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ABSTRACT

Existing statistics for use in ship damage stability assessment are based on either accident investigation reports or empirical crew records. This is the reason why the databases used within the context of ship design for safety are either incomplete or miss critical information. This paper introduces a methodology for the probabilistic evaluation of passenger ship damage extents. The model accounts for the influence of crashworthiness in real operational conditions. Based on operational statistical records for ships before grounding, a Monte Carlo simulation is utilized to randomly generate a realistic profile that accounts for variable ship speed, conical rock geometry, rock position, and height in both deep and shallow waters. Subsequently, using the operational parameters as input, a six degrees of freedom fluid–structure interaction (FSI) model is used to combine the influence of ship dynamics, and structural mechanics on the probability distributions of hull breaches. Ship damage stability evaluation is carried out using NAPA software, which measures ship survivability via an attained subdivision index. Probabilistic results are compared against existing distributions of damage extents and demonstrate an increase in the mean distribution of damage length. The findings demonstrate the method’s adequacy for improving passenger vessel safety in case of ship grounding. It is concluded that the method allows for low-fidelity optimization of the structural arrangement of the bottom of the ship, probabilistic evaluation of loads associated with ship crashworthiness, and the assessment of operational limitations during an evasive maneuver. It could therefore be used for the future development of ship damage stability standards or ad hoc forensic investigations.

1. Introduction

Shipping propels 90% of world trade. In recent years, the demands of the economies of scale lead to increased ship sizes, traffic complexity and inevitably accidents associated with extreme operational scenarios. Based on recent accident records critical factors associated with serious maritime accidents are collisions, fires, and hard groundings [1]. Amongst these unfortunate events, groundings are the most frequent yet the least understood events.

A grounding accident may occur when ships collide with a seabed obstruction. Regardless of the root causes, consequences with impact on property, environmental pollution and loss of human life can be detrimental [2]. This statement is well justified by the statistical accident records of the Helsinki Commission (HELCOM), according to which between 2000 and 2018 776 occurrences took place in the Baltic Sea area [3] (see Fig. 1). Notably, these statistics confirm that passenger vessels are the second most vulnerable to ship grounding accidents after cargo ships.

A critical review of the recent groundings of Akademik Ioffe in 2018 (attributed to incomplete information on bathymetry) [4], Amorella in 2020 (attributed to propulsion system malfunctioned) [5], Viking Grace in 2020 (attributed to stormy and gusty winds) [6], demonstrates that good operational practice is essential under uncertain environmental conditions; otherwise, ship flooding and loss of damage stability may
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lead to environmental pollution and loss of life. It is therefore important to establish tools and methods that can evaluate how long a ship can stay afloat in real operational conditions (e.g., see accident investigation reports for Monarch of the Seas [7], Express Samina [8] and Costa Concordia [9] accidents).

Understanding the dynamics of ship grounding from an operational perspective requires a sound combination of ship science and design practice. In this sense, the combination of principles of ship strength (loads and responses in real environmental conditions) and damage stability within the context of probabilistic mechanics should be considered practical and impactful from a ship safety perspective.

To date, ship crashworthiness during grounding events has been analyzed using finite element analysis (FEA) or empirical methods [10]. For example, existing models for the evaluation of penetration damages following grounding events have been investigated in terms of material fracture and plastic deformation [10,11]. In literature, several authors utilized experiments and FEA tools to develop mathematical equations expressing the resistance forces of hull bottom structures [12,13,14,15,16]. Accordingly, empirical equations have been developed for the simple calculation of structural reaction forces during impact. In these methods, the structural resistance of individual parts of the hull (plates, stiffeners, bulkheads, girders, and floors) is evaluated and their aggregate is used to assess the hull bottom deformation at the time of the accident [17,18,19,20,21,22].

