



**ITTC – Recommended  
Procedures and Guidelines**

**7.5-02  
-06-03**  
Page 1 of 11

**Validation of Manoeuvring  
Simulation Models**

Effective Date  
2014

Revision  
03

**Table of Contents**

<b>1. PURPOSE OF PROCEDURE.....2</b>	<b>3.6 Simulation Software .....7</b>
<b>2. INTRODUCTION .....2</b>	<b>3.7 Simulated Manoeuvres.....7</b>
<b>3. DOCUMENTATION OF A MANOEUVRING SIMULATION MODEL .....3</b>	<b>4. VALIDATION..... 8</b>
<b>3.1 Ship Particulars .....3</b>	<b>4.1 Introduction ..... 8</b>
<b>3.2 Prediction of the Hydrodynamic Forces.....4</b>	<b>4.2 Benchmark Data..... 8</b>
<b>3.3 Modelling of Forces in the Mathematical Model. ....5</b>	<b>4.3 Potential Causes of Prediction Uncertainties ..... 9</b>
<b>3.4 Mathematical Model Structure .....6</b>	<b>4.4 Sensitivity Analysis..... 9</b>
<b>3.5 Integration Method .....7</b>	<b>5. REFERENCES ..... 10</b>

Prepared by	Approved
Manoeuvring Committee of the 27 <sup>th</sup> ITTC	27 <sup>th</sup> ITTC 2014
Date 03/2014	Date 09/2014

## Validation of Manoeuvring Simulation Models.

### 1. PURPOSE OF PROCEDURE

This procedure proposes the necessary steps and documentation for the development of a simulation model. The procedure is valid for a simulation model based on

- empirics,
- captive tests or
- virtual captive tests (CFD).

The procedure can be applied to

- specific manoeuvring models (valid for one ship) or for
- generic manoeuvring prediction methods.

This procedure is intended to help assess the validity and quality of a manoeuvring simulation model. Any validity check is a difficult task due to the lack of reliable full-scale results to compare simulations with. There is however a considerable amount of model scale validation material available. The need for accurate simulations justifies significant attention in this area.

### 2. INTRODUCTION

The development of a manoeuvring simulation model can have many purposes. A distinction can be made between:

- (a1) models for prediction of ship manoeuvrability;
- (a2) models for use in simulators.

Prediction of standard ship manoeuvres (a1) is needed at the design stage to ensure that a ship

has acceptable manoeuvring behaviour, as defined by the ship owner, IMO or local authorities.

Simulator, or time-domain, models (a2) are used in real-time, man-in-the-loop simulators, or fast-time simulators for training of deck officers or investigation of specific ships operating in specific harbours or channels. For these purposes, the simulation often has to model a specific ship in deep and shallow water (finite water depth), as well as interactions with the environment in the form of wind, current, waves and tugs. Lateral restrictions are also possible, which are referred to as restricted water, that includes banks, ship-ship interaction, etc. Other purposes might exist but these cover those most commonly encountered.

The requirements for validation are the same for both types of models. However, the amount of required data and, hence, the validation effort is much larger for simulator models (a2) since they typically address more parameters and operating conditions than the models used for prediction of ship manoeuvrability (a1).

The generation of a manoeuvring model covers a series of steps, which must be validated and documented individually:

1. Ship particulars
2. Prediction of the Hydrodynamic forces
3. Modelling of forces in the mathematical model (derivatives, coefficients, tables, direct simulation of forces)
4. Mathematical Model Structure
5. Integration method
6. Simulation software
7. Simulated manoeuvres

Each of the above steps is addressed in the following sections.

### 3. DOCUMENTATION OF A MANOEUVRING SIMULATION MODEL

This section is valid for prediction of IMO type standard manoeuvres alone (a1) and for models in a (full mission or fast time) simulator which have to perform in addition to standard manoeuvres many other manoeuvres (a2). The simulator models (a2) are in general more extensively described than the (a1) models.

A simulation model should be documented in a way such that the methods and assumptions used are stated and the parameters, for which the model is valid, are clearly given. Furthermore, the documentation should include simulated standard manoeuvres and possibly address the expected accuracy of these simulations.

The purpose of the manoeuvring simulation model must be stated and a definition of the nomenclature and coordinate systems used must be given.

