



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Offshore floating vertical axis wind turbines, dynamics modelling state of the art. Part I: Aerodynamics.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/80097/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Borg, M, Shires, A and Collu, M (2014) Offshore floating vertical axis wind turbines, dynamics modelling state of the art. Part I: Aerodynamics. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 39. 1214 - 1225. ISSN 1364-0321

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.07.096>

---

**Reuse**

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

**Title: Offshore floating vertical axis wind turbines, dynamics modelling state of the art. Part I:  
Aerodynamics**

Authors:

Mr Michael Borg<sup>\*a</sup>, Whittle Building, Cranfield University, Cranfield, MK43 0AL, United Kingdom  
E-mail address: m.borg@cranfield.ac.uk

Dr Andrew Shires<sup>a</sup>, Whittle Building, Cranfield University, Cranfield, MK43 0AL, United Kingdom  
E-mail address: a.shires@cranfield.ac.uk

Dr Maurizio Collu<sup>a</sup>, Whittle Building, Cranfield University, Cranfield, MK43 0AL, United Kingdom  
E-mail address: maurizio.collu@cranfield.ac.uk

*\*corresponding author*

*<sup>a</sup>affiliation: Cranfield University, UK*

Keywords: floating offshore wind turbines; VAWT; vertical axis wind turbine; coupled dynamics; aerodynamics

## Abstract

The need to further exploit offshore wind resources has pushed offshore wind farms into deeper waters, requiring the use of floating support structures to be economically sustainable. The use of conventional wind turbines may not continue to be the optimal design for floating applications. Therefore it is important to assess other alternative concepts in this context. Vertical axis wind turbines (VAWTs) are one promising concept, and it is important to first understand the coupled and relatively complex dynamics of floating VAWTs to assess their technical feasibility. A comprehensive review detailing the areas of engineering expertise utilised in developing an understanding of the coupled dynamics of floating VAWTs has been developed through a series of articles. This first article details the aerodynamic modelling on VAWTs, providing a review of available models, discussing their applicability to floating VAWTs and current implementations by researchers in this field. A concise comparison between conventional horizontal axis wind turbines and VAWTs is also presented, outlining the advantages and disadvantages of these technologies for the floating wind industry. This article has been written both for researchers new to this research area, outlining underlying theory whilst providing a comprehensive review of the latest work, and for experts in this area, providing a comprehensive list of the relevant references where the details of modelling approaches may be found.

## 1 Introduction

With the need to increase renewable energy's share in global energy production and to exploit offshore wind resources, wind farms are moving further and further offshore into deeper waters. In water depths greater than 50 metres, bottom-mounted (i.e. fixed) support structures for offshore wind turbines do not remain the most economically viable option [1]. A transition from fixed to floating support structures is essential for deep offshore wind farms to become economically viable in the near future.

The onshore wind industry has reached a relatively mature level, with the majority of large scale wind turbines sharing the same configuration: horizontal axis of rotation, three blades, upwind, variable-speed and variable blade pitch (with feathering capability). This has been the result of several decades of research and development, and originally several configurations had been considered, including horizontal axis wind turbines (HAWTs) with a different number of blades, but also vertical axis wind turbine (VAWT) configurations. The conventional design emerged as the optimum techno-economic trade-off for the onshore large scale wind market.

The same "evolutionary process" did not take place for the offshore wind market, substituted by a "marinisation" of the trusted configurations used for the onshore market. It has been implicitly assumed that, despite the very different environmental conditions of an offshore environment, the

1 optimum configuration for the wind turbine is the same i.e. the conventional three bladed, upwind,  
2 horizontal axis wind turbine. This has been implicitly assumed not only for the bottom-mounted  
3 offshore wind turbine configurations, but also for proposed floating systems. In fact two prototype  
4 floating wind turbines, Hywind [2] and WindFloat [3], made use of 2-2.3MW HAWT machines  
5 design for fixed on- and offshore foundations.  
6

7  
8 It is therefore important to assess the technical and economic feasibilities of alternative concepts for  
9 the offshore floating wind industry in order to ensure that the most suitable configurations are  
10 employed, with VAWTs being one promising concept that could complement HAWTs in offshore  
11 wind industry. The first step is to understand the complex dynamics of such a floating system  
12 subjected to the harsh offshore environment. As part of this task, a series of articles have been  
13 developed to present a comprehensive literature review covering the various areas of engineering  
14 expertise required to understand the coupled dynamics involved in floating VAWTs. This first article  
15 focuses on aerodynamic modelling of VAWTs and is organised as follows:  
16  
17

- 18 • section 2 gives a brief history of the development of VAWTs
- 19 • section 3 compares VAWTs to the more conventional HAWTs on a number of aspects  
20 highlighting their advantages and disadvantages
- 21 • section 4 discusses and compares the different aerodynamic modelling techniques in depth
- 22 • section 5 outlines current implementations by researchers
- 23 • section 6 presents some conclusions.

## 24 **2 A brief history of VAWT developments**

25  
26 As outlined by Shires [4], the modern onshore VAWT was developed in the years following the first  
27 oil crisis of 1973. These designs were based on 1922 patent by the French engineer Georges Darrieus,  
28 with straight or curved blades rotating about a vertical shaft.  
29

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

FIGURE 1 – 3.8MW Éole VAWT  $\Phi$ -rotor

The 1970s and 1980s saw a substantial amount of research and development, particularly in the  
United States and Canada, that led to a number of curve bladed (or  $\Phi$ -rotor) Darrieus turbines. The  
largest onshore VAWT, built in 1986 in Québec, Canada, was the Éole Darrieus Wind Turbine shown  
in Figure 1, with a height of 96 metres. With a rated maximum power of 3.8MW, it produced 12GWh  
of electric energy during the 5 years it operated but was shut down in 1993 due to a bearing failure.

Attempts to commercialise these VAWT developments were made in the United States during the  
1980s by FloWind Ltd. A number of onshore wind farms were developed and worked efficiently,  
although they experienced fatigue problems with the blades [5].

FIGURE 2 - 0.5MW VAWT-850 H-rotor

1 The straight-bladed Darrieus turbine or H-rotor was largely developed in the UK by Peter Musgrove  
2 during the 1980s and 1990s. The concept of the H-rotor was to reduce blade manufacturing costs and  
3 simplify the support structure, relative to the  $\Phi$ -rotor, with a shorter tower and eliminating the need  
4 for guy wires [6]. A number of onshore prototypes were constructed in the UK, the largest being a  
5 500kW machine shown in Figure 2 built in 1990 [7]. However, this prototype suffered a blade failure  
6 after a few months of operation due to a manufacturing defect that set back any further VAWT  
7 deployment efforts [8].  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 The V-rotor, first proposed by Olle Ljungstrom in 1973 [9], aimed to mimic the lower half of an  $\Phi$ -  
13 rotor. It had the advantage of a shorter tower than a  $\Phi$  or H-rotor and eliminated the horizontal (and  
14 therefore dragging) struts and supporting arms of  $\Phi$  and H-rotors.  
15  
16

