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Abstract

From 2013 onwards EEDI for newly built ships will become mandatory. Ships meeting the CO₂ emission standards will be granted energy certificate for needed for exploitation. The article presents the EEDI in the current form, energy certification procedure as well as reduction of CO₂ emission planned for coming years (Part I). The majority of ships built at present, meets the CO₂ emission standards for 2013, yet their further decrease in subsequent years will consequently necessitate further actions as well. One of them is ship hull design of smaller resistance values and higher propulsion efficiency. The article (Part II) presents calculation results of the numerical analyses (CFD) performed for an actually built ship, aiming at decreasing propulsion power and therefore the EEDI value as well.
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1. Introduction

Aiming at the so called greenhouse gas reduction (including CO₂) has resulted in the introduction of new criteria and standards, in combustion engine design or entire means of transport. IMO has drawn up Energy Efficiency Design Index (EEDI) for newly built and designed ships, mandatory since 2013, which is defined as follows:

\[ EEDI = \frac{CO_2 \text{ emission}}{\text{transport work}} \]  

and expressed in CO₂ grammes/1 tonne·mile of transported cargo.

Introduction of such criterion is to enforce such ship design and exploitation (together with its propulsion) as to decrease CO₂ emission (CO₂ emission will be gradually reduced in subsequent years).

Although the main aim of the EEDI is CO₂ reduction, still the very structure of this index allows it to be used as yet another design criterion as well as some kind of transport efficiency
measure. Proper application of EEDI in ship design can therefore reduce CO\textsubscript{2} emission on the one hand, and lead to optimal choice of technical and service parameters on the other, which in turn maximise economic performance for a shipowner.

2. Energy Efficiency Design Index

Research into EEDI has been carried out for years now. As a basis laid the assumption that sea transport of cargo is also associated with CO\textsubscript{2} emission, which has been defined as, \cite{5}:

\[
\text{Attained design } \text{CO}_2 \text{ index} = \frac{C_F \cdot SFC \cdot P}{\text{Capacity} \cdot V_{ref}}, \tag{2}
\]

where:
- \(C_F\) – conversion factor between fuel consumption and CO\textsubscript{2} emission,
- \(SFC\) – specific fuel consumption,
- \(P\) – 75\% of the rated installed power (MCR),
- \(\text{Capacity}\) – deadweight for all types of carriers and gross tonnage for passanger ships,
- \(V_{ref}\) – the ship speed at specified at calm sea (no wind, no waves).

The formula (2) was initially a complex one with additional coefficients. There have been over a dozen of corrections and amendments in total, proposed mainly by Denmark, Japan, and the USA. The current version, subject to further research and analysis, recommended for ship design is presented below \cite{2}:

\[
\left( \prod_{j=1}^{M} f_j \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_{ME}} P_{ME(i)} C_{FME(i)} SFC_{ME(i)} \right) + \left( P_{AE} C_{FAE} SFC_{AE} \right) + \left( \prod_{j=1}^{M} f_j \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_{PTI}} P_{PTI(i)} - \sum_{i=1}^{n_{eff}} f_{eff(i)} P_{AEeff(i)} \right) C_{FAE} SFC_{AE} \right) \right) f_i \cdot \text{Capacity} \cdot V_{ref} \cdot f_w
\]

\[
\left( \sum_{i=1}^{n_{eff}} f_{eff(i)} P_{eff(i)} C_{FME(i)} SFC_{ME(i)} \right) f_i \cdot \text{Capacity} \cdot V_{ref} \cdot f_w,
\tag{3}
\]

where:
- \(C_{FME(i)}\) – a non-dimensional conversion factor between fuel consumption (in grams) and CO\textsubscript{2} emission (also in grams) on the basis of carbon content, Table 1,
- \(SFC_{ME(i)}\) – specific fuel consumption (main engine),
- \(P_{ME(i)}\) – 75\% ships' total installed main power (MCR),
- \(C_{FAE}\) – a non-dimensional conversion factor (like \(C_{FME(i)}\)) for auxiliary engines,
- \(SFC_{AE}\) – specific fuel consumption (auxiliary engines),
- \(P_{AE}\) – power of auxiliary engines, IMO MEPC define it according to MCR for ships power below and above 10 000 kW,
- \(P_{PTI(i)}\) – 75\% shaft motor power,
- \(P_{AEeff(i)}\) – auxiliary power reduction due to innovative electrical energy efficient technology measured at \(P_{ME(i)}\),
- \(f_{eff(i)}\) – availability factor of innovative energy efficiency (if used),
- \(P_{eff(i)}\) – output of innovative mechanical energy efficient technology,
- \(V_{ref}\) – is the ship speed, measured in nautical miles per hour (knot), on deepwater in the condition of maximum allowed summer load draught as provided in confirmed stability information,
- \(f_i\) – the capacity factor for any technical/regulatory limitation on \text{Capacity},
\[ f_w \] – a non-dimensional coefficient indicating the decrease of speed in representative sea conditions of wave height, wave frequency and wind speed,

\[ f_j \] – a correction factor to account for ship specific design elements.