#### 3.1 Ship Particulars

For a model to be used in the prediction of ship manoeuvrability (a1), at least the following ship particulars should be given:

**Type of ship** (container, LNG, etc.)

##### Hull data

- Design displacement
- Design draft
- $L_{PP}$
- $L_{OA}$
- Breadth moulded

##### Actual loading condition

- Draft fore/aft or mean draught/trim

- Displacement
- Wetted surface
- Longitudinal centre of buoyancy
- Moment of inertia in yaw
- $\overline{KG}$ ,  $\overline{BM}$ ,  $\overline{KB}$ , moment of inertia in roll (4-DOF model)
- Approach speed and/or service speed

##### Engine characteristics

- Engine type
- Shaft power

##### Data on propulsors

- Type
- Number of propulsors
- Position
- Diameter
- Thrust and torque open water characteristics
- Type dependent data (e.g. for propellers: direction of rotation, no. of blades, pitch ratio at  $0.7R$ , area ratio  $A_E/A_O$ ; for pods: lateral area, pod diameter, length)

##### Data on steering devices

- Type
- Number of steering devices
- Position
- Type dependent data (e.g. for rudders: type of rudder (spade, horn, flap), movable rudder area, total rudder area, height, length, aspect ratio, thickness, maximum rudder rate, maximum rudder angle)

Other useful information for documentation includes

- a set of hydrostatic data (at least for the given loading condition);
- drawings of the rudder and propulsor areas, including contour and profiles;
- a body plan and stern and stem contours of the ship;
- description and drawings of appendages on the hull, including bilge keels, additional fins, etc.;
- if possible, photographs of the ship;

- for models to be used in real-time simulators, profiles exposed to wind should be included, as well as their corresponding frontal and lateral areas;
- a table giving the ship speed at various control settings in deep and shallow water;
- data on thrusters and other auxiliary manoeuvring devices, including number, position, design thrust, etc.

A recommended example of how to document ship particulars of a simulation model is given in Hwang, 2004.

### 3.2 Prediction of the Hydrodynamic Forces

A simulation model is usually based on Newton's Second Law, applied to a rigid body for six degrees of freedom:

- Translation modes:

$$mass * acceleration = \sum external\ forces$$

- Rotation modes:

$$mass\ moment\ of\ inertia * angular\ acceleration = \sum external\ moments$$

The mass properties of the vessel in the various degrees of freedom are generally well-known. The external forces and moments are primarily of hydrodynamic origin for marine vessels, and include effects of the hull itself, along with those of steering devices and propulsors. Additionally, forces and moments exerted by tugs, moorings, environmental forces, etc., are included as applicable in the external forces. Naturally, the accuracy of the various force and moment models greatly affects the accuracy of the simulations.

A variety of possible sources are available for the estimation of hydrodynamic forces and moments; they can be distinguished as follows:

- (b1) data base (type ship concept)
- (b2) regression equations from data base
- (b3) captive model tests (see 23<sup>rd</sup> ITTC, 2002: Captive Model Test Procedure)
- (b4) free model tests with system identification
- (b5) full scale trials with system identification
- (b6) calculation of forces resulting from prescribed kinematics by CFD techniques (see 26<sup>th</sup> ITTC, 2011: Guideline on use of RANS tools for manoeuvring prediction)
- (b7) Direct Manoeuvring Simulation using CFD

Several of these methods (b2), (b3), (b4), (b6) and (b7) were studied and their performance was compared in the SIMMAN 2008 workshop on validation of manoeuvring mathematical models.

It should be noted that some of these methods, such as (b4) and (b5), often do not include explicit definition of the hydrodynamic forces. One conclusion from the SIMMAN 2008 workshop was that these methods are not applicable outside the combination of motion parameters where the mathematical model is created.

A distinction between force predictions from generic databases (b1, b2) and ship specific data (b3, b4, b5, b6, b7) has to be made. If either database method is used, it should be clearly documented to what extent the current design is represented in the database that is being used as source. As an example, a database that consists only of full form tankers, cannot be used for prediction of forces on a container ship. The adequacy of a database for a given vessel can be assessed by comparing appropriated parameters such as  $T/L$ ,  $B/T$ ,  $C_B$ , approach speed, etc. This was clearly demonstrated in the SIMMAN 2008 workshop. Therefore it is recommended that the

adequacy of the (b1) and (b2) methods is demonstrated by comparison to several vessels within the range of applicability of the method. If applicable, the free model tests results produced by the SIMMAN 2008 workshop should be part of this validation.

