# Performance Investigation of an Optimal Control Strategy for Zero-Emission Operations of Shipboard Microgrids

Fabio D'Agostino, Marco Gallo, Matteo Saviozzi, Federico Silvestro

Electrical, Electronics and Telecommunication Engineering and Naval Architecture Department - DITEN Universita degli Studi di Genova Genova, Italy

fabio.dagostino@unige.it, marco.gallo@edu.unige.it, matteo.saviozzi@unige.it, federico.silvestro@unige.it

Abstract—This work introduces an efficient power management approach for shipboard microgrids that integrates diesel generators, a fuel cell, and battery energy storage system. This strategy addresses both unit commitment and power dispatch, considering the zero-emission capability of the ship, as well as optimizing the ship's speed. The optimization is done through mixed integer linear programming with the objective of minimizing the operational cost of all the power resources. Evaluations are conducted on a notional all-electric ship, with electrical load simulated using a Markov chain based on actual measurement data. The findings underscore the effectiveness of the proposed strategy in optimizing fuel consumption while ensuring protection against blackout occurrences.

Index Terms—Ship Speed Optimization, Carbon Intensity Indicator, Hydrogen, Zero-Emission.

# I. INTRODUCTION

The reduction of  $CO_2$  emissions from ships is one of the main topics concerning the maritime sector. Starting from January 1<sup>st</sup> 2023, all ships are required to calculate their Energy Efficiency Existing Ship Index (EEXI) to assess energy efficiency. This measure also involves collecting data for reporting their annual operational Carbon Intensity Indicator (CII) and CII ratings [1].

This aligns with the European Union's Fit for 55 climate package of legislative proposals [2], which includes initiatives aimed at reducing Global Greenhouse Gases (GHG) emissions by 55% by 2030 compared to 1990 levels.

Several recent papers suggest employing Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) to improve efficiency in All Electric Ship (AES) powered by Diesel Generators (DGs). In [3], various functions for BESS are described, with strategic loading being an interesting function that optimizes the operating point of the DGs.

Starting from January 2026, the Norwegian Maritime Authority will require that all navigation in the fjord to be zeroemission [4].

Efficiency and zero-emission capability must be combined with a robust and secure management of the generation system. According to the International Association of Classification Societies (IACS) guidelines, in the event of a failure of one generating unit, the system must be able to avoid the blackout [5]. Hence, the security constraints must account for the primary limitations of each generating unit, including both the maximum overload capacity and the maximum allowable load step that a generator can handle during emergencies.

In AES one of the main challenges lies in designing an effective Power Management System (PMS) strategy that coordinates the power sources to achieve efficient and robust operation.

In the existing literature, several authors have proposed different power management strategies. In [6], the scheduling methodology outlined optimizes ship operations with the goal of minimizing fuel consumption and diesel generator emissions. In [7], two supervisory optimization-based power and energy management control systems have been proposed with Model Predictive Control (MPC) and Reinforcement Learning (RL) approaches.

Furthermore, the use of fuel cells to ensure zero-emission capability has been suggested by various authors. In [8], a zero-emission hybrid ship based on Fuel cell (FC), batteries and cold ironing is proposed. In [9], a sizing method for the energy storage system in a FC hybrid ferry is proposed, along with a real-time optimization control strategy.

In this paper, an optimal power management strategy for shipboard microgrids equipped with DGs, a fuel cell and a BESS is proposed. The algorithm, based on an optimization Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP) problem, provides both the Unit Commitment (UC) and the economic dispatch of all generating units.

A preliminary version of this approach has been presented in [10]. The innovative contributions of this work are represented by: the modeling of Proton Exchange Membrane Fuel Cell (PEMFC) in the Shipboard Power System (SPS) and the inclusion of the generation cost of all power sources in the objective function.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section II introduces the System Modelling adopted for the PMS, Section III provides the Optimization Problem, Section IV reports Simulation and Results Analysis, while the Conclusions are reported in Section V.

## **II. SYSTEM MODELLING**

Figure 1 reports the notional architecture of the selected cruise ship. The generating resources of the ship are composed

of DGs, a PEMFC and a BESS that are based on real components.



