DNV·GL

Machine Learning – the latest news Lars Landberg, James Bleeg, Elizabeth Traiger

01 October 2019

COMMITTED TO INNOVATION

5%

of revenue invested in research and innovation

Collaborating

with industry partners and external experts

Sharing

knowledge through standards and best practices

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\partial\overline{u}}{\partial t} + \overline{u}\frac{\partial\overline{u}}{\partial x} + \overline{v}\frac{\partial\overline{u}}{\partial y} + \overline{w}\frac{\partial\overline{u}}{\partial z} = f\overline{v} - \frac{1}{\rho_0}\frac{\partial\overline{p}_1}{\partial x} + \nu\nabla^2\overline{u} \\ &- \left(\frac{\partial\overline{u'v'}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial\overline{u'w'}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial\overline{u'w'}}{\partial z}\right), \\ \frac{\partial\overline{v}}{\partial t} + \overline{u}\frac{\partial\overline{v}}{\partial x} + \overline{v}\frac{\partial\overline{v}}{\partial y} + \overline{w}\frac{\partial\overline{v}}{\partial z} = -f\overline{u} - \frac{1}{\rho_0}\frac{\partial\overline{p}_1}{\partial y} + \nu\nabla^2\overline{v} \\ &- \left(\frac{\partial\overline{u'v'}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial\overline{v'}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial\overline{v'w'}}{\partial z}\right), \\ \frac{\partial\overline{w}}{\partial t} + \overline{u}\frac{\partial\overline{w}}{\partial x} + \overline{v}\frac{\partial\overline{w}}{\partial y} + \overline{w}\frac{\partial\overline{w}}{\partial z} = g\frac{\overline{\theta}_1}{\theta_0} - \frac{1}{\rho_0}\frac{\partial\overline{p}_1}{\partial z} + \nu\nabla^2\overline{w} \\ &- \left(\frac{\partial\overline{w'u'}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial\overline{w'v'}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial\overline{w'^2}}{\partial z}\right), \\ \frac{\partial\overline{\theta}}{\partial t} + \overline{u}\frac{\partial\overline{\theta}}{\partial x} + \overline{v}\frac{\partial\overline{\theta}}{\partial y} + \overline{w}\frac{\partial\overline{\theta}}{\partial z} = \alpha_h\nabla^2\overline{\theta} \\ &- \left(\frac{\partial\overline{u'\theta'}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial\overline{v'\theta'}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial\overline{w'\theta'}}{\partial z}\right), \\ \frac{\partial\overline{u}}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial\overline{v}}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial\overline{w}}{\partial z} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$\bullet a = F/m$$

AI Physicist!



Turbine interaction loss predictions with high-fidelity flow modelling

Advantages

- Directly simulate the two-way coupling between wind farm and atmosphere
- Includes oft-neglected first-order influences such as atmospheric stability (e.g. gravity waves)
- Captures both wake and blockage effects

Disadvantages

- Slow
- Expensive
- Cannot realistically optimize a turbine layout



Objective: Combine the accuracy benefits of a high-fidelity flow model with the speed of a reduced-order model

Idea: Train a machine learning model to estimate what the high-fidelity flow model would predict at each turbine location



••••

•••••

Challenge

Neutral network:

Fixed number of inputs in a fixed order



Wind farms: Variable number of turbines with no clear order



Solution: Graph Networks







(a) Edge update

(b) Node update

(c) Global update

Allows for different numbers of inputs

Order invariant



Graph Networks as Learnable Physics Engines for Inference and Control. Alvaro Sanchez-Gonzalez, Nicolas Heess, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Josh Merel, Martin Riedmiller, Raia Hadsell, Peter Ba

Well-suited to learning physical interactions between objects

Battaglia PW, et al. "Relational inductive biases, deep learning, and graph networks" <u>https://arxiv.org/pdf/1806.01261.pdf</u>

Current implementation – We are starting simple

Graph networks comprising MLPs constructed using



- Inputs
 - Turbine coordinates
 - Rotor diameter
 - $-C_t$ at plateau of the C_t curve
 - Wind direction
- Output / Prediction
 - U / U_I for each turbine

U = Effective wind speed (i.e. the wind speed used to look up power in the power curve).

The "I" subscript denotes the situation where the turbine is operating in isolation

• 41 different wind farms

- Simulated with steady-state RANS CFD
 - Neutral boundary layer with capping inversion and stably stratified free atmosphere
 - Below-rated wind speeds
 - Varying wind directions
 - -182 simulation in total ($\rightarrow 10^{6}$)
- Trained on 145 simulations
- Tested against 39 simulations



 10^{6}



11 DNV GL ©



- Can we predict the variation with wind speed?
- Can we predict the sensitivity to atmospheric stability?
- Can we handle mixed turbine types?
- TBD

- Low end: A tool that can interpolate between CFD results at a given wind farm (e.g. translate simulation results for 6 wind directions into results for 180 directions)
 - Benefit: Reduces the number of high-fidelity simulations needed to conduct a complete turbine interaction analysis of a wind farm.
- High end: A machine learning model reliable enough that it can be used on wind farms that are not part of the training set
 - Benefits: Turbine interaction loss predictions high-fidelity models accuracy and engineering model speed. Wind farm layouts could then be optimized considering both wakes and blockage

Summary

- High-fidelity CFD takes a long time
- Trend in AI to "learn physics"
- New model developed that "learns" CFD
- Some very promising first results
- Much more to follow!

Thank you

DISCLAIMER

This presentation shows models and results that are the product of professional research only.

Techniques and methods demonstrated here are not in commercial use by DNV GL.

The work presented within this presentsion represents research in progress. As such, any findings are preliminary and subject to change.

Lars.Landberg@dnvgl.com

www.dnvgl.com

SAFER, SMARTER, GREENER

The trademarks DNV GL[®], DNV[®], the Horizon Graphic and Det Norske Veritas[®] are the properties of companies in the Det Norske Veritas group. All rights reserved.



Backup

A little more insight into the statistical accuracy

The red line indicates that the mean absolute bias (i.e. mean error over a wind farm) across all the test predictions is a little over 0.1%



The worst wind farm bias was 1.5%