Simulation models based on captive tests (b3) should be developed based along well established methodologies. Methodologies therefore need to be well established within the institute. The applicability of the methods needs to be validated by comparison with free model tests or full scale measurements. In particular, it is important to model ships with low GM and higher speeds, using 4 DOF mathematical models. That implies that the roll angle should be a parameter in the test matrix. The SIMMAN 2008 workshop has demonstrated clearly the large difference in the performance between 4 DOF models and 3 DOF models for such ships.

For the cases (b4, b5), free model tests and full-scale trials with system identification, it is essential to demonstrate that force representation is also adequate to describe manoeuvres which are not included in the trials or tests. This extrapolation may be difficult, although models that contain only the necessary effects will usually be the most successful. Oltmann (1996) gives an example wherein free model zig-zag tests were used to create an adequate mathematical model. A subsequent, independent comparison with a full-scale turning circle was successful, showing that the model created from zigzag data was applicable to steady-state turning. In fact, this same study also illustrates an effective scaling of forces.

In the case of free model tests (b4) and full-scale trials (b5), one should demonstrate that the system identification method gives good results either using the own data (showing that the simulations predict the tested manoeuvres used for the system identification) or applying the same

procedure for other independent benchmark data. Similarly, the use of CFD to calculate forces (b6) should be validated against benchmark captive force measurements. Finally, simulation making use of CFD (b7) can be validated against benchmark manoeuvres from either free sailing model tests or full scale trials. The use of system identification results to validate CFD calculations, and vice versa, is not recommended.

As a final note, the use of full-scale trials for the purpose of identifying forces (b5) often have the difficulty of uncontrolled or poorly documented environmental conditions, such as second-order wave forces, wind, currents, and non-uniform sea bottom. These effects, which degrade the quality of data significantly, can be minimized through careful selection of the trial site and conditions of weather, wave height, and tidal flow. The environmental conditions should be measured and documented as accurately as possible. Furthermore, the vessel should be instrumented as well as possible in order to record ship motions. Thereby it may be possible to model the environmental effects in the mathematical model or at least to develop upper bounds of their impact on the overall response (see Procedure 7.5-04-02-01: Full Scale Manoeuvring Trials Procedure).

### **3.3 Modelling of Forces in the Mathematical Model.**

The hydrodynamic forces acting on the ship can be represented mathematically in many forms, from the fairly simple Abkowitz derivatives for prediction of first quadrant manoeuvres, to a full four-quadrant deep and shallow water simulator model.

Forces are described with the following means:

1. Hydrodynamic derivatives (obtained from measured or calculated forces)

2. Look-up tables of the forces
3. Algebraic equations (empirical or theoretical)
4. Direct simulation (CFD)

For any approach, the proposed mathematical model must be able to reproduce the original force data with sufficient accuracy. Results from a PMM test for a ROPAX vessel are shown in Figure 1, as an example; the measured yaw moment is given as function of drift angle and speed. The PMM tests covered three speeds to account for the speed loss during a turning circle. The proposed mathematical model for the yaw moment,  $N'(\beta, u')$ , is:

$$N'(\beta, u') = N'_{\beta} \beta + N'_{\beta|\beta} \beta |\beta| + N'_{\beta\beta\beta} \beta^3 + N'_{\beta u} \beta u'$$

Here non-dimensional surge and sway velocities are given as:

$$u' = \frac{u - U_0}{\sqrt{u^2 + v^2}}, \quad \tan \beta = -\frac{v}{u}$$

As the figure shows, the proposed mathematical model captures the measured yaw moment reasonably well, with regard to variations in both  $u'$  and  $\beta$ .

When databases or regression equations (b1, b2) are used, the obtained force formulation corresponds to the structure of the mathematical model. Validation of the mathematical model is therefore impossible in these cases.