17  
18 Despite these onshore VAWT developments, problems with fatigue failures due to the highly cyclic  
19 loads and a low demand in the wind energy market in the United States contributed to a fall in  
20 financial support for VAWT development projects in the 1990s. However, the need for larger offshore  
21 turbines that can utilise economies of scale and a need for deep water solutions have led to a recent  
22 resurgence of interest in VAWTs. In a recent review of VAWT technologies and economics, Sandia  
23 concluded that VAWTs “have significant advantages over HAWTs in off-shore applications” [10] and  
24 that H or V-rotor designs are likely to be more cost-effective. Furthermore there have recently been a  
25 small number of projects investigating floating VAWT concepts, namely the NOVA project [11], EU-  
26 FP7 DeepWind project [12] and EU-FP7 INFLOW project [13].  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **3 VAWTs versus HAWTs**

34  
35  
36  
37 In this section VAWTs are compared to HAWTs for a number of different aspects, highlighting both  
38 the advantages and disadvantages of this technology. Other publications such as Paraschivoiu [14],  
39 Jamieson [15] and Islam et al. [16] have also attempted to compare HAWTs and VAWTs. Figure 3  
40 gives the reader a first glance at the differences between HAWTs and VAWTs.  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 **FIGURE 3 - Conceptual comparison between floating horizontal and vertical axis wind turbines**

46  
47  
48 *State of Technology.* Since HAWTs have been the main focus of the wind energy industry over the  
49 past decades, its state of technology is more mature than that of VAWTs, with a large number of  
50 successfully deployed projects and the formation of a dedicated supply chain. VAWTs were  
51 investigated in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century but interest was lost mainly due to fatigue issues and low  
52 efficiencies [10].  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
*Conversion Efficiency.* The maximum theoretical efficiency of any wind turbine is 59.3% (the Betz limit) [17]. HAWTs are inherently more efficient than VAWTs with power coefficients of up to approximately 50% compared to approximately 40% for VAWTs. This should not be seen as the ultimate deciding factor between the two configurations as many other factors affect the final cost of electricity. Recent research by Kinzel et al. [18] found that by placing two VAWTs in close proximity to one another, the conversion efficiency may actually increase when compared to single VAWTs. This may further the case for VAWTs and affect the design of future VAWT wind farms.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
*Upscaling.* A major factor in designing floating wind turbines is scalability, as the system is more cost-effective at larger scales. HAWTs have a limiting factor due to gravitational fatigue since the blades undergo tension-compression cycles as the rotor rotates [17]. VAWTs do not undergo this phenomenon and so far do not seem to have any major obstacles in upscaling.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
*Fatigue.* Whilst HAWTs have gravitational fatigue issues, VAWTs produce a cyclically varying torque that can have adverse effects on the transmission and control systems [15]. Whilst this produces high-frequency fatigue cycles in small-scale VAWTs, multi-megawatt VAWTs would rotate at a few revolutions per minute, where it would not be such a significant problem. Also with advances in materials technology, fatigue can more easily be remedied today.

31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
*Machinery Position.* A very important aspect is the position of the transmission and generation system. In an HAWT it is at the very top of the tower (considering the latest offshore wind turbines, the nacelle weight around 400 tonnes, and is around 100 metres above the ground (see for example Vestas V164-8.0MW), inducing greater bending moments and motions on the tower, requiring larger, stronger structures. This would also require a larger floating platform to deal with the larger loads. On the other hand, VAWTs usually have the transmission and generation systems at the bottom [19], requiring small support structures and complying more with fundamental naval architecture principles.

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
*Extreme Conditions.* HAWTs are usually shut down in wind speeds greater than 25m/s whilst VAWTs, in theory, should be able to operate in wind speeds up to 65m/s [16]. VAWTs are also much more insensitive to extreme weather conditions such as heavy snow, freezing rain, frost, salt, sand and humidity [16].

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
*Packing Factor.* In wind farms using HAWTs, the turbines are usually placed a distance of up to ten times their diameter from one another due to the effect of their wakes [20], leaving large amounts of unexploited space in between them. With VAWTs it has been postulated that their wake dissipates much quicker than those of HAWTs, allowing them to be packed closer together [21]. In fact Kinzel

1 et al. [18] found that for a single operating VAWT, the flow velocity required a distance of four rotor  
2 diameters behind the turbine to reach 95% of the freestream velocity, whilst approximately fourteen  
3 rotor diameters are required in the case of a HAWT for the downwind flow to reach 95% of the  
4 upwind velocity [18]. Whilst this was a preliminary study into the wake characteristics of VAWTs, it  
5 is indicative of the potential benefits of such turbines in utilising available wind farm site area.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 *Installation Issues.* Floating wind turbines provide the possibility of the majority of construction being  
11 done dockside rather than on site. Whilst this is beneficial to both HAWTs and VAWTs, the former  
12 still require very large cranes to mount the machinery and blades, increasing the capital costs [15].  
13 This aspect is also an advantage over fixed-support wind turbines, as they are usually assembled on  
14 site.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 20 **4 Modelling Approaches**

21  
22  
23 The major aerodynamic modelling approaches used for VAWTs are the Blade Element Momentum  
24 (BEM) model, Cascade model and Vortex model [22], whilst panel methods also seem to be a  
25 promising approach for modelling VAWTs [23-26]. Methods such as Reynolds-averaged Navier-  
26 Stokes (RANS) computational fluid dynamics (CFD) are not discussed here as they are too  
27 computationally intensive to form part of a methodology used for the conceptual and preliminary  
28 design of floating wind turbine systems.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 **4.1 Blade Element Momentum Models**

36  
37  
38 This model is based on equating the streamwise momentum change across the turbine to the forces  
39 acting on the turbine blades [27]. The first momentum model for VAWTs (based on Glauert's theory  
40 for propellers) was developed by Templin [28], where a single streamtube passing through an actuator  
41 disk was used to represent the VAWT, similar to Froude's momentum theory applied to HAWTs.  
42 Subsequently a multiple streamtube model was developed concurrently by Wilson and Lissaman [29]  
43 and Strickland [30], where now the flow through the actuator disk is split into a number of equal  
44 streamtubes that are independent of one another. The momentum equation is thus applied to each  
45 streamtube and the blade elements that pass through that streamtube.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 The double-multiple streamtube (DMST) model as described in [31] is the most elaborate variant, and  
52 has the best agreement with experimental results [14; 22] for momentum models. Besides having  
53 multiple streamtubes, this model also performs the momentum calculations separately for the upwind  
54 and downwind half-cycles of the rotor, shown schematically in Figure 4. This enabled the analysis of  
55 more complex shapes without a loss in numerical accuracy (see e.g. Shires [32]). Subsequently,  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 further improvements to include secondary effects such as dynamic stall and tip losses were made in  
2 [14; 32-34], as will be further elaborated in §4.5.