Fig. 1: System Architecture, adapted from [10]

In an AES the primary load is typically the propulsion system, which correlates with the ship's speed. Additional propulsive loads such as HVAC, galley, and accommodation are encompassed within the hotel load [11]. These loads are assessed in the Electric Power Load Analysis (EPLA) of the ship, categorized based on the Operating Conditions (OCs) of the vessel [12].

## A. DG Fuel Consumption and BESS

The DG fuel consumption is modelled by a linearized Specific Fuel Oil Consumption (SFOC) curve and the State Of Charge (SOC) of the battery is modelled according to the following equation ( $\forall t = 1 : T$ ), as in [10]:

$$SOC(t+1) = SOC(t) + \left(P_b^c(t)\eta_c - \frac{P_b^d(t)}{\eta_d}\right)\frac{\Delta t}{E_n}$$
(1)

where  $E_n$  [kWh] is the rated energy of the battery,  $P_b^c(t)$  [kW] and  $P_b^d(t)$  [kW] are respectively the charge and discharge power variables of the battery at time t,  $\Delta t$  is the granularity of the control and T is the horizon of the optimization (notice that t = 1 : T stands for t = 1, ..., T).

#### B. PEMFC and Hydrogen Storage

The specific hydrogen consumption is modeled by a linearized specific hydrogen consumption curve, as reported in Fig. 2. This curve is derived from [13] and subsequently linearized using the methodology previously described for diesel generators.

Linearization points are selected by identifying the regions with the most significant derivative variations to minimize approximation errors.

The Level of Hydrogen (LoH) is modelled according to the following equation:

$$LoH(t+1) = LoH(t) - \frac{\dot{m}_{H_2}(t)\Delta t}{M_{H_2}} \quad \forall t = 1:T$$
 (2)

where  $M_{H_2}$  [t] is the total mass of H<sub>2</sub> available and  $\dot{m}_{H_2}$  [t/h] is the H<sub>2</sub> flow rate variable. The latter is derived from the specific hydrogen consumption curve shown in Fig. 2.



Fig. 2: Specific hydrogen consumption curve.

#### III. OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM

The proposed methodology is based on a MILP optimization algorithm implemented in MATLAB/General Algebraic Modelling System (GAMS) environment. Several constraints are implemented in the algorithm to model the DGs, the BESS, the PEMFC and to ensure the system's security.

The objective function is formulated as:

$$\min \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \dot{m}_{f,i}(t) \Big( c_f + e_f c_{CO_2} \Big) + c_{H_2} \dot{m}_{H_2}(t) + (3) + c_i u_i(t) + c_b \Big( 1 - SOC(t) \Big) \right) \Delta t$$

where  $\dot{m}_{f,i}(t)$  is the fuel flow rate of *i*-th DG,  $c_f$  is the cost of the fuel [ $\in$ /kg],  $e_f$  is the emission factor of CO<sub>2</sub>,  $c_{CO_2}$  is the cost of CO<sub>2</sub> [ $\in$ /kg],  $c_{H_2}$  is the cost of the hydrogen [ $\in$ /kg],  $c_i$  represents the start-up cost of the *i*-th generator and  $c_b$  is the cost associated with the Depth Of Discharge (DOD) of the battery (1 - SOC(t)). The optimization algorithm minimizes the total cost [ $\in$ ], which is composed of three parts: the cost of fuel and hydrogen, the start-up cost, and the cost related to battery degradation. The latter accounts for DOD and, therefore, considers battery degradation aspects. The term  $c_b$ assigns a cost to battery management.

The cost function (3) is subjected to several constraints. In [10], it is reported a detailed description of each constraint.

#### **IV. SIMULATIONS AND RESULTS ANALYSIS**

The proposed algorithm has been validated through the simulation of a shipboard microgrid consisting of three DGs, a PEMFC and a BESS (see Fig.1). The nominal power of each generating source is based on a previous work [14].

Since the ship electrical load profile was not available, it was modelled by simulating a generic operating profile, as in [10].

Figure 3 shows the load profile obtained through the simulation. In this case, the granularity of the load modelling is equal to 15 min and T = 24 hour. The goal is to replicate the typical navigation of the cruise ship within a Norwegian

fjord. The maximum speed variation is  $2 \,\mathrm{knts}$  in the Fjord OC.

The simulation parameters are listed in Table I.



Fig. 3: OC and power profile.