### Table 1. Non-dimensional factor \( C_F \) for different type of fuel [2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Fuel</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Carbon content</th>
<th>( C_F ) (t-CO(_2)/t-Fuel)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Diesel/Gas Oil ISO 8217 Grades DMX through DMC</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>3.206000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Light Fuel Oil (LFO) ISO 8217 Grades RMA through RMD</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.151040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Heavy Fuel Oil (HFO) ISO 8217 Grades RME through RMK</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.114400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Liquified Petroleum Gas (LPG) Propane</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>3.000000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Butane</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>3.030000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Liquified Natural Gas (LPG)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.750000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EEDI formula has been drawn up mainly for conventional propulsion systems (combustion engine) and does not have to be used in other propulsion systems such as: diesel-electric, turbine or hybrid propulsion types.

The EDDI formula is quite a complex one, where two basic groups of parameters can be distinguished:

- the first group, pertaining to the marine power plant, that is main and auxiliary engine(s) power, specific fuel consumption, conversion factors between fuel consumption and CO\(_2\) emission, power of waste heat generators, as well as parameters defining the application and use of innovative technology – given in the formula numerator (3),

- the first group, pertaining to ship exploitation, that is, the capacity, the ship speed on calm sea, the decrease of a ship speed in real-life weather conditions, which can be found in the formula denominator as well as a nominator parameter defining type and specific work conditions eg. sailing through ice.

Currently binding EEDI version is by no means final, although it will be mandatory since 2013. It has been widely discussed, with numerous changes proposed eg. on values or the calculation methods of some parameters (power, speed, capacity) or their coefficients (eg. decrease in ship speed on rough sea).

3. Reference line

In order to establish the expected CO\(_2\) emission a reference line has been drawn up for various types of ships of different sizes. It will be enforced since 2013. EEDI calculation will be performed for each newly built ship and compared against the appropriate reference line (for the ship type and size). If the EEDI value will be equal or smaller than that on the reference line, the ship will be granted International Energy Certificate and fit for exploitation. Examples of reference lines in 2013 are given in Fig. 1±3.
Fig. 1. Reference line for tanker ships, [1]

Fig. 2. Reference line for containerships, [1]

Fig. 3. Reference line for bulk carriers ships, [1]
Methodology for defining the reference line was first proposed by Denmark. In order to determine the reference line (base line) Lloyd’s Register Fairplay (LRFP) data on existing, already built ships was used. Such data is incomplete, therefore some simplifications had to be made, or some missing data completed using similar ships with regression relationship. For all the ships used, a constant specific fuel consumption (SPF) was assumed, independently from the actual engine of a ship. The calculations do not include potential shaft generators, although they might have been present on some of the ships. Therefore, the EDDI values as seen on Fig.1+3 are above the reference line, which is not necessarily true. Thus further research has been undergoing in order to adjust the reference line as needed, especially for some types of large capacity ships.

In order to facilitate EEDI estimation for a newly built ship and establish whether it meets the CO\textsubscript{2} emission criteria, the reference line has been approximated as follows \cite{3}:

\[ L_{\text{ref}} = a \cdot b^{(c)} \]  

(4)