3  
4  
5 FIGURE 4 - Schematic diagram of the Double Multiple Streamtube Model [34]  
6

7  
8 Figure 5 outlines a typical time-stepping scheme for the DMST model as implemented by Shires [32].  
9 At each time increment, the process involved calculating the relative velocity and angle of attack at  
10 each collocation point. With these in hand the aerofoil lift and drag characteristics are obtained from a  
11 database of the static aerodynamic loads that are generally derived from wind tunnel testing. These  
12 forces are then updated to take into account dynamic stall and other three-dimensional effects. Finally  
13 the momentum loss over the upwind and downwind cycles (see Figure 4) is calculated, and the blade  
14 loads are integrated before moving on to the next time step.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 FIGURE 5 - Typical time-stepping scheme for blade element momentum models [32]  
23  
24

25 Although this model gave good agreement with experimental results of the overall performance for  
26 light-loaded, low-solidity rotors, it suffers both numerically and in accuracy when the rotor has a high  
27 solidity, is heavily loaded and/or is operating at high tip-speed ratios [14; 22; 27].

28 The Actuator Cylinder flow model approach proposed by Risø National Laboratory at the Technical  
29 University of Denmark [35] represents an extension of the actuator disc concept. Instead of  
30 considering the momentum balance within streamtubes, an energy balance approach is considered for  
31 the swept surface of a VAWT rotor acting as an actuator cylinder.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 4.2 Cascade Models 39 40 41

42 These models are based on cascade theory used in turbo-machinery design (see e.g. [36; 37]), and  
43 were first applied to VAWTs by Hirsch and Mandal [38]. The blades of the rotor are assumed to be  
44 positioned on a plane surface, known as a cascade, with the spacing between adjacent blades equal to  
45 the rotor circumference divided by the number of blades, as illustrated in Figure 6. The development  
46 and implementation of this model then follows a similar route as the DMST momentum model.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 FIGURE 6 - Cascade model configuration, adapted from Islam et al. [22]  
53  
54

55 An improvement over the model presented by Hirsch and Mandal was proposed by Mandal and  
56 Burton [39] to include flow curvature and dynamic stall. These modifications allowed the model to  
57 more accurately represent the flow and loading characteristics experienced by a VAWT in reality,  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 providing for local blade force predictions and generated power in better agreement with experimental  
2 data in the study.

3 Although this model requires more computational time than its momentum model counterpart, it  
4 provides more accurate overall values for both low and high solidity rotors [22], and does not suffer  
5 convergence problems at high solidities and high tip speed ratios [22]. According to [38], momentum  
6 models are not suited for calculating instantaneous blade forces and wake velocities for high solidity  
7 rotors and for high tip speed ratios. This is due to the fact that momentum models assume steady-state  
8 flow (which is not necessarily the case for floating VAWTs, where platform-induced motion and  
9 turbulent wind create unsteady flow conditions), where average the flow momentum losses through  
10 the VAWT rotor over one revolution.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 4.3 Vortex model

18 Vortex models assume potential (i.e. inviscid) flow. The velocity field in the vicinity of the rotor is  
19 obtained by calculating the influence of vorticity in the wake of the blades [14; 22]. In this model the  
20 aerofoil blades are split up into a number of elements, and each element is replaced by a bound (or  
21 substitution) vortex filament, also known as a lifting line [27]. With each time step vortices are shed  
22 and these influence the induced velocity of the blade, as illustrated in Figure 7.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 FIGURE 7 - Vortex element schematic diagram with progression of shed vortices, adapted from  
32 Strickland et al. [27]  
33  
34  
35

36 Two dimensional vortex models for VAWTs were first proposed by Larsen [40], and further two  
37 dimensional models were presented by Fanucci and Walter [41], Holme [42] and Wilson [43]. These  
38 models made several assumptions such as: high tip-speed ratios, lightly loaded rotor, small angles of  
39 attack to ignore stall, and high height-to-diameter ratios (for two-dimensional flow). These  
40 assumptions limited the vortex models to a specific range of applications and operating conditions.  
41 The first three-dimensional model was presented by Strickland et al. [27]. Further improvements by  
42 Strickland et al. [44] included dynamic effects, such as dynamic stall, pitching circulation and added  
43 mass. When compared with experimental results, it was found that there was good correlation for  
44 instantaneous blade forces and near-wake velocities. Some discrepancies were attributed to  
45 shortcomings in the experimental set-up by Strickland et al. [27].  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 To further enhance this free-vortex model, Cardona [45] incorporated flow curvature as well as  
54 modifying the dynamic stall model. These modifications were found to improve the correlation  
55 between results for both overall power coefficient values and instantaneous blade forces.  
56  
57

58 Vandenberghe and Dick [46] presented a modified analysis of this model using a multi-grid approach  
59 consisting of solving the Poisson equation on a rectangular grid rather than using the Biot-Savart law  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 to calculate the wake-induced velocity field. It was found that this approach reduced computational  
2 times and was proposed for the parametric optimisation of VAWTs and for pitch-controlled turbines.  
3 Another modification to the free-vortex model was performed by Beyer et al. [47] using curved vortex  
4 filaments rather than straight ones though problems with convergence of the straight line and curved  
5 filament models at fine discretisations were encountered.  
6

7  
8 Another approach was taken by Ponta and Jacovkis [48] to combine the free-vortex model with a  
9 finite element analysis of the flow in the vicinity of the rotor. The concept behind this approach was to  
10 split the analysis into two separate regions: macro and micro models. This helped to avoid certain  
11 shortcomings of the abovementioned vortex model, and showed better agreement with experimental  
12 results. One disadvantage of this approach was that it does not cover all stall phenomena.  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 FIGURE 8 - Plan view of a typical blade trailing edge wake simulation of a three-bladed VAWT,  
19 adapted from Strickland et al. [27]  
20  
21  
22

23 Sebastian [49] recently showed the potential of applying vortex models to floating horizontal axis  
24 wind turbines. The ability of vortex models to accurately predict the velocities and evolution of the  
25 near wake (see Figure 8), allow for more precise simulations of the wake-rotor interactions. These  
26 interactions may prove to be an important factor, as they may significantly affect the aerodynamic  
27 performance of the floating turbine. The influence of multiple turbines on one another may also be  
28 investigated with this model, as it has been observed through experimentation by Kinzel et al. [18]  
29 that two closely spaced VAWTs may actually improve power production compared to a single  
30 operating VAWT, depending on their relative position to one another and the incoming wind flow. In  
31 certain configurations a VAWT pair was found to generate 5-10 percent additional power as  
32 compared to isolated VAWTs. Ilin et al. [50] found that whilst the vortex model does not significantly  
33 improve power predictions when compared to the momentum models, it does more accurately predict  
34 blade loads, which may be of more importance when investigating the coupled dynamics of floating  
35 VAWTs.  
36  
37

38 Scheurich and Brown [51] also recently used a vorticity transport model (originally developed for  
39 helicopter applications) to investigate the overall turbine efficiency for different VAWT  
40 configurations in both steady and unsteady wind conditions. The use of helical/twisted blades was  
41 found to improve turbine performance as compared to straight blade. This aerodynamic model was  
42 compared to experimental data by Scheurich and Brown [52] and Scheurich et al. [53] and found to be  
43 in very satisfactory agreement based on blade aerodynamic loading and predicted power curves.  
44

45 Figure 9 presents a typical time-stepping scheme for a vortex model, based on codes developed by  
46 Strickland et al. [27] and Sebastian [49].  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60 FIGURE 9 - Typical time-stepping scheme for vortex models  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

#### 4.4 Panel Models

This approach is based upon discretizing the 3D surface of the rotor into a number of panels and assumes a potential flow regime, as shown in Figure 10a. On each panel, an ideal flow element (such as a source or doublet) is placed with a prescribed strength and the Laplace equation is subsequently solved for the inviscid and incompressible flow. Panel models can be considered as an extension to vortex models. Vortex models represent an aerofoil as a single blade element, using look up tables for lift and drag characteristics to derive the corresponding vortex strength of the element. Panel models represent the aerofoil using a series of body conforming panels at which 3D flow properties are calculated and consequently are generally more accurate. This method has been applied extensively in naval hydrodynamics as well as aircraft aerodynamics, as reviewed by Erickson [54]. The relatively fast computational time in comparison to using higher-fidelity CFD simulations is one of the main benefits of this method. Another major benefit of panel method is that any geometry can be modelled, and does not rely on the interpolation/extrapolation of two-dimensional aerofoil data obtained through experiment or CFD.