#### A. Sensitivity Analysis

To test the performance of the algorithm, a sensitivity analysis is performed. Different sizes of BESS and FC have been exploited. The range goes from 0 to 10 MW for both generating units. The aim is to evaluate the zero emission capability in different configuration of the SPS.

Figure 4 presents the results in terms of CII rating for all the tested configurations. The white squares are referred to an



Fig. 4: CII comparison.

unfeasible solution of the optimization. The lowest CII ratings are associated with high power ratings of the FC and battery.

In terms of total operational cost, the Fig. 5 reports that the lowest values are associated with high power ratings of the FC and battery.

A different pattern can be seen for the hydrogen consumption in Fig. 6. In this case, lower value of hydrogen consumption are given for low FC power rating and high BESS energy rating.

Finally, a comparison in terms of average load factor of the DGs is computed. Figure 7 shows that value next to the

TABLE I: Parameters of the simulations.

Parameter	Value	Description		
$P_{DG,i=1}^{n}$	$5.04\mathrm{MW}$	Rated power of $i = 1$ DG		
$P_{DG,i=2,3}^n$	$6.72\mathrm{MW}$	Rated power of $i = 2,3$ DG		
$t_{min_u,i}$	$30\mathrm{min}$	Min up-time of i-th gen unit		
$t_{min_d,i}$	$30\mathrm{min}$	Min down-time of i-th gen unit		
$c_{g,min}$	0	Min power of gen unit		
$c_{g,max}$	1	Max power of gen unit		
$\Delta P_{r_u,i}$	$10\mathrm{MW}/\mathrm{min}$	Max gen unit power ramp-up limit		
$\Delta P_{r_d,i}$	$10\mathrm{MW}/\mathrm{min}$	Max gen unit power ramp-down limit		
$lpha_g$	1.1	Max gen unit overload in emergency		
$\beta_g$	0.33	Max gen unit step in emergency		
$c_i$	200€	gen unit start-up cost		
$c_f$	$0.861  {\rm e/kg}$	fuel cost		
$c_{CO_2}$	0.3€/kg	CO <sub>2</sub> cost		
$e_f$	3.206	Emission factor CO <sub>2</sub>		
$P_{FC}^n$	$6\mathrm{MW}$	Rated power of the PEMFC		
$M_{H_2}$	$10\mathrm{t}$	Mass of H <sub>2</sub> in the storage		
$c_{H_2}$	$5.176  {\rm e/kg}$	H <sub>2</sub> cost		
$n_i^{DG}$	10	Number of SFOC intervals curve		
$n_i^{FC}$	11	Number of specific H <sub>2</sub> intervals curve		
$P_b^n$	$5.35\mathrm{MW}$	BESS nominal power		
$E_n$	$5.35\mathrm{MWh}$	BESS nominal energy		
SOC(1)	50%	Initial SOC of the battery		
SOC(T)	50%	Final SOC of the battery		
$SOC_{max}$	80%	Max SOC of the battery		
$SOC_{min}$	20%	Min SOC of the battery		
$\eta_d$	92%	BESS discharge efficiency		
$\eta_c$	95%	BESS charge efficiency		
$c_{c,min}$	0	Min charging C-rate		
$c_{c,max}$	1	Max charging C-rate		
$c_{d,min}$	0	Min discharging C-rate		
$c_{d,max}$	2	Max discharging C-rate		
$lpha_b$	3	Max BESS overload in emergency		
$c_b$	$5 \in$	Battery utilization cost		
M	$10^{9}$	Big M parameter		
N	5	Number of gen unit		
D	197.9	Total distance travelled by the ship		
$CII_{max}$	13	Maximum allowable CII		

lowest SFOC are given for approximately  $P_{fc} = 5.75 \ MW$ and  $E_b = 4.75 \ MWh$ .

It is worth noting that the lowest FC power rating where the optimization problem provides a feasible solution is  $P_{fc} = 4.25 MW$ . While for the battery, there are no issue regarding a minimum value.

To address the influence of the CO<sub>2</sub> taxation a comparison has been conducted. Figure 8 - 10 reports the results in which  $c_{CO_2}$  is equal to zero.

Overall, different pattern are presented from the previous analysis. In particular, it is possible to see that for battery energy ratings above 5 MWh the CII becomes higher. In the



Fig. 5: Cost comparison.



