### Wave-in-Deck Assessment for Fixed Offshore Structures



### Konstruksjonsdagen 2023



#### **Palle Teis Nielsen**

Senior Structural Engineer Rambøll - Marine Structures Esbjerg



#### **Hans Fabricius Hansen**

Senior Metocean Engineer HAW MetOcean ApS Copenhagen



#### **Bjørn Thomas Svendsen**

Lead Structural Engineer Rambøll - Marine Structures Stavanger



- Ramboll in short
- Wave-in-Deck Assessment for Fixed Offshore Structures
- Crest Elevation Calculation



#### 16000 in Ramboll

#### 2000 in Ramboll Energy

Among the 10 leading energy consultancies in Europe

Ramboll Head Office

• Ramboll offices

## **RAMBOLL** Energy Transition



40 years of experience with offshore



Partner for sustainable change



Risk, Safety – Cost reduction



New types of projects





Carbon Capture & Storage INEOS, North Sea



Seegreen Wind Farm TotalEnergies, Scotland



Floating Solar Power Plant Equinor, Norway Solar



**Energy Island P2X** Energinet, North Sea

### Wave-in-Deck Assessment for offshore structures

#### Objective

Give a wide overview of likelihood for wave-in-deck on Norwegian bottom fixed offshore structures

#### Scope of work

- 1. Calculation of wave crest elevation for 100-, 1,000- and 10,000 year return period
- 2. Collection of platform data and calculate platform topside air gap
- 3. Evaluate on different methods and compare against other projects and measured storm data





1. Calculation of wave crest elevation



- 1. Calculation of wave crest elevation
- 2. Taking into account subsidence



- 1. Calculation of wave crest elevation
- 2. Taking into account subsidence
- 3. Extreme event



### **Platform Overview**

- North Sea and Norwegian Sea
- In total 59 jackets in operation, split between 5 operators:





• Similar wave crest assessment has been done for platforms in Danish and British part of the North Sea.



#### Metocean analysis

- 14 locations on water depth 65-198 m
- 10 methods for calculating elevations

- Note that results are point-statistic results, i.e. for a platform assessment, e.g. point-to-area corrections should be considered to account for topside size.
- Combining results with platform data...



### Air gap results – 100y

- One line for each metocean calculation method
- Results from the analysis method used varies approx. 2 m for all locations
- 5-10% of all platforms the anual probability for negative air-gap is higher than  $10^{-2}$
- All platforms with negative air gap are already planned to be un-manned during storms (Operator's inputs)



### Air gap results – 10,000y

- Results from the analysis method used varies approx 3-4 m depending on the location
- For 25-60% of all platforms the anual probability for negative air-gap is higher than  $10^{-4}$
- Multiple platforms are planned manned during storm and is expected to have negative air gap for a 10,000-year occurance



#### Critical?

- Acceptance criteria for the platforms will be different
- Wave-in-Deck load calculation
- Structural resistance evaluation
- Reinforcements
- Monitoring of platforms



## Wave crest height calculation

#### Objective

Calculate wave crest elevation with return periods up to 10,000 years using latest best-practice

#### Scope of work

- 1. Calculate long-term sea state distribution using best-practice statistical methods
- 2. Convolve with higher-order wave crest height distribution
- 3. Assess sensitivity of end results



#### Long-term Maximum Crest Height Distribution

$$P(\eta_{c,max}) = \int_{\Omega} P(\eta_{c,max} | \Omega) p(\Omega) d\Omega$$

where

 $\Omega = (H_s, T_p, ...)$ : Sea state parameters

 $P(\eta_{c,max} | \Omega)$ : Probability distribution of maximum crest height conditional on sea state  $p(\Omega)$ : Probability density of sea state parameters

# Extreme value analysis of sea state distribution – Background

- Shell/Lancaster Univ. in 00'es:
  - Covariates (directional- and seasonal- rather than omni-distributions)
  - Generalised Pareto distribution tails (rooted in Extreme Value Theory)
  - 'Extrapolation' uncertainty acknowledged and included
- Shell/Lancaster approach adopted by:
  - Mærsk Oil (Tyra as-is/AWARE) (2015-)
  - LOADS JIP (2016-)
  - UK HSE (Extreme wave study 2020-2022)
  - bp (2019-)
  - Aker BP (Valhall)
  - TotalEnergies (2021-)

### Crest height distribution – Background

- Field data / basin tests analysed
  - JIP's (CresT -> ShorTCresT -> LOADS)
  - Maersk Oil/TotalEnergies (Tyra as-is/AWARE)
- Conclusions
  - Higher order effects increase crest heights beyond Forristall's second order distribution
  - Wave breaking reduces crests in severely breaking sea states
  - Uncertainty in measurements
- Number of updated crest height distributions developed
  - LOADS JIP Unified crest height distribution (Swan, Karmpadakis)
  - LOADS JIP OCG distribution (Gibson, 2021)
  - Schubert/Jonathan (2020) (AWARE)

### Crest height distribution – Background

- Field data / basin tests analysed
  - JIP's (CresT -> ShorTCresT -> LOADS)
  - Maersk Oil/TotalEnergies (Tyra as-is/AWARE)
- Conclusions
  - Higher order effects increase crest heights beyond Forristall's second order distribution
  - Wave breaking reduces crests in severely breaking sea states
  - Uncertainty in measurements
- Number of updated crest height distributions developed
  - LOADS JIP Unified crest height distribution (Swan, Karmpadakis)
  - LOADS JIP OCG distribution (Gibson, 2021)
  - Schubert/Jonathan (2020) (AWARE)