FIGURE 10 - a) Panel discretization of a VAWT blade section and wake roll up; b) sample visualisation of a 2-bladed VAWT panel model simulation using the Unsteady free-wake Multi-body Panel Method (UMPM) [55; 56]

Eliassen and Muskulus [26] implemented and validated a fast hybrid vortex-panel model on a general purpose graphical process unit GPU, showcasing the potential of this model and computational strategy. A three-dimensional panel method for VAWTs was first presented by Dixon et al. [25] and was then validated by Dixon [55] and Ferreira et al. [56]. Dixon [55] used Stereo-PIV experimental results and smoke-trail studies for a straight-bladed VAWT to demonstrate the validity of the model. This model was developed to analyse and understand the development of the near wake and tip vortices of a VAWT. A sample visualisation of a 2-bladed VAWT simulation using this model is given in Figure 10b.

Since this type of model is based on potential flow, viscous effects such as stall are not implicitly included. Therefore there is a need to incorporate a boundary layer model such as the lag-entrainment method (see e.g. Green et al. [57]). Although a viscous coupled panel method is available for HAWT aerodynamics (e.g. NEWPAN [58]) the authors are not aware of a similar development for VAWTs. Figure 11 outlines a typical time-stepping scheme for a panel model, as implemented by Dixon [55]. As can be seen, it is more involved than the previous models described.

FIGURE 11 - Typical time-stepping scheme for panel models [55]

## 4.5 Modelling Secondary Effects

As described previously, the inclusion of secondary effects allows for better prediction of the power performance and blade forces of a VAWT. In the following sections the various secondary effects and their significance shall be briefly outlined.

### 4.5.1 Dynamic Stall

The dynamic stall phenomena results from unsteady lag effects as an aerofoil experiences a rapidly changing pitch angle. Initially, as the pitch angle increases beyond the static stall onset angle the dynamic lift increases beyond the maximum lift for quasi-steady conditions due to the unsteady boundary layer response and the effect of induced camber. Consequently, the effective pitch angle is lower than the instantaneous angle resulting in a delay in the onset of separation. More significantly, when separation occurs a strong vortex may be shed from the leading edge of the aerofoil which travels downstream thereby augmenting the lift of the section whilst the vortex remains above the aerofoil. When the vortex is shed from the trailing edge the lift decreases abruptly due to a state of full flow separation, often resulting in a lower lift than that corresponding to quasi-steady conditions. Flow reattachment can also occur at pitch angles lower than that corresponding to static stall onset due to the lag effects associated with the unsteady boundary layer response. The qualitative features of the dynamic stall process often remain similar for varying Reynolds numbers and forcing conditions, though the quantitative behaviour of the aerodynamic forces and moments show variations for different aerofoil shapes, thereby proving to be a challenge for low order numerical models. The degree of lift augmentation, the timing of vortex shedding, and the onset of vortex formation is dependent on factors such as the aerofoil shape, mean angle, amplitude and rate of oscillation, and compressibility effects. In general, three main categories of dynamic stall models that have been published in literature exist:

1. The actual kinematics of the process such as the time delay effects on leading edge pressure response, vortex formation, and vortex shedding are modelled (e.g., Beddoes-Leishman model);
2. The mechanics of the process are neglected, and the characteristics of the lift curve are modelled (e.g., ONERA model);
3. A reference pitch angle is introduced that mimics the effective pitch angle under dynamic conditions (e.g., Gormont model).

The Gormont model, initially developed for helicopter rotor applications, has been widely used in VAWT BEM models since it lends itself readily for implementation and has been shown to provide good accuracy. However it has been speculated that it over-predicts the effects of Dynamic Stall since

1 the maximum angle of attack reached is generally higher than is typical for helicopter blades and a  
2 number of researchers have proposed a suitable damping coefficient to improve accuracy.  
3

#### 4 4.5.2 Tower Shadow

5  
6  
7  
8 Tower shadow can contribute to periodic fluctuations in electrical power output of both HAWTs and  
9 VAWTs due to a blade passing through the low momentum wake behind a tower. It is necessary  
10 therefore to locally modify the velocity field downstream of a tower to account for these losses,  
11 usually through an empirically derived correction factor.  
12  
13  
14

#### 15 4.5.3 Tip and Junction Losses

16  
17 One of the major limitations of the original BEM theory is that there are no finite aspect ratio (*i.e.*,  
18 3D) considerations. Blade tips will shed vortices due to the pressure differential producing a local  
19 reduction in lift and an additional induced drag component. Similarly a horseshoe vortex is  
20 established at junctions of streamlined sections such as supporting struts that results in additional  
21 drag. Shires [32] proposed that a Prandtl lift loss factor, similar to that used within HAWT BEM  
22 models is also applicable for VAWT BEM models by applying a factor to the 2D lift coefficient based  
23 on the non-dimensional spanwise position, local angle of attack and the number of blades. Shires [32]  
24 also proposed an empirical relationship to determine the drag associated with secondary vortices in  
25 junction regions though this increment is comparatively small.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

#### 35 4.5.4 Flow Curvature

36  
37 The streamtube approach generally assumes a constant cross section is maintained through the rotor.  
38 Corrections are proposed for streamtube expansion [14] and curvature [45] though their effect on  
39 rotor performance is not significant.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 4.5.5 Turbulent Incident Wind

46  
47 Most numerical models of VAWT performance have assumed a rotor in steady and therefore artificial  
48 wind conditions. The effects of a stochastic wind profile on the dynamic response can be significant  
49 and should ideally be included in any analysis.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

#### 4.6 Other Modelling Approaches

1  
2  
3 Within the Aerospace community, CFD is routinely used for performance prediction in combination  
4 with experimental verification of designs in a wind tunnel. For Aerospace applications the RANS  
5 equations are generally solved or the Euler equations coupled with an appropriate empirical boundary-  
6 layer model. Whilst the steady state cruise performance of a complete aircraft can be performed with  
7 reasonable computational resources, the CFD analysis of a wind turbine is further complicated by the  
8 requirements for a time-dependant solution and the large range of complex flow physics experienced  
9 by the rotor with blades rapidly entering into and out of a deep stall condition. Due to the high  
10 requirements for computational resources CFD is consequently not routinely used for wind turbine  
11 analysis and lower order models remain the industry standard.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