Fig. 6: Hydrogen consumption comparison.

other hand, to obtain an average load factor close to 80% it is necessary to use a BESS with higher value of energy.

# B. Study Cases

The proposed power management strategy has been tested in two study cases. In the first study case (SC1), neither the BESS or the PEMFC are considered. In the second study case (SC2), both the BESS and the PEMFC are actively involved. It's worth noting that the Norwegian Maritime Authority mandates zero-emission navigation in the fjord. Therefore, in the second study case, the PMS is obligated to utilize only the battery and the fuel cell for the entire duration within the fjord. An exception is made for manoeuvring, where security constraints ensure that power generation is met by the DGs and the battery.

Figure 12 shows the results of the optimization for the SC1, wherein the power generation is provided only by the DGs. On the other hand, Fig. 13 illustrates the results obtained for SC2, where both the BESS and the PEMFC are available.



Fig. 7: DG average load factor comparison.



Fig. 8: CII comparison without CO<sub>2</sub> taxation.

The total power load, indicated in blue as  $P_{load}$ , represents the optimized load.

The results are summarized in Table II, which reports the total cost, the amount of fuel and hydrogen required, the total CO<sub>2</sub> emission, the final value of the CII and the average loading factor of the DGs  $(LF_{avg})$ .

TABLE II: Simulations results.

SC1 - only DGs							
Total Cost [€]	Total Fuel $[kg]$	Total $H_2$ [kg]	$\begin{array}{c} \operatorname{CO}_2 \\ [kg] \end{array}$	CII $[g/t \cdot nm]$	LF <sub>avg</sub> [%]		
65508	35280	0	113110	11.9	58		
SC2 - DGs, PEMFC and BESS							
Total Cost [€]	Total Fuel $[kg]$	Total $H_2$ [kg]	$\begin{array}{c} \operatorname{CO}_2\\ [kg] \end{array}$	$\overline{\text{CII}}\\[g/t \cdot nm]$	LF <sub>avg</sub> [%]		
65575	19029	5619	61009	6.4	78.34		



Fig. 9: Cost comparison without CO<sub>2</sub> taxation.



Fig. 10: Hydrogen consumption comparison without CO<sub>2</sub> taxation.

The cost of hydrogen considered is equal to  $154.29 \in /kWh$ . This value includes the cost of fuel plus the compressed hydrogen storage costs reported in [15]. Considering that the lower heating value of the hydrogen is equal to 33.33 kWh/kg,  $c_{H_2}$  is equal to  $5176 \in /kg$ , as previously reported (see Table I). The required CII for the notional cruise ship is computed according to the International Maritime Organization (IMO) MEPC.336(76) standard [14] and it is equal to  $15 \text{ gCO}_2/(t \cdot nm)$ .

The comparison of these two study cases shows that the BESS and the PEMFC allows to reduce the CO<sub>2</sub> emission by 46% (52101 kg of CO<sub>2</sub> saving with respect the SC1). In SC2, the average load factor ( $LF_{avg}$ ) is in proximity to the minimum specific consumption, which occurs at around 80% of the nominal power. It's worth noting that both case studies utilize the optimal control strategy. The total cost is higher in SC2. This is due to the presence of the zero-emission



Fig. 11: DG average load factor comparison without CO<sub>2</sub> taxation.



Fig. 12: Simulation results, SC1. Only DGs.

constraint during navigation in the Fjord. In fact, hydrogen is more expensive than Very Low Sulphur Fuel Oil (VLSFO). The ranking levels are referred to the IMO MEPC.339(76) standard [14].

Figure 14 presents the comparison between the CII profile in the two study cases. In SC1, the CII reaches the maximum value imposed by the constraint, while in SC2, the CII is significantly lower.

Figure 15 shows the comparison between the SOC of the battery and LoH of the hydrogen system. It is worth noting that the SOC is within its maximum (80%) and minimum (20%) limits.

#### V. CONCLUSIONS

This work proposes an optimal power management strategy for shipboard microgrids equipped with DGs, PEMFCs and BESSs. The power management algorithm is based on a MILP problem that includes the UC and the economic dispatch, to ensure a reliable power supply at minimum cost. A set of security constraints ensures to meet the IACS requirements.

Two study cases have been investigated: the first one has been used as a reference as it considers only the utilization



Fig. 13: Simulation results, SC2. DGs, PEMFC and BESS.