### Work Description – Input

- Long time series of  $H_s$ ,  $T_p$ , etc. required for extreme value analysis
  - <u>NORA10 hindcast</u>
    - Meteorologisk institutt Norge 65 years hindcast 1957-2022
  - <u>NEWS hindcast</u>
    - Ocean Weather hindcast 1979-2022
  - NS1200 synthetic simulation
    - Climate model simulation of 1200 years worth of present climate

• Extreme value analysis using SAM JIP code

- Extreme value analysis using SAM JIP code
  - Variations with direction of storm and time of year included
  - -> Directional and seasonal covariates



- Extreme value analysis using SAM JIP code
  - Variations with direction of storm and time of year included
  - -> Directional and seasonal covariates
  - Uncertainty in 'extrapolation' accounted for

- Extreme value analysis using SAM JIP code
  - Variations with direction of storm and time of year include
  - -> Directional and seasonal covariates
  - Uncertainty in 'extrapolation' accounted for
    - -> 'Predictive' distributions used



- Extreme value analysis using SAM JIP code
  - Variations with direction of storm and time of year include
  - -> Directional and seasonal covariates
  - Uncertainty in 'extrapolation' accounted for



- Extreme value analysis using SAM JIP code
  - Variations with direction of storm and time of year include
  - -> Directional and seasonal covariates
  - Uncertainty in 'extrapolation' accounted for



- Extreme value analysis using SAM JIP code
  - Variations with direction of storm and time of year include
  - -> Directional and seasonal covariates
  - Uncertainty in 'extrapolation' accounted for
    - -> 'Predictive' distributions used



- Extreme value analysis using SAM JIP code
  - Variations with direction of storm and time of year included
    - -> Directional and seasonal covariates
  - Uncertainty in 'extrapolation' accounted for
    - -> 'Predictive' distributions used
  - Joint distributions of wave period conditional on wave height



- Extreme value analysis using SAM JIP code
  - Variations with direction of storm and time of year included
    - -> Directional and seasonal covariates
  - Uncertainty in 'extrapolation' accounted for
    - -> 'Predictive' distributions used
  - Joint distributions of wave period conditional on wave height
  - Storm 'trajectory' sampling to model evolution of storm events



- Extreme value analysis using SAM JIP code
  - Variations with direction of storm and time of year included
    - -> Directional and seasonal covariates
  - Uncertainty in 'extrapolation' accounted for
    - -> 'Predictive' distributions used
  - Joint distributions of wave period conditional on wave height
  - Storm 'trajectory' sampling to model evolution of storm events

20

15

C

3

 $_{L}^{10}$ 



- Extreme value analysis using SAM JIP code
  - Variations with direction of storm and time of year included
    - -> Directional and seasonal covariates
  - Uncertainty in 'extrapolation' accounted for
    - -> 'Predictive' distributions used
  - Joint distributions of wave period conditional on wave height
  - Storm 'trajectory' sampling to model evolution of storm events
    - Historical storms matched

Ramboll





16

15

14

(<u>s</u> 13 10 12

nagnitude ([m] 11 10 8

-20

-15

-10

-5

Storm event with:

★ H<sub>m0</sub> [m]

 $O T_{01} [s]$ 

 $H_{m0} = 10.5m$ 

\*

0

5

10

15

20

 $T_{01} = 14.9s$ 



- Extreme value analysis using SAM JIP code
  - Variations with direction of storm and time of year included
    - -> Directional and seasonal covariates
  - Uncertainty in 'extrapolation' accounted for
    - -> 'Predictive' distributions used
  - Joint distributions of wave period conditional on wave height
  - Storm 'trajectory' sampling to model evolution of storm events
    - Historical storms matched and rescaled
  - Sea state maximum crest height sampled from parametric crest height distribution  $P(\eta_c|H_{m0}, T_{01}, \sigma_{\theta}, d)^N$

- Folding with short-term distributions
  - Forristall distribution (for reference)
  - LOADS OCG distribution



#### Extreme Value Analysis – Associated storm surge

• Storm surge can correlate with waves -> extra contribution to total water level



### Results

- Analysis at 14 points
- 10 different results at each point
  - 5 different data sets
  - 2 different priors



#### Results – 100 year $H_{m0}$

 $H_{m0} \ [\mathrm{m}] - 100 \ \mathrm{year} \ \mathrm{RP}$ 



#### Results – 100 year crest elevation

OCG (2021) $\eta_{\rm max}~[{\rm mMSL}]-100~{\rm year}~{\rm RP}$ 



#### Results – 10,000 year $H_{m0}$

 $H_{m0}$  [m] – 10000 year RP



Results – 10,000 year crest elevation

OCG (2021)  $\eta_{\rm max}$  [mMSL] – 10000 year RP



#### Conclusive remarks

- Range of 100 year crest elevation estimates (min-max) from 1.0 to 2.5 meter
- Range of 10,000 year crest elevation estimates (min-max) from 2.0 to 4.5 meter
- Differences due to
  - Input data differences
  - Extrapolation (priors, data set length)
- Uncertainties included
  - Extrapolation (threshold, parameter) uncertainty
  - LOADS OCG crest height distribution uncertainty
- Uncertainties not included
  - Measurement uncertainty and bias (field and basin)
  - Input data uncertainty (hindcast scatter)

Thank you!

#### **Palle Teis Nielsen**

Senior Structural Engineer Marine Structures Ramboll Energy

D +45 51617320 pltn@ramboll.com Hans Fabricius Hansen Senior Metocean Engineer HAW MetOcean ApS

D +45 61710362 hfh@haw-metocean.com

## Questions?