Documentation of the mathematical model should include:

- Form of the model
- Nomenclature
- Non-dimensionalisation used
- All state variables
- The range of state variables for which the mathematical model is valid

- Interaction terms in modular models




Figure 1: Comparison of measured and predicted yaw moment. Lines indicate simulation model

All effects that are included in the mathematical model should be defined. As an example, if the model includes propeller rotational speed, the strategy for relating engine power and rpm during simulation should be explained.

### 3.4 Mathematical Model Structure

With respect to the complexity of the mathematical model, the following distinctions are made:

- Whole-ship models (Abkowitz)
- Modular models of components
- Direct simulation (CFD)

Whole-ship models are typically used for prediction of ship manoeuvrability, whereas modular models may be used additionally for real-time simulator models. In the latter case, the human operator has access to a large number of sensors and interacts with a variety of vessel subsystems. While whole-ship models and modular models are typically quasi-steady, CFD models enable simulation of transient manoeuvres by increasing the resolution at the fluid level.

### 3.5 Integration Method

Once the governing differential equations are known, a large variety of integration methods exist to make a time-domain simulation. The implementation must be validated against a known problem with a time constant similar to what is expected for the ship manoeuvres and which can be solved in an analytical way. For example, the step response of a first- or second-order system can be used.

The solution must also be checked for convergence, i.e. the time step and integration procedure used should be sufficient to model the frequencies included in the simulations. At the lower end, a 3-DOF model for prediction of IMO manoeuvres can be considered low frequency, for example the zigzag manoeuvre. The inclusion of roll motion immediately adds a higher frequency into the calculation, so that a smaller time step or a higher-fidelity integration scheme is required. Also, the viscous roll damping coefficient adjustment method must be documented. Full scale data or numerical methods (based on Procedure 7.5-02-07-04.5: Numerical Estimation of Roll Damping) may be used. Full 6-DOF models bring in higher resonance frequencies in heave, roll and pitch. Simulator models may introduce even more resonant components, due to interaction with moorings, fenders, and tugs, as well as waves.

A proper time integration method should be encompassed which works with a small enough time step so that all phenomena are captured.

### 3.6 Simulation Software

The mathematical model and the integration method that is implemented must be validated through relevant test and debug cases.

### 3.7 Simulated Manoeuvres

The following documentation should be included for each manoeuvre performed in simulation:

- Definition of manoeuvre
- Track plot with heading indication
- Table containing time series of state variables (see below)
- For zigzag manoeuvres, time series plot of rudder and heading
- For 4-DOF models, include time series plot of roll angle
- Derived manoeuvring indices (overshoot angles, turning circle parameters etc.)

The list of state variables to be tabulated should at least include:

- Rudder/steering device angle(s)
- Horizontal position in a fixed frame of reference ( $x, y$ )
- Longitudinal speed
- Transverse speed or drift angle
- Heading
- Yaw rate
- Propeller rpm and pitch, if applicable

A 4-DOF model should also include roll angle.

A simulator model sometimes requires the documentation of more parameters depending of the purpose of the model. Examples of additional parameters are:

- Thrusters forces and RPM
- Tug forces
- Mooring line forces
- Shallow waters parameter (depth to draft ratio)
- Restricted waters parameters (such as bank characteristics)

As noted previously, it is important that the proposed mathematical model covers the various parameter ranges encountered in the simulated manoeuvres. It should be verified that the data used by the model during the simulation are covered by the validity range of the model.

The time resolution of the output tables and the representation of the various parameters should be consistent with the application.

A recommended example of how to document the manoeuvres of a simulation model is given in Hwang, 2004.

## 4. VALIDATION

### 4.1 Introduction

Generally, the method of prediction applied must be validated against benchmark data, and the documentation of such validation should be available in the form of a report or published paper.

For predictions based on captive model testing (b3), the recommended procedure for uncertainty analysis is given in Procedure 7.5-02-06-02: Uncertainty Analysis, Example for Planar Motion Mechanism Test.

System identification is a separate task from making the force measurements, however, and is not included in the mentioned procedure. The case where both free model tests (b4) and captive model tests (b3) exist for the same vessel in the same condition is an excellent basis for validation of the system identification process. Except for scaling effects, captive model tests, with augmentation by free model tests for highly non-linear manoeuvres, present the best prospects for control of overall modelling uncertainty. The errors will be generally limited to sensor and actuation errors, which are not difficult to quantify, and unavoidable errors induced by a finite-dimensional model.