#### 4.7 Discussion

19  
20  
21  
22 In the BEM models, the assumption of quasi-steady flow may be violated by the complex flow field  
23 of floating wind turbines [47; 49], thereby possibly rendering these models invalid. Another potential  
24 issue is that these models are not inherently developed for floating turbine applications, but for  
25 onshore wind turbines, whose oscillations in pitch and roll are orders of magnitude smaller than the  
26 ones experienced by floating wind turbine systems, and with virtually no heave oscillation (contrary  
27 to FOWTs). To evaluate the instantaneous loads acting on the rotor, a whole rotor revolution must be  
28 computed. Whilst some research has recently considered modifying the BEM model for floating  
29 applications [59] to allow for real-time interfacing with a hydrodynamic model, the models are  
30 currently not the most suitable for time-domain simulations.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 As mentioned in §4.1, BEM models may break down at high tip speed ratios and when simulating  
38 high solidity rotors. Cascade models can be used in these situations to complement the BEM models,  
39 especially as they both follow very similar computational procedures. So far there has not been any  
40 research into whether cascade models can fully incorporate the unsteady, complex flow associated  
41 with floating wind turbines, although Mandal and Burton [39] did incorporate dynamic stall to  
42 improve numerical accuracy.  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 In spite of these drawbacks, the very efficient and quick execution times of these models have seen  
48 them maintain popularity. They should not be disposed of, as they can be an essential tool in the  
49 preliminary research and design of floating VAWT systems. BEM models can speed up the initial  
50 phases of a project by allowing a vast number of simulations to be carried out in a relatively short  
51 period of time, narrowing down the number of possible configurations and therefore allowing a more  
52 precise but more computationally demanding approach to focus on only the most promising  
53 configurations.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Whilst vortex models are deemed more accurate of than the two other models mentioned in this  
2 section [22], they require substantially more computation time than either the momentum or cascade  
3 models. This is an important factor in coupled-dynamics modelling, as the model has to execute as  
4 fast as possible, and has been the main reason vortex models have as yet not really been implemented  
5 in coupled dynamics codes for both VAWTs and HAWTs (except for Sebastian [49]). Attempts to  
6 modify the vortex model through vortex merging and other techniques by McIntosh and Babinsky  
7 [60] have improved computational efficiency whilst maintaining numerical accuracy and solution  
8 integrity. Whilst this work has been focused on small-scale VAWTs in urban areas, it could readily be  
9 applied in the offshore context.

14 Advances in desktop computational power and parallel computing have paved the way for much  
15 faster computation times of three-dimensional vortex models [61; 62], with up to a 35.9 fold reduction  
16 over single processor times [62]. As discussed by Muskulus [63], vortex models are a viable option  
17 for use in coupled dynamics modelling of floating wind turbines. A shortcoming of this large  
18 reduction in computational time is that the model is required to be programmed in a language specific  
19 for multi-core processing units, but this can be overcome in programming environments such as  
20 MATLAB or using libraries for programming languages such as C or Fortran (see e.g. [64; 65]).  
21 Panel models offer the same advantages as the vortex models with regards to investigating rotor  
22 interactions with the near wake, multiple rotors operation in close proximity to one another, as well as  
23 novel rotors (possibly with multiple rotating bodies or pitching blades). It has yet to be seen whether  
24 panel models can compete with the previously described methods with regards to computation time,  
25 although parallel programming may significantly improve computational performance.

34 Ferreira and Scheurich [66] recently demonstrated that the power produced and instantaneous loads of  
35 a VAWT are decoupled. This revelation may undermine the trend of validating codes through power  
36 curves, as whilst power prediction curves may be in very good agreement with experimental data,  
37 individual blade force predictions may not agree well with experimental data. This is seen in a number  
38 of papers when using BEM models [14], cascade models [39] and vortex models [45]. In the context  
39 of floating VAWTs it may be more suited to perform verification and validation based on blade force  
40 predictions rather power predictions.

46 Secondary effect models (in particular dynamic stall and flow curvature) have improved instantaneous  
47 blade force predictions for both momentum and vortex models, but discrepancies still exist. This  
48 aspect is rather important to consider when developing a coupled dynamics model for floating  
49 VAWTs as the blade forces shall affect system-level performance and any aeroelastic effects<sup>1</sup>.

53 Table 1 summarises the advantages and downfalls of the different aerodynamic models available for  
54 use within an efficient coupled model of dynamics in the design of floating VAWTs.

---

59 <sup>1</sup> Aeroelastic effects and modelling in the context of floating VAWTs are discussed in the companion paper on  
60 structural modelling for floating VAWTs, Borg et al. [73]

Table 1 – Comparison of aerodynamic models

## 5 Current implementations

There have been a significant number of codes developed to analyse VAWTs by researchers around the world:

- Paraschivoiu [14] implemented the DMST momentum model in a code known as CARDAAX. Shires [32] also recently implemented a modified DMST model to evaluate more novel rotors, with emphasis on offshore applications [4].
- Strickland [27] developed two- and three-dimensional vortex models VDART2 and VDART3, respectively, in the 1970s as part of Sandia National Laboratories' efforts to develop VAWTs as a viable wind energy technology [10]. McIntosh and Babinsky [60] recently developed a very computationally efficient two-dimensional vortex model to investigate small-scale VAWTs deployed in urban areas that would have positive implications in the context of coupled dynamics modelling of floating VAWTs.
- Dixon [55] developed an unsteady three-dimensional panel model for VAWTs at Delft University of Technology that became known as UMPM (Unsteady free-wake Multi-body Panel Method). Whilst initially used for VAWTs in urban areas, it is now also being applied to large offshore VAWTs in collaboration with Sandia National Laboratories

In the context of coupled dynamics design codes for floating wind turbines, comparative studies by Jonkman and Musial [67], and Cordle and Jonkman [68; 69] found that all major offshore wind design codes employ the BEM model as well as the generalised dynamic wake model in some cases, illustrated in Figure 12 adapted from [67]. In fact, BEM models were used during the design of both the Hywind [2] and WindFloat [3] full scale prototypes. Whilst it is evident that BEM models are sufficient to design floating HAWTs, the inherently more complex aerodynamic nature described in the above sections indicate that momentum models are not as suitable for designing floating VAWTs. Sebastian [49] applied a free-vortex model coupled with NREL's FAST code for a floating HAWT. Whilst the authors were investigating the evolution of the wake of the rotor, it was not a fully coupled simulation and might have led to certain effects being ignored.

FIGURE 12 - Comparison of models used in current design codes for offshore HAWTs [67]

As yet these are restricted to HAWTs and no publicly-available coupled dynamics code exists for floating VAWTs that the authors are aware of, although Vita [19] applied the DMST momentum model coupled with the HAWC2 code to model a Darrieus turbine mounted on a rotating platform.



