PO.182

EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF EFFECTS OF BUOY MOTION ON OFFSHORE WIND SPEED MEASUREMENT

Hiroto Ichikawa[1], Teruo Ohsawa[1], Kengo Wakabayashi[1], Hiroshi Asou[2] , Shintaro Hashimoto[2] , Shigenori Komori[2]
1: Kobe University, Japan 2: Zeni Lite Buoy Co., Ltd., Japan

Introduction

Compared to onshore, wind speed measurements are much fewer offshore, especially in coastal waters, where satellite observation is not available. In Japan, most of the offshore wind speed measurements are obtained from buoys. However, a frequently asked question is whether the buoy measured wind speed is really accurate or not. In fact, there are few studies which directly answer this question[1) 2)]. Thus, this study is undertaken to understand the effects of buoy motion on wind speed measurement. A method for motion correction is proposed and the effect is also evaluated.

Methods

The experiment was conducted at the pier of the Hazaki Oceanographical Research Station (**Figure 1**) in Ibaraki Prefecture, Japan, from 28th to 30th September, 2015. At the head of the 427-meters-long bier, a buoy-motion simulator, which can oscillate a sonic anemometer like an inverted pendulum, was installed. Using this buoy-motion simulator, five experiments with different oscillations were performed, and the measured wind speeds were compared to those measured with a fixed sonic anemometer, installed next to the simulator (**Figure 2**).



Figure 1: Location and bird's-eye view of the Hazaki Oceanographical Research Station.

Then, a motion correction technique was applied to the wind speeds measured with the oscillated anemometer and the performance was evaluated. The motion correction can be simply written as follows.

$$V_{corrected} = \boldsymbol{R} \cdot V_{measured} + V_{anemometer}$$

where, $V_{corrected}$ is a corrected wind speed, $\boldsymbol{R}$ is a rotation matrix to convert the anemometer fixed coordinates to the Earth fixed coordinates, $V_{measured}$ is a measured wind speed, and $V_{anemomter}$ is a speed of the sonic anemometer in the Earth fixed coordinate. Changing the cycle, amplitude and constant slope of the oscillation, five experimental cases based on the wave period of actual sea shown in **Table 1** were conducted.



Figure 2: Oscillated anemometer on the buoy-motion simulator and fixed anemometer.

Table 1: Experiment cases.

Case name	Cycle	Half amplitude	Constant slope	Samples
Case 1	4 sec.	12 deg.	0 deg.	10
Case 2	4 sec.	12 deg.	5 deg.	10
Case 3	8 sec.	12 deg.	5 deg.	50
Case 4	12 sec.	12 deg.	5 deg.	9
Case 5	random	random	0 deg.	3

Results

Results of all of the experiment cases are summarized in **Tables 2** and **3**, which show three statistics (bias, root-mean-square-error (RMSE) and correlation coefficient (CC)) on the accuracy of the oscillated-anemometer- measured wind speed against the fixed-anemometer-measured wind speed. **Tables 2** and **3** show those before and after motion correction, respectively.

Firstly, 10-min wind speeds are compared. Regardless of motion correction, the oscillated-anemometer- measured wind speeds have nearly-zero bias and RMSE and nearly-one CC, except Case 5. This means that there are no large differences in 10-min average wind speed between the oscillated and the fixed anemometers. In addition, comparing the averaged statistics for all cases between **Tables 2** and **3**, the three statistics all indicate that the corrected wind speeds are more accurate than those before motion correction, though the differences are very small. **Figure 3** shows a representative scatter diagram (for Case 3) comparing wind speeds before and after motion correction. It is found that most of the samples are distributed on or around the straight line of 1 : 1 with or without motion correction. This feature can be also seen in other cases.

Secondly, 2-min average, 10-sec average and raw (4 Hz) wind speeds are compared. In **Table 2**, it is found that as an averaging time is shorter, RMSE and CC become higher and lower, respectively, indicating the accuracy gets lower. Although the same tendency can be seen in **Table 3**, it is found that the accuracy is higher compared to before motion correction shown in **Table 2**. In particular, the effectiveness of motion correction can be clearly seen in 4Hz raw wind speed. However, Case 5 is exceptional, because RMSE decreases by making motion correction. In this case, the anemometer was fluctuated manually, and sometimes it moved very fast compared to the sampling interval of the anemometer. This causes an error in estimating the speed of the anemometer, leading to an error in corrected wind speed.