For mathematical models based on full-scale trials and system identification (b5), the main difficulty lies in the quality of the data which complicates control of experimental and system identification errors. The hydrodynamic forces themselves are simply not available.

### 4.2 Benchmark Data

As mentioned in the 22<sup>nd</sup> ITTC (1999) Manoeuvring Committee Report, there is little full-scale manoeuvring benchmark data available. Trials with the tanker *Esso Osaka* are the only instrumented experiments widely cited, see the 23<sup>rd</sup> ITTC (2002) *Esso Osaka* Specialist Committee Report, and the 22<sup>nd</sup> ITTC (1999) Manoeuvring Committee Report. It is however recommended not to use this data as validation material: the data is for an old ship design and the results are measured using old equipment, making data on some of the measured parameters questionable. Free and captive model tests are commonly used as a substitute for full-scale trials. While the question of scale effects is unresolved in this case, one still has the advantage of being able to control the model geometry, the test parameters and the test environment.

On this background the 24<sup>th</sup> ITTC decided to adopt a new set of benchmark data. Four different ship hulls were selected: two versions of a full-form tanker named KVLCC1 and KVLCC2, a container ship named KCS and a naval combatant named 5415. Though none of these ships exist in full-scale, they all represent modern hull forms of the respective types and full geometrical data for hull, propeller, rudder and other appendages is publicly available. In connection with the Workshop on Verification and Validation of Ship Manoeuvring Simulation Models (SIMMAN 2008), a large model test campaign was performed, comprising PMM, CMT (circular motion tests) and free model tests for each of the four hulls.

Benchmark data for restricted water manoeuvre simulations for different vessels may be found in Lataire et al., (2009a, 2009b) and Vantorre and Delefortrie (2013). Manoeuvring in waves benchmark data is presented in Yasukawa (2006).

#### 4.3 Potential Causes of Prediction Uncertainties

There are a number of uncertainty causes affecting accuracy, related to each of the validation steps mentioned above.

- Prediction of forces is presumably the main contributor to the uncertainty of the final simulation result. Sources can include sensor noise and nonlinearities in physical tests, approximations and extrapolations inherent in the database models, and the difficulties of CFD analysis. For each of the methods (b1-b7) mentioned in this procedure, a validation procedure should be implemented. However, at the present time of writing, only the procedure

“Captive Model Testing” exists. Reference is therefore given to this procedure.

- Modelling of forces in a mathematical model: uncertainty here lies primarily in the applied method for representing the forces as functions of the state variables.
- The mathematical model structure may be inappropriate to capture the desired effects, or may not cover the range of state vectors and environments encountered in manoeuvring.
- Integration method uncertainties are usually small compared with the other sources, provided the time step is small enough to handle frequencies in the physical problem.
- Simulation software errors are unavoidable and occur occasionally.
- Simulated manoeuvres should be made with high resolution both temporally and spatially.
- For shallow water validation, the blockage effects due to the towing tank lateral walls may affect the experimental results, since the presence of the walls increase the hydrodynamic forces on the ship compared to the unrestricted water condition (Toxopeus et al., 2013)

#### 4.4 Sensitivity Analysis

As noted above, to perform a formal sensitivity analysis on calculated manoeuvres from a mathematical model is a cumbersome task, due the presence of nonlinear effects in most models. However, it is still necessary to address the uncertainty of calculated manoeuvres in some quantitative way.

For direct manoeuvring predictions based on databases and regression equations (b1, b2) sensitivity analysis may be difficult because of the lack of any data specific to the vessel in question. Little advice can be given except to check

the ship parameters against the population of ships represented in the database.

For situations in which a mathematical model has been created, however, the evaluation of manoeuvring sensitivity is a matter of repeated simulations, while varying the parameters in turn. The study may sweep through the parameters systematically, or randomly; the latter case is attractive if a large number of parameters exists and the effects of multiple variations need to be considered.




Figure 3: Relative sensitivity (ratio of change in estimated results when each parameter is individually increased 10%) of various parameters on the first overshoot angle in a 10-10 zigzag test in a simulation model. (adapted from Ishiguro et al,1996)

An example case of sensitivity analysis results is illustrated in Figure 3, from Ishiguro et al. (1996).