1 The authors are currently developing an aero-hydro-servo-elastic coupled model of dynamics for  
2 floating VAWTs, and the development progress is outlined by Collu et al.[70]. Some example  
3 applications of this model for a floating VAWT with passive damping devices and combined with a  
4 wave energy converter have been presented by Borg et al. [71; 72].  
5  
6

## 7 8 **6 Conclusions** 9

10  
11 As highlighted in §2, the case for VAWTs deployed in deep offshore sites is evident as they seem to  
12 be more suitable than HAWTs to deliver a cost-effective wind energy solution. As part of furthering  
13 the development of this technology, it is essential to understand how the floating VAWT interacts  
14 with the offshore environment. As part of a series of articles, this article focussed on presenting a  
15 review on the different aerodynamic models suitable to be implemented as part of an efficient coupled  
16 model of dynamics for the preliminary design of floating VAWTs. The advantages and disadvantages  
17 of momentum-based models, vortex models and panel models, as well as modelling secondary effects  
18 such as dynamic stall and flow curvature were discussed.  
19

20 The blade element momentum and cascade models provide very fast computational times and power  
21 predictions in good agreement with experimental data, but may fall short of adequately predicting  
22 instantaneous blade forces. As these models were originally developed for onshore VAWTs, their  
23 validity as quasi-steady approaches may be questioned when applied to floating VAWTs where  
24 unsteady flow conditions dominate. Despite these drawbacks, the ease of implementation and  
25 computational speed make these models very attractive and they have seen continued use by  
26 researchers.  
27

28 Vortex and panel models are higher-fidelity models that are able to simulate the wake of the VAWT  
29 and can fully incorporate unsteady flow regimes, unlike the former two models. The ability to analyse  
30 interactions between the VAWT and its own wake as the platform oscillates, and the possibility of  
31 modelling a rotor(s) consisting of multiple rotating bodies are major advantages. These models can  
32 more accurately predict instantaneous blade forces and this may play an important role when  
33 considering aeroelasticity and the subsequent effects on system performance in terms of power  
34 generation and platform motion.  
35

36 These models differentiate in the fact that vortex models still require lift/drag characteristics for  
37 known aerofoils, whilst in panel models any blade geometry can be modelled, enhancing the  
38 flexibility and potential of these types of aerodynamic models.  
39

40 The cost of these higher-fidelity models is significantly increased computational times, which is an  
41 important factor when developing an efficient coupled model of dynamics for floating VAWTs.  
42 Recent trends towards high performance desktop PCs and parallel computing may drastically improve  
43 the computational performance of these models as discussed in §4.7.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

As part one of a series of papers, part two focuses on modelling structural and mooring dynamics, and part three focuses on support structure hydrodynamics and approaches to developing coupled dynamics models for floating VAWTs.

### Acknowledgements

The research leading to these results has been performed in the frame of the H2OCEAN project (www.h2ocean-project.eu) and has received funding from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement n° 288145.

It reflects only the views of the author(s) and the European Union is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.

### References

- [1] Jonkman, J. M. and Matha, D. (2011), "Dynamics of offshore floating wind turbines-analysis of three concepts", *Wind Energy*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 557-569.
- [2] Nielsen, F. G., Hanson, T. D. and Skaare, B. (2006), "Integrated dynamic analysis of floating offshore wind turbines", *Proceedings of the International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering - OMAE*.
- [3] Roddier, D., Cermelli, C., Aubault, A. and Weinstein, A. (2010), "WindFloat: A floating foundation for offshore wind turbines", *Journal of Renewable and Sustainable Energy*, vol. 2, no. 3.
- [4] Shires, A. (2013), "Design optimisation of an offshore vertical axis wind turbine", *Proc. Inst of Civil Engineers, Energy*, vol. 166, pp. 1-12.
- [5] Eriksson, S., Bernhoff, H. and Leijon, M. (2008), "Evaluation of different turbine concepts for wind power", *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 1419-1434.
- [6] Musgrove, P. (2010), *Wind power*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [7] Mays, I., Morgan, C., Anderson, M. and Powles, S. (1990), "Experience with the VAWT 850 demonstration project", *Proceedings 1990 European community wind energy conference, Madrid, Spain*, pp. 482.
- [8] Price, T. J. (2006), "UK large-scale wind power programme from 1970 to 1990: the Carmarthen Bay experiments and the musgrove vertical-axis turbines", *Wind Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 225-242.
- [9] Ljungstrom, O. (1986), "Innovative concepts in axial and cross-flow wind turbine systems", *Proceedings of the European Wind Energy Association Conference, Rome, Italy*.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- [10] Sutherland, H. J., Berg, D. E. and Ashwill, T. D. (2012), *A retrospective of VAWT technology*, SAND2012-0304, Sandia National Laboratories, California.
  - [11] Collu, M., Brennan, F. P. and Patel, M. H. (2012), "Conceptual design of a floating support structure for an offshore vertical axis wind turbine: the lessons learnt", *Ships and Offshore Structures*, , pp. 1-19.
  - [12] Paulsen, U. S., Madsen, H. A., Hattel, J. H., Baran, I. and Nielsen, P. H. (2013), "Design Optimization of a 5 MW Floating Offshore Vertical-axis Wind Turbine", *Energy Procedia*, vol. 35, no. 0, pp. 22-32.
  - [13] INFLOW-FP7 (2013), available at: <http://www.inflow-fp7.eu/>.
  - [14] Paraschivou, I. (2002), *Wind turbine design: emphasis on the darrieus concept*, 1st ed, Polytechnic International Press, Montreal.
  - [15] Jamieson, P. (2011), *Innovation in Wind Turbine Design*, 1st ed, Wiley, London.
  - [16] Islam, M., Mekhilef, S. and Saidur, R. (2013), "Progress and recent trends of wind energy technology", *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 21, pp. 456-468.
  - [17] Burton, T., Sharpe, D., Jenkins, N. and Bossanyi, E. (2001), *Wind energy handbook*, John Wiley & Sons, 2001, Chichester.
  - [18] Kinzel, M., Mulligan, Q. and Dabiri, J. O. (2012), "Energy exchange in an array of vertical-axis wind turbines", *Journal of Turbulence*, vol. 13, no. 1.
  - [19] Vita, L. (2011), *Offshore floating vertical axis wind turbines with rotating platform* (Ph.D. thesis), Technical University of Denmark, Roskilde, Denmark.
  - [20] Jenkins, N. (1993), "Engineering wind farms", *Power Engineering Journal*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 53-60.
  - [21] Whittlesey, R. W., Liska, S. and Dabiri, J. O. (2010), "Fish schooling as a basis for vertical axis wind turbine farm design", *Bioinspiration and Biomimetics*, vol. 5, no. 3.
  - [22] Islam, M., Ting, D. S. -. and Fartaj, A. (2008), "Aerodynamic models for Darrieus-type straight-bladed vertical axis wind turbines", *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 1087-1109.
  - [23] Smith, M. J. C., Wilkin, P. J. and Williams, M. H. (1996), "The advantages of an unsteady panel method in modelling the aerodynamic forces on rigid flapping wings", *Journal of Experimental Biology*, vol. 199, no. 5, pp. 1073-1083.
  - [24] Gorelov, D. N. (2009), "Analogy between a flapping wing and a wind turbine with a vertical axis of revolution", *Journal of Applied Mechanics and Technical Physics*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 297-299.
  - [25] Dixon, K., Simao Ferreira, C. J., Hofemann, C., Van Bussel, G. J. W. and Van Kuik, G. A. M. (2008), "A 3D unsteady panel method for vertical axis wind turbines",

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

*Proceedings of the European Wind Energy Conference and Exhibition*, 31 March - 3 April, Brussels, EWEA, pp. 1-10.

