Omega} \\ \Delta \dot{\tilde{\Omega}} \\ \phi \\ \tilde{m}_{\text{tilt}} \\ \dot{\tilde{m}}_{\text{tilt}} \\ M_{\text{tilt}} \\ \tilde{m}_{\text{yaw}} \\ \dot{\tilde{m}}_{\text{yaw}} \\ M_{\text{yaw}} \end{pmatrix}^T
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix} Q_{\text{gen}} \\ \theta_{\text{col}} \\ \theta_{\text{cos}} \\ \theta_{\text{sin}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ k_P & 0 & k_I & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & k_P \cos \psi_0 & 0 & k_I \cos \psi_0 & k_P \sin \psi_0 & 0 & k_I \sin \psi_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -k_P \sin \psi_0 & 0 & -k_I \sin \psi_0 & k_P \cos \psi_0 & 0 & k_I \cos \psi_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x_c
\]

Tuning parameters

- P-gain on speed: $k_P$
- I-gain on speed: $k_I$
- Lead angle: $\psi_0$
- P-gain on cyclic: $k_{Pc}$
- I-gain on cyclic: $k_{Ic}$

Filter frequencies

Filter damping ratios

---

Risø DTU, Technical University of Denmark

Aeroelastic Workshop, October 27

2011
Lead angle from open-loop analysis

\[ \theta_{\text{cos}} \rightarrow \begin{cases} m_{\text{tilt}} \\ m_{\text{yaw}} \end{cases} \]

Response to cosine pitch variations

NREL 5 MW turbine
Open and closed-loop wind shear response

\[ k_P = 0.9 \text{ rad/(rad/s)} \]
\[ k_I = 0.5 \text{ rad/rad} \]
\[ \psi_0 = 28 \text{ deg} \]
\[ k_P^c = 1.0 \text{ deg/MNm} \]
\[ k_I^c = 1.0 \text{ deg/MNm/s} \]
Aero-servo-elastic modes and damping

\[ k_p = 0.9 \text{ rad/(rad/s)} \]
\[ k_I = 0.5 \text{ rad/rad} \]
\[ \psi_0 = 28 \text{ deg} \]
\[ k_{Pc} = 1.0 \text{ deg/MNm} \]
\[ k_{Ic} = 1.0 \text{ deg/MNm/s} \]
HAWC2 simulations at 17 m/s with NTM

- Flapwise moment [MNm]
- Pitch angle [deg]
  - No cyclic pitch
  - With cyclic pitch

Time [s]
Cyclic controller induced instability

\[ k_P = 0.9 \text{ rad/(rad/s)} \]
\[ k_I = 0.5 \text{ rad/rad} \]
\[ \psi_0 = 28 \text{ deg} \]
\[ k_P^C = 1.0 \text{ deg/MNm} \]
\[ k_I^C = 1.3 \text{ deg/MNm/s} \]
Validation of transfer functions with HAWC2

\[ \Delta \theta_p \text{ to } \Delta \Omega \]

\[ \Delta Q_{\text{gen}} \text{ to } \Delta \Omega \]

Amplitude [RPM / deg]

Amplitude [RPM / 1kN/m]

Phase [deg]

Excitation freq [Hz]
Validation of low order models

Methods: “mt” = Modal truncation and “br” = Balanced residualization
Summary

• HAWCStab2 can be used for performing open-loop and closed-loop eigenvalue and frequency-domain analysis of three-bladed turbines:
  – Controller equations are still hardcoded. A suitable interface is under consideration, for example based on DLLs as in HAWC2.
  – Full order analyses can be performed both inside or outside HAWCStab2 by writing out system matrices for each operation point.
  – Reduced order modelling capabilities are currently performed outside HAWCStab2. Automated procedures for obtaining models with desired details will be implemented in HAWCStab2, or in Matlab scripts.