Sensitivity analysis has been discussed in the Manoeuvring Committee Report of the 22<sup>nd</sup> ITTC and in the procedure 7.5-02-06-04 on uncertainty analysis for manoeuvring predictions based on captive model tests.

## 5. REFERENCES

International Towing Tank Conference, 1996, "Manoeuvring Committee - Final Report and Recommendations to the 21st ITTC", Proceedings of 21st ITTC, Bergen - Trondheim, Norway, Vol. 1, pp. 347-398.

International Towing Tank Conference, 1999, "Manoeuvring Committee - Final Report and Recommendations to the 22<sup>nd</sup> ITTC", Proceedings of 22<sup>nd</sup> ITTC, Seoul/Shanghai.

International Towing Tank Conference, 2002, "Esso Osaka Specialist Committee - Final Report and Recommendations to the 23<sup>rd</sup> ITTC", Proceedings of 23<sup>rd</sup> ITTC, Venice, Italy.

International Towing Tank Conference, 2002, "Manoeuvring – Captive Model Test Procedure", ITTC Quality Manual, Venice, Italy.

Lataire, E.; Vantorre, M.; Eloit, K., 2009a, "Systematic model tests on ship-bank interaction effects", in: Eloit, K. et al. (Ed.). International Conference on Ship Manoeuvring in Shallow and Confined Water: Bank Effects. pp. 9-22

Lataire, E.; Vantorre, M.; Delefortrie, G., 2009b. "Captive model testing for ship-to-ship operations", in: International Conference on Marine Simulation and Ship Manoeuvrability (MARSIM 2009), August 17-20, Panama City, Panama: conference proceedings. pp. [1-10]

Oltmann, P., 1996, "On the Influence of Speed on the manoeuvring behaviour of a container carrier", In Proceedings of Marine Simulation and Ship Manoeuvrability, Copenhagen, Denmark, ISBN 90 54108312

	<b>ITTC – Recommended Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-02 -06-03</b> Page 11 of 11	
	<b>Validation of Manoeuvring Simulation Models</b>	Effective Date 2014	Revision 03

Ishiguro, T., S. Tanaka, and Y. Yoshimura, 1996, “A Study on the Accuracy of the Recent Prediction Technique of Ship’s Manoeuvrability at an Early Design Stage,” In Proceedings of Marine Simulation and Ship Manoeuvrability, M.S. Chislett, ed., Copenhagen, Denmark.

Ship Manoeuvring in Shallow and Confined Water, June 3 - 5, 2013, Ghent, Belgium

Hwang, W-Y., 2004, “Guideline for Ship Model Documentation”, submitted for workshop discussion at 31<sup>st</sup> IMSF Annual General Meeting.

Stern, F. and Agdrup, K. (editors): “Proceedings of The Workshop on Verification and Validation of Ship Manoeuvring Simulation Methods - SIMMAN 2008”, Lyngby, Denmark, 2009.

Stern, F., Agdrup, K., Kim, S.Y., Hochbaum, A.C., Rhee, K.P., Quadvlieg, F., Perdon, P., Hino, T., Broglia, R., Gorski, J., 2011, “Experience form SIMMAN 2008 – the first workshop on verification and validation of ship manoeuvring simulation methods”, Journal of Ship Research, Vol. 55, No. 2, June 2011, pp. 135-147.

Toxopeus, S.L., Simonsen, C.D., Guilmineau, E., Visonneau, M., Xing, T. and Stern, F., 2013, “Investigation of water depth and basin wall effects on KVLCC2 in manoeuvring motion using viscous-flow calculations”, Journal of Marine Science and Technology, 2013, DOI 10.1007/s00773-013-0221-6.

Yasukawa, H., 2006, “Simulations of Ship Manoeuvring in Waves (1st report: turning motion)”, Journal of the Japan Society of Naval Architects and Ocean Engineers, Vol.4, pp.127-136

Vantorre, M., Delefortrie, G., 2013, “Behaviour of Ships Approaching and Leaving Locks: Open Model Test Data For Validation Purposes”, In: 3rd International Conference on