Large scale multiphysics crashworthiness methods can provide useful advancements in terms of exploring the influence of fluid actions on grounding dynamics [23,24,25,26]. These methods combine non-linear FEA with potential flow hydrodynamics while accounting for ship operations, and seabed evasion. Recent research demonstrates that practical limitations associated with the computational economy of these large scale methods may be overtaken by the use of the super-element technique [27] or simplistic contact mechanics models [28]. Yet, the broader appreciation of uncertainties associated with environmental conditions (such as shallow water, short waves, wind, and ocean currents), ship particulars (operating draft), operating conditions (velocity, bathymetry, seabed profile, human decision), ship’s maneuverability and their influence on ship safety remain under development [29,30].

Probabilistic damage mechanics could suggest a feasible framework for the evaluation of stochastic ship grounding dynamics and associated effects on damage stability. Furthermore, ship grounding hazard is linked with risk and sustainability, where environmental, social, and economic metrics of ship grounding can be assessed by using the probabilistic damage mechanics of the ship [31].

![Fig. 1. Accident statistics in the Baltic Sea from 2000 to 2018, data from [3].](image-url)
damage extents developed by a novel method are transferred into the NAPA\textsuperscript{1} software to assess ship survivability [46]. The focus of the paper is to explore the “actual damage” in a way of a ship’s bottom while accounting for the size of the rock and ship maneuverability in real conditions. The ultimate goal is to populate a probabilistic database for use in ship damage stability analysis or structural crashworthiness assessment following hard grounding events.

This paper makes use of a NAPA 3D passenger ship model namely FLOODSTAND Ship B presented by [47]. This 3D ship model includes a buoyant hull and all compartments inside the hull, namely tanks, machinery rooms, crew accommodation, stores, etc. The NAPA damage stability solver is designed to analyze vessel survivability if one or more of these compartments are damaged and/or flooded. Following the modelling of the damage extents, the software calculates the righting lever curve for each flooding stage of the damage and evaluates the s-factor as per SOLAS2020 Chapter II-1 Part B-1 Regulation 7-2. The p-factor and attained index are obtained as discussed in section 4.

The grounding solver is a rapid grounding dynamics model, which combines 6-DoF ship maneuvering motions with a model accounting for structural deformations and the influence of hydrodynamic properties in way of grounding contact [28]. The model advances the state of the art by allowing for:

1) Implementation of varying plate split angles (where the plate split angle represents the extent of plate deformation ahead of the conical rock);
2) Variation of the inner and outer bottom plate split angles that were considered equivalent in past models [17,21];
3) Evaluation of dynamic rock–ship interactions, through a rapid coupling algorithm that combines internal and external mechanics at the interface of the rock tip with the ship’s bottom.

Earlier grounding assessment models, such as the grounding and collision analysis toolkit GRATACAT [48], did not include the attributes listed above. Furthermore, the model by Taimuri et al. [28] has been tested against non-linear FEA simulations using the commercial solver LSDYNA-MCOL. To investigate ship grounding, a commercial coupled nonlinear FEA FSI model may be used to provide more accurate results. However, the primary limitation of adopting these FEM and FSI models is the high computational cost, which makes them non-feasible within the context of rapid crashworthiness assessment and probabilistic analysis.

Section 2 of the paper presents an overview of the method. Section 3 provides an overview of the rapid 6-DoF FSI solver, which includes a summary of external mechanics, internal mechanics, and the contact coupling algorithm. Section 4, briefly outlines the procedure of ship survivability after flooding. In section 5, the methodology used for the damage profile modelling governed by the FSI solver is explained in detail. Section 6, discusses the result of the simulations, compares damage with historical data, and provides a realistic probability density function of damage extents, maximum forces, and ship motions. Conclusions are presented in section 7.

2. Methodology

The methodology is depicted in Fig. 2 and comprises the following building blocks:

- At first, the probabilities of the ship operation and environmental condition before the accidents described in the statistics of Youssef and Paik are considered [43]. These statistical distributions include information on the velocity of the ship before grounding, the eccentricity of the rock with respect to the ship centerline and rock height / tip radius / semi-apex angle. Bathymetry is obtained from HELCOM [3] accident statistics.
- The probability distributions are embedded into the two-way coupled 6-DoF rapid multiphysics solver. A series of Monte Carlo simulations that consider the influence of FSI and conical rock geometry are carried out. At each step of the simulations, the location of the rock is searched. For those cases where the rock gets in contact with the hull, the damage penetration, width, and length are evaluated. The contact algorithm accounts for structural deformations and ship motions in all 6-DoF. The probabilities of the damage extent, maximum ship motions, structural resistance forces, and deformation energy are generated.
- The resultant damage extents are transferred into NAPA software to estimate the probability of flooding of a single compartment or compartment groups (p-factor).
- Based on the damaged compartment(s), the survivability factor (s-factor) is calculated as defined in the safety of life at sea SOLAS2020 Chapter II-1 Part B-1 Regulation 7-2. These are in line with the procedure followed by Bulian et al. [32,35], for damage ship survivability assessment.

3. Summary of the grounding dynamics solver used to assess the ship’s damage

The grounding dynamics solver used to assess the ship’s damage is described by Taimuri et al. [44,28]. The governing mathematical formulation of this model is given in Equation (1).

\[
\text{Surge E.O.M.} : (m - X)u + (m_{CG} - 0.5X,T)\ddot{q} = m(rv + x_c(r^2 + q^2) - wq - z_Gpr) + p\Delta g\sin(\theta) + X_{Hull} + X_{Buoyant(1-t)} + X_{Prop} + X_{Rad} + X_{Wind} + X_{WavesShort} + X_{Currents}.
\]

\[
\text{Heave E.O.M.} : (m - Z)\ddot{w} = (m_{CG} + Z)\ddot{q} = m(uq - vp + z_G(p^2 + q^2) - x_Grp) - p\Delta g\cos(\phi)\cos(\theta) - 2z_G\omega w(m - Z) + Z_{FG}\ddot{w}.
\]

\[
\text{Roll E.O.M.} : - (m_{CG} + K_f)\ddot{\psi} + \left(\frac{I_k - I_y}{I_y} \right)\ddot{\theta} = m(z_{CG} - z_{CG} - z_{CG}wp + x_Gwp) + (I_f - I_y)\ddot{q} - p\Delta g\sin(\theta)\sin(\phi)\cos(\theta) + K_f + K_h + K_w + K_{WavesLong} - z_w w(m - Z) + \omega w Z_{GRD} - z_w \omega E_{GRD}.
\]

\[
\text{Pitch E.O.M.} : (m_{CG} - 0.5X,T)\ddot{\theta} - (m_{CG} + Z)\ddot{\psi} = m\left(z_{CG} - z_{CG} - z_{CG}wp + x_Gwp - x_Grp\left(p^2 - r^2\right) + (I_f - I_k)\ddot{r}\right) - p\Delta g M_{Gy} \sin(\phi)\sin(\theta) + M_{Rad} - z_w w(m - Z) - x_w \omega Z_{CG} + z_w \omega X_{GRD}.
\]

\[
\text{Yaw E.O.M.} : (m_{CG} - N_1)\ddot{\psi} = m\left(z_{CG} - z_{CG} - z_{CG}wp + x_Gwp - x_Grp\left(p^2 - r^2\right) + (I_f - I_k)\ddot{r}\right) - p\Delta g N_{Moment} - p\Delta g N_{Gy} \sin(\theta) + N_{Hull} + N_{Rad} + N_{Wind} + N_{WavesLong} + m(uq - vp - z_G(p^2 + q^2) - x_Grp)\ddot{w} + N_{Currents} + \omega w E_{GRD} - \omega \psi E_{GRD}.
\]

\[
\text{Pitch E.O.M.} : (m_{CG} - 0.5X,T)\ddot{\theta} - (m_{CG} + Z)\ddot{\psi} = m\left(z_{CG} - z_{CG} - z_{CG}wp + x_Gwp - x_Grp\left(p^2 - r^2\right) + (I_f - I_k)\ddot{r}\right) - p\Delta g M_{Gy} \sin(\phi)\sin(\theta) + M_{Rad} - z_w w(m - Z) - x_w \omega Z_{CG} + z_w \omega X_{GRD}.
\]