- [26] Eliassen, L. and Muskulus, M. (2012), "Validation of a Fast Panel Vortex Code for Wind Turbines Implemented on a General Purpose Graphics Processor Unit", *22nd International Offshore (Ocean) and Polar Engineering Conference*, 17-22 June, Rhodes, Greece, ISOPE.
- [27] Strickland, J. H., Webster, B. T. and Nguyen, T. (1979), "Vortex model of the darrieus turbine: an analytical and experimental study." *American Society of Mechanical Engineers (Paper)*, no. 79 -WA/FE-6.
- [28] Templin, R. J. (June, 1974), *Aerodynamic performance theory for the NRC vertical-axis wind turbine*, LTR-LA-190, NRC Lab.
- [29] Wilson, R. E. and Lissaman, P. B. (1974), *Applied aerodynamics of wind power machines*, PB-238595, Oregon State Univ., Corvallis (USA).
- [30] Strickland, J. H. (October 1975), *The darrieus turbine: a performance prediction model using multiple streamtubes*, SAND75-0431, Sandia National Laboratories.
- [31] Paraschivoiu, I. (February 1981), "Double-multiple streamtube model for darrieus wind turbines", *Second DOE/NASA wind turbines dynamics workshop, NASA CP-2186, Cleveland, OH*, , pp. 19-25.
- [32] Shires, A. (2013), "Development and Evaluation of an Aerodynamic Model for a Novel Vertical Axis Wind Turbine Concept", *Energies*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 2501-2520.
- [33] Paraschivoiu, I. and Delclaux, F. (1983), "DOUBLE MULTIPLE STREAMTUBE MODEL WITH RECENT IMPROVEMENTS.", *Journal of energy*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 250-255.
- [34] Masson, C., Leclerc, C. and Paraschivoiu, I. (1998), "Appropriate dynamic-stall models for performance predictions of VAWTs with NLF blades", *International Journal of Rotating Machinery*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 129-139.
- [35] Madsen, H., Larsen, T., Vita, L. and Paulsen, U. (2013), "Implementation of the Actuator Cylinder flow model in the HAWC2 code for aeroelastic simulations on Vertical Axis Wind Turbines", in *American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics*, .
- [36] Chen, N. (2010), *Aerothermodynamics of Turbomachinery: Analysis and Design*, 1st ed. ed, Wiley, Singapore.
- [37] Scholz, N. "Aerodynamics of cascades.", *AGARDograph*, , no. AGARD-AG-220.
- [38] Hirsch, I. H. and Mandal, A. C. (1987), "A cascade theory for the aerodynamic performance of Darrieus wind turbines.", *WIND ENGG.*, vol. 11, no. 3 , 1987, pp. 164-175.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- [39] Mandal, A. C. and Burton, J. D. (1994), "Effects of dynamic stall and flow curvature on the aerodynamics of Darrieus turbines applying the cascade model", *Wind Engineering*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 267-282.
- [40] Larsen, H. C. (1975), "Summary of a vortex theory for the cyclogiro", *Proceedings of the 2nd US national conferences on wind engineering research*, Vol. 8-1-3, Colorado State University, .
- [41] Fanucci, J. B. and Walter, R. E. (1976), "Innovative wind machines: the theoretical performance of a vertical-axis wind turbine", *Proceedings of the vertical-axis wind turbine technology workshop*, Vol. 3, Sandia Laboratories, SAND 76-5568, USA, pp. 61-95.
- [42] Holme, O. A. (1976), "Contribution to the aerodynamic theory of the vertical axis wind turbine", *International symposium on wind energy systems*, Vol. C4, 7-9 September, Cambridge, UK, pp. 55-71.
- [43] Wilson, R. E. (1980), "Wind-turbine aerodynamics", *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, , pp. 357-372.
- [44] Strickland, J. H., Webster, B. T. and Nguyen, T. (1981), *A vortex model of the darrieus turbine: an analytical and experimental study*, SAND81-7017, Sandia National Laboratories, USA.
- [45] Cardona, J. L. (1984), "FLOW CURVATURE AND DYNAMIC STALL SIMULATED WITH AN AERODYNAMIC FREE-VORTEX MODEL FOR VAWT.", *Wind Engineering*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 135-143.
- [46] Vandenberghe, D. and Dick, E. (1987), "A free vortex simulation method for the straight bladed vertical axis wind turbine", *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 307-324.
- [47] Beyer, F., Matha, D., Sebastian, T. and Lackner, M. (2012), "Development, Validation and Application of a Curved Vortex Filament Model for Free Vortex Wake Analysis of Floating Offshore Wind Turbines", *50th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting including the New Horizons Forum and Aerospace Exposition*, 9-12 January, Nashville, Tennessee, USA, AIAA.
- [48] Ponta, F. L. and Jacovkis, P. M. (2001), "A vortex model for Darrieus turbine using finite element techniques", *Renewable Energy*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 1-18.
- [49] Sebastian, T. (2012), *The aerodynamics and near wake of an offshore floating horizontal axis wind turbine* (Ph.D. thesis), University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, USA.
- [50] Ilin, S., Dumitrescu, H., Cardos, V. and Dumitrache, A. (2012), "A free wake method for performance prediction of VAWT", *AIP Conference Proceedings*, vol. 1479, no. 1, pp. 1635-1638.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- [51] Scheurich, F. and Brown, R. E. (2012), "Modelling the aerodynamics of vertical-axis wind turbines in unsteady wind conditions", *Wind Energy*.
  - [52] Schuerich, F. and Brown, R. E. (2011), "Effect of dynamic stall on the aerodynamics of vertical-axis wind turbines", *AIAA Journal*, vol. 49, no. 11, pp. 2511-2521.
  - [53] Scheurich, F., Fletcher, T. M. and Brown, R. E. (2011), "Simulating the aerodynamic performance and wake dynamics of a vertical-axis wind turbine", *Wind Energy*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 159-177.
  - [54] Erickson, L. L. (1990), *Panel Methods - An Introduction*, NASA TP-2995, NASA, California.
  - [55] Dixon, K. (2009), *The near wake structure of a vertical axis wind turbine* (Master's thesis), TU Delft, Netherlands.
  - [56] Ferreira, C., Hofemann, C., Dixon, K., Van Kuik, G. and Van Bussel, G. (2010), "3D wake dynamics of the VAWT: Experimental and numerical investigation", *48th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting Including the New Horizons Forum and Aerospace Exposition*.
  - [57] Green, J. E., Weeks, D. J., and Brooman, J. W. F. (1977), *Prediction of Turbulent Boundary Layers and Wakes in Compressible Flow by a Lag-Entrainment Method*, R. & M. No. 3791, Aeronautical Research Council, London.
  - [58] Flow Solutions Ltd (2013), *NEWPAN*, available at: <http://www.flowsol.co.uk/products/newpan/> (accessed 20.09.2013).
  - [59] Merz, K. O. (2012), "A Method for Analysis of VAWT Aerodynamic Loads under Turbulent Wind and Platform Motion", *Energy Procedia*, vol. 24, no. 0, pp. 44-51.
  - [60] McIntosh, S. C. and Babinsky, H. (2012), "Aerodynamic Modeling of Swept-Bladed Vertical Axis Wind Turbines", *Journal of Propulsion and Power*, , pp. 1-11.
  - [61] Stock, M. J., Gharakhani, A. and Stone, C. P. (2010), "Modeling rotor wakes with a hybrid OVERFLOW-Vortex method on a GPU cluster", *28th AIAA Applied Aerodynamics Conference*, 28 June-1 July, Chicago, Illinois, AIAA, USA, .
  - [62] Hard, S., Wilhelm, J., Pertl, F. A. and Smith, J. E. (2011), "GPU CUDA performance on two-dimensional and three-dimensional VAWT vortex models", *International Journal of Scientific and Statistical Computing*, vol. 2, no. 1.
  - [63] Muskulus, M. (2011), "Designing the next generation of computational codes for wind-turbine simulations", *Proceedings of the International Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference*, pp. 314.
  - [64] Martins, S. L., Ribeiro, C. C. and Rodriguez, N. (2002), "Parallel Computing Environment", in Pardalos, P. M. and Resende, M. G. C. (eds.) *Handbook of Applied Optimization*, Oxford University Press, New York, USA.