• HAWCStab2 is a common tool for both control engineers and mechanical engineers:
  – It can provide first-principle models for model-based controllers.
  – It can explain phenomena observed in load simulations.
7 Thick, flatback, high-lift multi-element airfoil
Design and test of a thick, flatback, high-lift multi-element airfoil

Frederik Zahle, Mac Gaunaa, Christian Bak, Niels N. Sørensen

Wind Energy Division · Risø DTU

27 October 2011
Introduction
The aim of this work has been to design and test a high lift airfoil for validation of numerical codes.

**Airfoil properties**
- Two elements: Main airfoil and a slat.
- 40% thick main element, flatback.
- 30% chord slat.
- Lift coefficient $> 3$

**This presentation**
- Numerical optimization method used to design the multi-element airfoil.
- Final design and predicted performance of the multi-element airfoil.
- Wind tunnel setup.
- Preliminary comparisons of numerical results and wind tunnel measurements.
- Flow visualization.
Introduction

Why are we interested in high-lift airfoils for the root?

- Madsen et al. showed that the neglection of the rotational effects in standard BEM formulations could potentially lead to designs with a less than optimal power production, since the root was not loaded sufficiently.
- Johansen et al. designed a rotor for maximum power production where a $C_P$ of 0.515 was achieved.
- This rotor had significantly higher loading towards the root than conventional rotors.
- Main drawback: Very large root chords.
- Gaunaa et al. explore the subject of high root loading further and show that at 20% radius the loading should be approx. 1.7 times that of the reference rotor used.
Introduction

Why multi-element airfoils?

Motivation

♦ One way to achieve high loading is to increase the chord.
♦ This is not desirable for many reasons: e.g. increased extreme loads, limitations on transport height, material costs.
♦ Multi-element airfoils can produce high lift coefficients even with thick airfoil sections.
♦ With very high lift coefficients the chord can be reduced even further, reducing extreme loads.
Introduction

How to design a multiple element airfoil?

Challenge

- Current in-house airfoil design codes were not adapted to handle multiple elements.
- Gaunaa et al. used a panel code to optimize the shape of a slatted airfoil.
- Performance subsequently evaluated using 2D CFD.
- Problem: panel code not sufficiently accurate.
- Our choice: Optimization code coupled with the 2D CFD solver Ellipsys2D.
The optimization method developed for this work was programmed in Matlab.

Bounded Nelder-Mead Simplex (\texttt{fminsearchbnd}).

Ellipsys2D is used to evaluate the cost function.

Cost function

Composed of three factors:

- The function $A_1$, which evaluates the lift-to-drag ratio at the target angle of attack.

- The function $A_2$, which seeks to maximize the lift coefficient at some angle of attack, which the optimizer is free to tune.

- A penalty function which forces the optimizer towards achieving the desired lift coefficient, $C_{l,\text{target}}$, at the specified target angle of attack, $\alpha_{\text{target}}$. 
Method
Design Method

Cost function

\[ CostFun = -Penalty \left( A_1 + A_2 \right) \]  (1)

\[ A_1 = \frac{C_l(\alpha_{\text{target}})}{C_d(\alpha_{\text{target}})} \cdot \frac{1}{(C_l/C_d)_{\text{target,ref}}} \cdot K_{\text{optim}} \]  (2)

\[ A_2 = \frac{C_l(\alpha)}{C_{l,\text{max,ref}}} \cdot (1 - K_{\text{optim}}) \]  (3)

\[ Penalty = \exp \left( -\frac{(C_l(\alpha_{\text{target}}) - C_l,\text{target})^2}{2\sigma_{\text{penalty}}} \right) \]  (4)

\( K_{\text{optim}} \) is a factor which biases the cost function towards either the target lift coefficient or lift-to-drag ratio.

- In this work there is no target angle of attack. \( C_l \) was maximized while ensuring high lift-to-drag ratio at \( \alpha_{C_l,\text{max}} \) -5 deg.
- For each optimization iteration two design evaluations were thus needed.
Method

Design variables

- Angle of attack,
- Position of slat trailing edge measured as:
  - Surface distance along main aerofoil surface from leading edge,
  - Normal distance from main aerofoil surface to slat trailing edge.
- Slat angle relative to main aerofoil.
- Slat camber (parabolic curve).
Method

Design evaluation using EllipSys2D

Mesh generation of multi-elements has been automized using Bash/fortran/HypGrid2D.