where \( a, b, c \) are parameters, whose values for each ship type are presented in the Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ship type defined in regulation 2</th>
<th>( a )</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>( c )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,25 Dry bulk carrier</td>
<td>1354,0</td>
<td>DWT of the ship</td>
<td>0,5117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,26 Gas carrier</td>
<td>1252,60</td>
<td>DWT of the ship</td>
<td>0,4597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,27 Tanker</td>
<td>1950,70</td>
<td>DWT of the ship</td>
<td>0,5337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,28 Container ship</td>
<td>139,38</td>
<td>DWT of the ship</td>
<td>0,2166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,29 General cargo ship</td>
<td>290,28</td>
<td>DWT of the ship</td>
<td>0,3300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,30 Refrigerated cargo carrier</td>
<td>227,01</td>
<td>DWT of the ship</td>
<td>0,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,31 Combination carrier</td>
<td>1219,00</td>
<td>DWT of the ship</td>
<td>0,488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since further reduction in CO\textsubscript{2} emission is planned for subsequent years, then the reference line will be changing accordingly. Prognostic values of CO\textsubscript{2} (expressed as a percent in relation to the basal values of reference line in 2013) are given in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ship Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Phase 0 1 Jan 2013 – 31 Dec 2014</th>
<th>Phase 1 1 Jan 2015 – 31 Dec 2019</th>
<th>Phase 2 1 Jan 2020 – 31 Dec 2024</th>
<th>Phase 3 1 Jan 2025 – and onwards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulk carrier</td>
<td>20,000 DWT and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000 – 20,000 DWT</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0-10*</td>
<td>0-20*</td>
<td>0-30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas carrier</td>
<td>10,000 DWT and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000 – 10,000 DWT</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0-10*</td>
<td>0-20*</td>
<td>0-30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanker</td>
<td>20,000 DWT and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,000 – 20,000 DWT</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0-10*</td>
<td>0-20*</td>
<td>0-30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container ship</td>
<td>15,000 DWT and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000 – 15,000 DWT</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0-10*</td>
<td>0-20*</td>
<td>0-30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General cargo ship</td>
<td>15,000 DWT and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 – 15,000 DWT</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0-10*</td>
<td>0-20*</td>
<td>0-30*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerated cargo carrier</td>
<td>5,000 DWT and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 – 5,000 DWT</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0-10*</td>
<td>0-20*</td>
<td>0-30*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination carrier</td>
<td>20,000 DWT and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 – 20,000 DWT</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0-10*</td>
<td>0-20*</td>
<td>0-30*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reduction factor to be linear interpolated between the two values dependent upon vessel size.


EEDI value calculation and International Energy Certificate for a new ship will be issued by the state Marine Administration on the basis of approved ship design documentation. It means that the subsequent ship exploitation together with changeable sailing conditions (shipping routes, weather) will have no influence on the EEDI value.

The EEDI certificate is therefore valid throughout the life of the ship [3], unless the ship undergoes a major conversion so as it is regarded as a new ship. The certificate loses its validity when the ship is withdrawn from the service or transferred to the flag of another state (sold, hired). It is possible however, that the marine administration of both contracting states, reach the agreement and transmit the certificate together with the copies of the relevant survey reports to the new ship’s operator within a three-month period. Subject to specified conditions the certificate is deemed valid.

In some documents and publications it is emphasized that in order to reduce CO₂ emission, the shipping routes must be optimised, the service speed of the ship decreased or higher quality fuel used. According to the currently binding criteria, such activities – although environmentally friendly – will not affect the already calculated EEDI value, and hence be decisive in meeting the required standards for the international energy certificate.

5. EEDI guidelines in ship design

Reference lines shown on Fig. 1-3 are the product of statistical analysis of EEDI values for various ship sizes (capacity) of the existing vessels of the same time, built in different years.

Although the reference lines result from approximate EEDI calculation values, still however even with the exact EEDI calculation value there will be some ships, whose EEDI will be above the reference line. As the Table 3 shows, the reduction factor of CO₂ emission from newly built ships with combustion engines will be steadily increasing. Therefore, even at present the significant potential for decreasing EEDI values (and at the same time improving the ship energy efficiency) is indicated as follows:

- improved hull design aiming at higher propulsion efficiency,
- more efficient propulsion engine – lower specific fuel consumption,
- higher fuel quality,
- development of new technologies, better waste heat recovery system,
- larger ship construction (bigger capacity),
- decreasing the ship’s speed,
- optimisation of the shipping route.

While some of the above suggestions do not play any major role now, since eg. EEDI value together with certificate is determined for a newly built ship and its future service together with
shipping route optimalisation is not taken into account; there are still other – pertaining to the propulsion engine, new technologies or fuel quality, which can be worked upon bearing in mind that our experience in these fields so far suggests that further improvements will not be revolutionary.

Low-speed engines, in turn, use the lowest quality fuel, which makes them economical to use. Building larger ships, suggested above, is not always profitable for the ship operator and the distribution of the ports large enough for them must be taken into account as well. Decrease in service speed of a ship is possible, but necessarily within a safety limit. Even now, the IMO has published guidelines, suggesting that decrease in service speed in order to lower the EEDI value of a ship, must not impede ship safety, i.e. manoeuvrability of the ship under adverse conditions or safe sailing against the opposite or oblique waves.

The remaining solution, could possibly found in the optimisation of the hull and propeller design so as to minimise the propulsion power and – at the same time - decrease ship fuel consumption and CO$_2$ emission.

The above considerations for improvement in hull design seem very attractive, however they could possibly be used for an unfounded suggestion, that the EEDI value of a new ship is lower than the actual. What is more, as already stated in some projects, it is possible to estimate the EEDI value in a dishonest way taking advantage of a possible lack of precision in regulations.
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