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- [65] Mishra, B.S. and Dehuri, S., ( 2011), *Parallel Computing Environments: A Review*.
- [66] Simão Ferreira, C. and Scheurich, F. (2013), "Demonstrating that power and instantaneous loads are decoupled in a vertical-axis wind turbine", *Wind Energy*.
- [67] Jonkman, J. and Musial, W. (2010), *Offshore Code Comparison (OC3) for IEA Task 23 Offshore Wind Technology and Deployment*, NREL/TP-5000-48191, NREL, Colorado.
- [68] Cordle, A. (2010), *State-of-the-art in design tools for floating offshore wind turbines*, UpWind D4.3.5, UpWind.
- [69] Cordle, A. and Jonkman, J. (2011), "State of the art in floating wind turbine design tools", *Proceedings of the International Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference*, pp. 367.
- [70] Collu, M., Borg, M., Shires, A. and Brennan, F. P. (2013), "Progress on the development of a coupled model of dynamics for floating offshore vertical axis wind turbines", *Proceedings of the ASME 2013 32nd International Conference on Ocean, Offshore and Arctic Engineering*, 9-14 June, 2013, Nantes, France, ASME.
- [71] Borg, M., Utrera Ortigado, E., Collu, M. and Brennan, F. P. (2013), "Passive damping systems for floating vertical axis wind turbines analysis", *European Wind Energy Conference*, 3-7 February, 2013, Vienna, Austria, EWEA.
- [72] Borg, M., Collu, M. and Brennan, F. P. (2013), "Use of a wave energy converter as a motion suppression device for floating wind turbines", *10th Deep Sea Offshore Wind R&D Conference*, 24-25 January, 2013, Trondheim, Norway.
- [73] Borg, M. and Collu, M. (under review), "Offshore floating vertical axis wind turbines, dynamics modelling state of the art. Part II: Structural & Mooring Line Dynamics", *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*.

Figures



Figure 1 - 3.8MW Éole VAWT  $\Phi$ -rotor



Figure 2 - 0.5MW VAWT-850 H-rotor






Figure 3 - Conceptual comparison between floating horizontal and vertical axis wind turbines




Figure 4 - Schematic diagram of the Double Multiple Streamtube Model [37]




Figure 5 - Typical time-stepping scheme for blade element momentum models [35]




Figure 6 - Cascade model configuration, adapted from Islam et al. [25]




Figure 7 - Vortex element schematic diagram with progression of shed vortices, adapted from Strickland et al. [30]




Figure 8 – Plan view of a typical blade trailing edge wake simulation of a three-bladed VAWT, adapted from Strickland et al. [30]




Figure 9 - Typical time-stepping scheme for vortex models




Figure 10 - a) Panel discretisation of a VAWT blade section and wake roll up; b) sample visualisation of a 2-bladed VAWT panel model simulation using the Unsteady free-wake Multi-body Panel Method (UMPM) [58; 59]




Figure 11 - Typical time-stepping scheme for panel models [58]

FAST	Bladed	ADAMS	HAWC2	3Dfloat	Simo	SESAM/DeepC
<b>Code Developer</b>						
NREL	GH	MSC + NREL + LUH	Rise-DTU	IFE-UMB	MARINTEK	DNV
<b>OC3 Participant</b>						
NREL + POSTECH	GH	NREL + LUH	Rise-DTU	IFE-UMB	MARINTEK	Acciona + NTNU
<b>Aerodynamics</b>						
(BEM or GDW) + DS	(BEM or GDW) + DS	(BEM or GDW) + DS	(BEM or GDW) + DS	(BEM or GDW)	BEM	None
<b>Hydrodynamics</b>						
Airy+ + ME, Airy + PF + ME	(Airy+ or Stream) + ME	Airy+ + ME, Airy + PF + ME	Airy + ME	Airy + ME	Airy + PF + ME	Airy+ + ME, Airy + PF + ME
<b>Control System (Servo)</b>						
DLL, UD, SM	DLL	DLL, UD	DLL, UD, SM	UD	DLL	None
<b>Structural Dynamics (Elastic)</b>						
Turbine: FEMP + (Modal / MBS), Moorings: QSCE	Turbine: FEMP + (Modal / MBS), Moorings: UDFD	Turbine: MBS, Moorings: QSCE, UDFD	Turbine: MBS / FEM, Moorings: UDFD	Turbine: FEM, Moorings: FEM, UDFD	Turbine: MBS, Moorings: QSCE, MBS	Turbine: MBS, Moorings: QSCE, FEM
Airy <sup>+</sup> – Airy wave theory; (+) with free surface connections BEM – blade-element/momentum DLL – external dynamic link library DNV – Det Norsk. Veritas DS – dynamic stall			GDW – generalized dynamic wake FEM <sup>P</sup> – finite-element method; (P) for mode preprocessing only MBS – multibody-dynamics formulation ME – Morison's Software Corporation		PF – linear potential flow with radiation and diffraction QSCE – quasi-static catenary equations SM – interface to Simulink® with MATLAB® UD – implementation through user-defined subroutine available UDFD – implementation through user-defined force-displacement relationships	

Figure 12 - Comparison of models used in current design codes for offshore HAWTs [70]

## Tables

**Table 1 – Comparison of aerodynamic models**

	<b>BEM model</b>	<b>Cascade model</b>	<b>Vortex model</b>	<b>Panel model</b>
<b>Complexity</b>	Low-Medium	Low-Medium	Medium-High	High
<b>Ease of implementation</b>	Easy-Medium	Easy-Medium	Medium	Hard
<b>Computational effort</b>	Low	Low	Medium-High	Medium-High
<b>Restricted to known aerofoils</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Incorporate unsteady conditions</b>	Limited	Limited	Yes	Yes
<b>Rotor-wake/multiple rotor interactions</b>	No/No	No/No	Yes/Limited	Yes/Yes