Figure: Typical meshes generated using the automated meshing scripts, left: standard patched grid, right: overset grid.
Communication between Matlab and EllipSys2D was handled from a series of Bash scripts that read files written by each code.

Matlab ran in the background, outputting for each optimization step a file containing the coordinates of the slat as well as the required angle of attack.

EllipSys was executed in parallel for maximum speed, and subsequently returned values of $C_l$ and $C_d$ for the given configuration.

Optimization was converged in approximately 100 optimization iterations, i.e. 200 EllipSys2D evaluations. $\approx$ 10 hours on 19 CPUs.
Results

**Flaback Airfoil**

The present study is based on the FFA-W3-360 aerofoil which was modified in the following manner:

- Increased thickness from 36% chord to 40% chord,
- Opening of trailing edge from 3.6% chord to 5.6% chord.
Results

Flaback Airfoil Performance

[Graphs showing airfoil performance metrics such as lift coefficient (C_l) and drag coefficient (C_d) as a function of incidence.]

Ell turb
Ell TI=0.05%
Ell TI=0.1%
Ell TI=0.2%
Ell TI=0.3%
Results

Slat Optimization

- Chosen slat baseline airfoil: FFA-W3-360.
- Chord length relative to main airfoil: 30%.
Slat Optimization

Four optimizations with different values of $k_{\text{optim}}$ were carried out.
Results

Slat Optimization - final design

K_{optim}=0.25 optimization yielded the best overall results.
Results

Predicted Slat Performance

2D lift coefficient and lift to drag ratio as function of incidence for fully turbulent and transitional boundary layers.
Results

Predicted Slat Performance

Parameter study

- Using the optimized slat shape a parameter study was carried out to determine the performance of the slat within the grid shown below.
- For each grid position the slat angle was optimized to minimize the cost function.
- $42 \times 60 = 2520$ EllipSys2D simulations.
- All carried out using a coarser grid than for the actual optimization (grid level 2).
Contours of maximum lift coefficient.
Results

Predicted Slat Performance

Contours of L/D at $\alpha_{C_{\text{max}}}$.
Results

Predicted Slat Performance

Contours of lift coefficient at $\alpha_{C_{lmax}}$ -5 deg.
Results

Predicted Slat Performance

Contours of L/D at $\alpha_{C_{max}}$ -5 deg.
Results

Predicted Slat Performance

Contours of velocity magnitude over the isolated main airfoil at 16 deg. AOA.
What makes the slat work so well?

- Best performance of the slat was found to be in the region where the flow acceleration over the suction side of the main airfoil was greatest.
- The flow disturbance at the slat TE results in a camber effect or modification of the local kutta condition, increasing the obtainable lift.
- The low pressure at the slat TE reduces the needed pressure recovery of the flow over the slat, allowing for much greater suction peaks than on conventional airfoils.
- The suction peak on the main airfoil is completely removed, requiring only a small pressure recovery for the flow on the main element.
- The airfoil can thus maintain attached flow up to much greater angles of attack due to these effects and hence produce very high lift.
- The positioning of the slat can thus be narrowed down considerably by studying the flow over the isolated main airfoil.
Wind Tunnel Setup

Test setup designed by LM Wind Power.
- The slat was hinged at its leading edge.
- Could be moved within limits of a grid with $8 \times 8$ holes with 10 mm spacing.
- Slat angle $\beta$ could be changed steplessly.
Another parameter study was carried out to determine the performance of the slat within the test setup grid.

For each grid position the slat angle was optimized to minimize the cost function.

$81 \times 60 = 4860$ EllipSys2D simulations.