Fig. 14: SC1 and SC2 CII profile comparison.

of DGs, while the second one includes also the exploitation of a PEMFC and a BESS. The available resources considered in the second study case allow reducing the  $CO_2$  emission by 46%, and enable zero-emission for specified operating conditions.

The sensitivity analysis highlights the importance of high power ratings for both FC and BESS in achieving optimal zero emission capabilities, fuel efficiency, and operational cost savings. Lower hydrogen consumption is observed with specific power and energy ratings. This analysis offers valuable insights for optimizing system performance while considering feasibility constraints.

Future developments will be devoted to extend the algorithm through a model predictive control strategy.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was partially funded by European Union – NextGenerationEU. Piano Nazionale di Ripresa e Resilienza, Missione 4 Componente 2 Investimento 1.4 "Potenziamento strutture di ricerca e creazione di "campioni nazionali di R & S" su alcune Key Enabling Technologies". Code CN00000023 – Title: "Sustainable Mobility Center (Centro Nazionale per la Mobilità Sostenibile – CNMS)". Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European



Fig. 15: SOC and LoH comparison.

Commission. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

#### REFERENCES

- 2021 guidelines on operational carbon intensity indicators and the calculation methods (cii guidelines, g1), IMO Convention MEPC.336(76), June 2011.
- [2] E. Commission, "Fit for 55—delivering the EU's 2030 climate target on the way to climate neutrality," Jul 2021.
- [3] J. F. Hansen and F. Wendt, "History and state of the art in commercial electric ship propulsion, integrated power systems, and future trends," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 103, no. 12, pp. 2229–2242, 2015.
- [4] Norwegian Maritime Authority, "Zero emissions in the world heritage fjords by 2026," https://www.sdir.no/, 2021.
- [5] SC1 Main source of electrical power Interpretations of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), 1974 and its Amendments, International Association of Classification Societies (IACS) Std., 1974, Rev.2, Feb. 2021.
- [6] M. Othman, A. Anvari-Moghaddam, N. Ahamad, S. Chun-Lien, and J. M. Guerrero, "Scheduling of power generation in hybrid shipboard microgrids with energy storage systems," in *IEEE International Conference on Environment and Electrical Engineering*, 2018.
- [7] W. Chen, K. Tai, M. W. S. Lau, A. Abdelhakim, R. R. Chan, A. Kåre Ådnanes, and T. Tjahjowidodo, "Optimal power and energy management control for hybrid fuel cell-fed shipboard dc microgrid," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 24, no. 12, pp. 14133–14150, 2023.
- [8] M. Rafiei, J. Boudjadar, and M.-H. Khooban, "Energy management of a zero-emission ferry boat with a fuel-cell-based hybrid energy system: Feasibility assessment," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 1739–1748, 2021.
- [9] Z. Zhang, C. Guan, and Z. Liu, "Real-time optimization energy management strategy for fuel cell hybrid ships considering power sources degradation," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 87046–87059, 2020.
- [10] F. D'Agostino, M. Gallo, M. Saviozzi, and F. Silvestro, "A securityconstrained optimal power management algorithm for shipboard microgrids with battery energy storage system," in 2023 IEEE International Conference on Electrical Systems for Aircraft, Railway, Ship Propulsion and Road Vehicles (ESARS).
- [11] A. Boveri, F. D'Agostino, P. Gualeni, D. Neroni, and F. Silvestro, "A stochastic approach to shipboard electric loads power modeling and simulation."
- [12] N. Doerry, "Electric power load analysis," *Naval Engineers Journal*, vol. 124, pp. 45–48, 12 2012.
- [13] P. Wu, J. Partridge, and R. Bucknall, "Cost-effective reinforcement learning energy management for plug-in hybrid fuel cell and battery ships," *Applied Energy*, vol. 275, p. 115258, 2020.
- [14] M. Gallo, D. Kaza, F. D'Agostino, M. Cavo, R. Zaccone, and F. Silvestro, "Power plant design for all-electric ships considering the assessment of carbon intensity indicator," *Energy*, vol. 283, 2023.
- [15] O. B. Inal, B. Zincir, and C. Deniz, "Investigation on the decarbonization of shipping: An approach to hydrogen and ammonia," *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 47, no. 45, pp. 19888–19900, 2022.