\[
\text{Yaw E.O.M.} : (m_{CG} - N_1)\ddot{\psi} = m\left(z_{CG} - z_{CG} - z_{CG}wp + x_Gwp - x_Grp\left(p^2 - r^2\right) + (I_f - I_k)\ddot{r}\right) - p\Delta g N_{Moment} - p\Delta g N_{Gy} \sin(\theta) + N_{Hull} + N_{Rad} + N_{Wind} + N_{WavesLong} + m(uq - vp - z_G(p^2 + q^2) - x_Grp)\ddot{w} + N_{Currents} + \omega w E_{GRD} - \omega \psi E_{GRD}.
\]

\[
\text{Pitch E.O.M.} : (m_{CG} - 0.5X,T)\ddot{\theta} - (m_{CG} + Z)\ddot{\psi} = m\left(z_{CG} - z_{CG} - z_{CG}wp + x_Gwp - x_Grp\left(p^2 - r^2\right) + (I_f - I_k)\ddot{r}\right) - p\Delta g M_{Gy} \sin(\phi)\sin(\theta) + M_{Rad} - z_w w(m - Z) - x_w \omega Z_{CG} + z_w \omega X_{GRD}.
\]

\[
\text{Yaw E.O.M.} : (m_{CG} - N_1)\ddot{\psi} = m\left(z_{CG} - z_{CG} - z_{CG}wp + x_Gwp - x_Grp\left(p^2 - r^2\right) + (I_f - I_k)\ddot{r}\right) - p\Delta g N_{Moment} - p\Delta g N_{Gy} \sin(\theta) + N_{Hull} + N_{Rad} + N_{Wind} + N_{WavesLong} + m(uq - vp - z_G(p^2 + q^2) - x_Grp)\ddot{w} + N_{Currents} + \omega w E_{GRD} - \omega \psi E_{GRD}.
\]

\[
\text{Pitch E.O.M.} : (m_{CG} - 0.5X,T)\ddot{\theta} - (m_{CG} + Z)\ddot{\psi} = m\left(z_{CG} - z_{CG} - z_{CG}wp + x_Gwp - x_Grp\left(p^2 - r^2\right) + (I_f - I_k)\ddot{r}\right) - p\Delta g M_{Gy} \sin(\phi)\sin(\theta) + M_{Rad} - z_w w(m - Z) - x_w \omega Z_{CG} + z_w \omega X_{GRD}.
\]

\[
\text{Yaw E.O.M.} : (m_{CG} - N_1)\ddot{\psi} = m\left(z_{CG} - z_{CG} - z_{CG}wp + x_Gwp - x_Grp\left(p^2 - r^2\right) + (I_f - I_k)\ddot{r}\right) - p\Delta g N_{Moment} - p\Delta g N_{Gy} \sin(\theta) + N_{Hull} + N_{Rad} + N_{Wind} + N_{WavesLong} + m(uq - vp - z_G(p^2 + q^2) - x_Grp)\ddot{w} + N_{Currents} + \omega w E_{GRD} - \omega \psi E_{GRD}.
\]
In the above equation $\dot{u}$, $\dot{v}$, $\dot{w}$, $\dot{p}$, $\dot{q}$, and $\dot{r}$, represent surge, sway, heave, roll, pitch and yaw acceleration respectively. The acceleration subscripts terms ($X\dot{u}$, $Y\dot{v}$, $Z\dot{w}$, $K\dot{p}$, $K\dot{q}$, $K\dot{r}$, $M\dot{q}$, $N\dot{v}$, $N\dot{r}$) represent the hydrodynamic added masses and added inertia forces that arise from the deflection of the surrounding fluid. The mass ‘$m$’ multiplier components on the right-hand side indicate the Coriolis and centripetal forces caused by the rotation of the body-fixed coordinate system about the inertial frame. The translation velocities in the surge, sway and heave directions are $u$, $v$ and $w$, respectively; $p$, $q$, and $r$, represent roll, pitch and yaw motions respectively. The density ‘$\rho$’ and gravity ‘$g$’ multiplier terms are restoring forces, that depend on waterplane area $A_{wp}$, the instantaneous change in heave displacement $\Delta z$ and angular roll $\phi$ and pitch $\theta$ rotations of the ship. Additionally, the restoring moments depend on transverse $GM_T$ and longitudinal $GM_L$ metacentric height. The contact forces at the location of the rock ($X_{\text{rock}}, Y_{\text{rock}}$, and $Z_{\text{rock}}$) ship interface are $X_{C,\text{GRD}}, Y_{C,\text{GRD}}$ and $Z_{C,\text{GRD}}$. Hydrodynamic damping forces are denoted by the subscript namely ‘Hull’. The remaining terms describe control forces (“prop”, “Rud”), environmental forces (“waveShort”, “Wind”), and ship resistance (“Res”) and are discussed in subsequent sections.