All carried out using a coarser grid than for the actual optimization (grid level 2).
Results

Wind Tunnel Experiment Plan

Parameter study
Results

Wind Tunnel Experiment Plan

![Diagram](image)

- OptimVar
  - -0.5
  - -0.55
  - -0.6
  - -0.65
  - -0.7
  - -0.75
  - -0.8
  - -0.85
  - -0.9
  - -0.95
  - -1

- X: -0.25 to 0
- Y: -0.05 to 0.1

Design and test of a thick, flatback, high-lift multi-element airfoil
Aeroelastic Workshop
The wind tunnel campaign was split into two parts:

- **Flatback airfoil:**
  - Clean, four Reynolds numbers: 1, 2, 3 and $4 \times 10^6$,
  - Roughness, Vortex generators, Gurney flaps.

- **Slatted airfoil:**
  - Clean, four Reynolds numbers: 1, 2, 3 and $4 \times 10^6$,
  - Seven slat positions,
  - Slat angle variations at five positions,
  - Roughness, Vortex generators, Gurney flaps at slat one position.
  - Flow visualization using wool tufts.
Preliminary data!

- The data from the experiment presented here are preliminary and not corrected for tunnel effects.
- Only selected data will be shown.
- Profile geometries as well as all data will be published and available to the public.
Wind Tunnel Results
Isolated flatback airfoil

Measurement sources - lift coefficient

- To measure the lift either the airfoil pressure (AP), the load cell (LC) or the wall pressure (WP) was used.
- Good agreement up to 5 deg. AOA (except for LC offset).

![Graph showing lift coefficient vs. angle of attack for different measurement sources.](image)
Wind Tunnel Results
Isolated flatback airfoil

Measurement sources - drag coefficient

- To measure the drag either the airfoil pressure (AP), the load cell (LC) or the wake rake (WR) was used.
- Drag behaves as expected for AOA < 5 deg.: $C_D_{AP} < C_D_{WR}$
- For AOA > 5 deg. AP and LC drag increase drastically.
Wind Tunnel Results
Isolated flatback airfoil

Comparison to EllipSys2D

- Variation of TI in EllipSys2D simulations: low TI simulations agree well with experiment for AOA < 5 deg.
- For AOA > 5 deg. TI > 0.2% appears to be in better agreement.
Wind Tunnel Results
Isolated flatback airfoil

Comparison to EllipSys2D

- Variation of TI in EllipSys2D simulations: low TI simulations agree well with experiment for AOA < 5 deg.
- For AOA > 5 deg. TI>0.2% appear to be in better agreement.
Wind Tunnel Results
Isolated flatback airfoil

Variation of Reynolds number - Experimental results only

- Increasing Re reduces $C_{l_{-}}^{max}$.

![Graph showing the variation of $C_l$ with angle of attack for different Reynolds numbers (Re=1x10^6, Re=2x10^6, Re=3x10^6, Re=4x10^6).]
Wind Tunnel Results

Isolated flatback airfoil

Roughness

- Roughness tape was mounted at various chordwise positions.

![Graph showing lift coefficient vs. angle of attack for different roughness conditions.](image)
Devices

- The flatback airfoil was tested with vortex generators and Gurney flaps.

![Graph showing the effects of vortex generators (VG) and Gurney flaps (GF) on lift coefficient ($C_l$) as a function of angle of attack ($\alpha$) for different configurations with airfoil Reynolds number ($Re$) of $2 \times 10^6$. The graph compares smooth and VG/GF cases with different x/c ratios and Gurney flap sizes.]
Wind Tunnel Results
Flatback with slat airfoil

Reference position 5E

- Variation of TI in EllipSys2D simulations: Lift coefficient vs angle of attack at the reference position 5E with reference $\beta = -29.35$ deg.
- All simulations show on the following slides were carried out with TI=0.2%.
Wind Tunnel Results
Flatback with slat airfoil

Reference position 5E

Position 5E with reference $\beta = -29.35$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
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Position 5E with reference $\beta = -29.35$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
Wind Tunnel Results
Flatback with slat airfoil

Reference position 5E

Position 5E with reference $\beta = -29.35$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
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Flatback with slat airfoil

Reference position 5E

Position 5E with reference $\beta = -29.35$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
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Flatback with slat airfoil

Reference position 5E

Position 5E with reference $\beta$ = -29.35 deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
Wind Tunnel Results
Flatback with slat airfoil

Reference position 5E

Position 5E with reference $\beta = -29.35$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
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Wind Tunnel Results
Flatback with slat airfoil

Position 7F

Position 7F with reference $\beta = -34.2$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
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Flatback with slat airfoil

Position 7F

Position 7F with reference $\beta=-34.2$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
Wind Tunnel Results
Flatback with slat airfoil

Position 7F

Position 7F with reference $\beta = -34.2$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.