Figure 3: 10-min average wind speeds measured with fixed-anemometer versus oscillated-anemometer. (a) without and (b) with motion correction anemometer.

Table 2: Statistics on accuracy of oscillated-anemometer-measured wind speed against fixed-anemometer-measured wind speed.

Bias(m/s)	Averaging time			Raw(4Hz)	Average
	10-min	2-min	10-sec		
Case1	0.081	0.081	0.080	0.101	0.086
Case2	0.015	0.014	0.014	0.041	0.021
Case3	-0.104	-0.113	-0.110	-0.100	-0.107
Case4	0.079	0.077	0.075	0.078	0.077
Case5	-0.301	-0.284	-0.277	0.108	-0.189
Average	-0.046	-0.045	-0.043	0.046	-0.022

RMSE(m/s)	Averaging time			Raw(4Hz)	Average
	10-min	2-min	10-sec		
Case1	0.024	0.029	0.069	0.478	0.150
Case2	0.039	0.043	0.086	0.469	0.159
Case3	0.038	0.043	0.099	0.387	0.142
Case4	0.022	0.028	0.070	0.210	0.083
Case5	0.161	0.150	0.214	1.235	0.440
Average	0.057	0.059	0.108	0.556	0.195

Corr.Coef.	Averaging time			Raw(4Hz)	Average
	10-min	2-min	10-sec		
Case1	0.997	0.996	0.989	0.923	0.976
Case2	0.994	0.993	0.987	0.935	0.977
Case3	0.999	0.999	0.995	0.976	0.992
Case4	0.995	0.994	0.983	0.947	0.980
Case5	0.981	0.985	0.968	0.719	0.913
Average	0.993	0.993	0.985	0.900	0.968

Table 3: Statistics on accuracy of motion-corrected wind speed against fixed anemometer-measured wind speed.

Bias(m/s)	Averaging time			Raw(4Hz)	Average
	10-min	2-min	10-sec		
Case1	0.093	0.093	0.092	0.100	0.094
Case2	0.036	0.036	0.036	0.047	0.039
Case3	-0.069	-0.069	-0.067	-0.064	-0.067
Case4	0.112	0.110	0.109	0.107	0.109
Case5	-0.057	-0.059	-0.059	-0.015	-0.048
Average	0.023	0.022	0.022	0.035	0.025

RMSE(m/s)	Averaging time			Raw(4Hz)	Average
	10-min	2-min	10-sec		
Case1	0.026	0.031	0.071	0.325	0.113
Case2	0.040	0.044	0.083	0.328	0.124
Case3	0.024	0.028	0.083	0.293	0.107
Case4	0.026	0.032	0.073	0.194	0.081
Case5	0.043	0.047	0.090	1.460	0.410
Average	0.032	0.036	0.080	0.520	0.167

Corr.Coef.	Averaging time			Raw(4Hz)	Average
	10-min	2-min	10-sec		
Case1	0.997	0.996	0.989	0.946	0.982
Case2	0.994	0.993	0.988	0.953	0.982
Case3	0.999	0.999	0.995	0.982	0.994
Case4	0.996	0.994	0.984	0.953	0.982
Case5	0.990	0.990	0.980	0.746	0.926
Average	0.995	0.995	0.987	0.916	0.973

Conclusions

Main results obtained in this study are summarized as follows.

■A 10-min averaged wind speed measured with an oscillating anemometer is almost the same as that obtained from a fixed anemometer without motion correction.

■As an averaging time is shorter, the effectiveness of motion correction can be clearly seen. The motion correction must be applied to a raw instantaneous wind speed.

The motion correction can fail if an anemometer fluctuates relatively faster compared to its sampling cycle.

Reference

1)Gerrit Wolken-Mohlman et al: Simulation of motion induced measurement error for wind measurements using LIDAR on floating platform, Fraunhofer IWES, Am Seedeich 45, 27572 Bremerhaven, Germany, 2011

2)Wakabayashi et al: Floating LIDAR measurements considering 6 degree freedom of platform motion, Japan Wind Energy Association, 2014

3)Takahashi et al: Automated observation of sea surface eddy flux on a cruising ship, Okayama University Earth Science Reports, Vol.7, No.1 pp.1-14, 2000