- $\beta = -34.2$ deg.
- AOA = 22 deg.

Pos = $\Phi$, $\beta = -34.2$ deg., AOA = 22 deg.

EllipSys2D Experiment

Frederik Zahle et al.
Rise DTU
Wind Tunnel Results
Flatback with slat airfoil

Position 7A

Position 7A with reference $\beta = -29.4$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
Position 7A

Position 7A with reference $\beta = -29.4\,\text{deg.}$ showing contributions from main, slat and total.
Wind Tunnel Results
Flatback with slat airfoil

Position 7A

Position 7A with reference $\beta = -29.4$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
Wind Tunnel Results
Flatback with slat airfoil

Position 1C

Position 1C with reference $\beta = -23.7$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
Position 1C

Position 1C with reference $\beta = -23.7$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
Wind Tunnel Results

Flatback with slat airfoil

Position 1C

Position 1C with reference $\beta=-23.7$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
Wind Tunnel Results
Flatback with slat airfoil

Position 3H

Position 3H with reference $\beta = -29.4\,\text{deg.}$ showing contributions from main, slat and total.

---

Frederik Zahle et al.
Rise DTU

Design and test of a thick, flatback, high-lift multi-element airfoil
Aeroelastic Workshop
Position 3H

Position 3H with reference $\beta=-29.4$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
Wind Tunnel Results
Flatback with slat airfoil

Position 3H

Position 3H with reference $\beta=-29.4$ deg. showing contributions from main, slat and total.
Wind Tunnel Results

Flatback with slat airfoil

Position 5E changing the slat angle $\beta$.

- 2D CFD predicts best performance for $\beta = -29.35$ deg.
Wind Tunnel Results
Flatback with slat airfoil

Position 5E changing the slat angle $\beta$.

- 2D CFD predicts best performance for $\beta = -29.35$ deg.
- Experimental results show an increasing maximum lift coefficient for decreasing $\beta$.

![Graph showing lift coefficient and angle of attack variations](Image)

![Graph showing chord and span variations](Image)
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Position 5E changing the slat angle $\beta$.

- 2D CFD predicts best performance for $\beta = -29.35$ deg.
- Experimental results show an increasing maximum lift coefficient for decreasing $\beta$.

![Graph showing lift coefficient vs. angle of attack for different slat angles and experimental data.](image)

![Graph showing chord distribution for Pos = 5E, $\beta$ variations.](image)

![Graph showing lift coefficient vs. angle of attack for Pos = 5E, $\beta = -35.4$ deg.](image)
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Position 5E changing the slat angle $\beta$.

- 2D CFD predicts best performance for $\beta = -29.35$ deg.
- Experimental results show an increasing maximum lift coefficient for decreasing $\beta$.

![Graph of Pos = 5E, $\beta$ variations](image)

![Graph of Cl vs AOA](image)
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2D Tunnel Effects

- 2D simulations were carried out using a wind tunnel setup with symmetry conditions on top and bottom walls.
- 2D simulations with same airfoil grids but with outer mesh boundaries placed 30c away from airfoil made for comparison.
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- 2D simulations were carried out using a wind tunnel setup with symmetry conditions on top and bottom walls.
- 2D simulations with same airfoil grids but with outer mesh boundaries placed 30c away from airfoil made for comparison.
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**2D Tunnel Effects**

- Lift coefficient increases in a tunnel configuration.
- Drag coefficient is largely unchanged.
- 2D tunnel effects cannot explain the discrepancies seen between simulations and measurements.

![Graph showing lift coefficient vs. incidence with tunnel and no tunnel effects compared.](attachment:image.png)
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2D Tunnel Effects

- Lift coefficient increases in a tunnel configuration.
- Drag coefficient is largely unchanged.
- 2D tunnel effects cannot explain the discrepancies seen between simulations and measurements.

![Graph showing lift coefficient vs. incidence with and without tunnel effects]
Wind Tunnel Results
Flow Visualization

3D surface flow

- Flow visualization using tufts revealed 3D effects caused by wall effects even at low AOA.
- Below picture is from AOA=22 deg.
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3D surface flow

- 3D CFD simulations by Niels N. Sørensen on an FB-3500-1750 flatback airfoil show similar trends when comparing simulations with and without walls.
- Below picture is from AOA=19 deg.
3D surface flow

- 3D CFD simulations by Niels N. Sørensen on an FB-3500-1750 flatback airfoil show similar trends when comparing simulations with and without walls.
- Below picture is from AOA=19 deg.
3D surface flow

- 3D CFD simulations by Niels N. Sørensen on an FB-3500-1750 flatback airfoil show similar trends when comparing simulations with and without walls.
- Below picture is from AOA=19 deg.
Running the wind tunnel at 100 m/s (Re = 4e6) resulted in condensation trails forming on the suction surface of the slat and main element. The very low pressure coefficients ($C_p=-9$) resulted in the vapour condensation threshold being reached.
Wind Tunnel Results
Flow Visualization

High angle of attack flow re-attachment

- Using wool tufts to visualize the surface flow patterns we observed that the flow seemingly did not separate on the mail airfoil even for angles of attack up to 50 deg.
- We knew the flow was stalled, but why did it appear to be attached?

<animation: not included>
A 2D CFD simulation was carried out at 40 deg. incidence with particles seeded upstream of the airfoil.

In the animation it is clearly seen that particles remain attached to the surface of the main airfoil.

(animation: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3oal5Mbhq9g)
Conclusions

Optimization method for multi-element airfoils

- Method has been implemented to optimize the shape of a multi-element airfoil.
- Mesh generation has shown to be very robust.
- On a cluster, optimization with 5 design variables required approx. 10 hrs.
Optimization method for multi-element airfoils

Design of a high lift, thick, flatback, multi-element airfoil

- A 40% flatback and 30% slat airfoil was designed that was predicted to have a $C_{l_{max}} = 3.4$.
- Less roughness sensitivity than flatback airfoil alone.
- Extensive parameter study carried out to map the performance of the slat at different positions.
Conclusions

Optimization method for multi-element airfoils

Design of a high lift, thick, flatback, multi-element airfoil

Wind Tunnel Campaign

- The multi-element airfoil was tested in the LM Wind Power wind tunnel.
- Comprehensive test matrix, data still being processed.
- Generally good agreement for lift (AP) and drag (WR).
- Comparison of AP and WP revealed what is believed to be severe 3D effects.
- Flow visualization confirmed this.
- The AP drag and WR drag were in very poor agreement.
Conclusions

Future Work

EUDP application in collaboration with Siemens and LM

- WP1: Design and validation of new thick airfoils.
- WP2: Identification of 2D/3D thick airfoil data.
- WP3: Identification of the standstill problem using aeroelastic 3D CFD.
- WP4: Identification of the importance of elastic couplings in the aeroelastic behaviour of wind turbine blades
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Future Work

EUDP application in collaboration with Siemens and LM

♦ WP1: Design and validation of new thick airfoils.
♦ WP2: Identification of 2D/3D thick airfoil data.
♦ WP3: Identification of the standstill problem using aeroelastic 3D CFD.
♦ WP4: Identification of the importance of elastic couplings in the aeroelastic behaviour of wind turbine blades

Thank you for listening :-)
Risø DTU is the National Laboratory for Sustainable Energy. Our research focuses on development of energy technologies and systems with minimal effect on climate, and contributes to innovation, education and policy. Risø has large experimental facilities and interdisciplinary research environments, and includes the national centre for nuclear technologies.