### 3.1. Ship maneuvering dynamics

The maneuvering model assumes calm water resistance $X_{Res}$ for the case of a ship moving at a straight course. This can be obtained either from statistical regression [49] or from Model tests or computational fluid dynamic CFD solvers. Ship propulsion $X_{Prop}$ and rudder forces (subscript ‘Rud’ Equation (1)) are defined in [50,51,44]. Aerodynamics play an influential role in ship dynamics, where the loads are dependent on time and location due to the stochastic nature of the wind. The evaluation of wind loads on a ship (subscript ‘Wind’ Equation (1)) is given in [51,52], where the coefficients of wind forces are estimated according to Blendermann [53]. This study does not demonstrate the influence of wind loads on grounding dynamics. However, for the completeness of the method wind loads are idealised as reported in [52].
The model accounts for short waves (wavelength to ship length ratio of $\lambda/L_{pp} \leq 0.5$), heading and speed before the grounding impact. Hydrodynamic resistance in short waves is based on the models of Sakamoto and Baba [54], and Faltinsen [55,56]. The hull forces acting on the ship during maneuvering are expressed by hydrodynamic derivatives. These forces acting on the ship hull account for ship velocity and acceleration and are presented in [44]. The radiation damping associated with heave, roll, and pitch motions (see $\zeta$ multiplier terms in Equation (1)) is considered linear and depends on the natural period of the ship under small amplitude motions. A description of the reference technique that accounts for the change in the hydrodynamic assumption of hull forces for a twin-screw vessel is given in [27]. In a typical grounding scenarios, the effect of shallow waters on ship resistance may be significant [52]. Accordingly, the viscous resistance corrections proposed by Raven have been implemented in the model [57]. The influence of shallow water effects on hydrodynamic coefficients is implemented as per Ankudinov et al. [58] and Kijima et al. [59]. Fig. 3 illustrates the numerical integration method used to evaluate the ship trajectories and

Fig. 3. Flow chart and modelling approach of ship external dynamics analysis.
motions. The external dynamics are presented and validated in Taimuri et al. [44].

3.2. Bottom structural deformation

The contact forces and moments (subscript ‘C.GRD’, Equation (1)) originated from the impact between the ship bottom and rock. The detailed formulation for the evaluation of accidental loads following ship hard grounding can be found in Taimuri et al. [28]. The loads from contact with the rock were realized based on the so-called “energy-based criteria of deformable bodies”, i.e., the rock was assumed rigid, the structure is considered to be rigid-plastic and the effect of elastic energy is ignored in the resulting deformation following contact. This method accounts for bottom structural deformations presented by Simonsen [17] and Sun et al. [21]. Accordingly, the energy dissipation is obtained from the integration of the stress and strain fields over the volume of the structure and the upper-bound method of plasticity given in Equation (2) [17].

\[ F_p U = E_p + E_c + E_f = F_{GRD} U + \int p U_{rel} dS \]  

(2)

In the above expression, \( F_p \) is the resisting force of the structure in the direction of \( U \); \( U \) is the relative velocity between the ship and a rock; \( E_p, E_c, E_f \) express the rate of plastic, crack, and frictional energy dissipation respectively; \( F_{GRD} \) is the plastic resistance which includes both plasticity and fracture; \( \mu \) is the Coulomb coefficient of friction; \( p \) is the normal pressure on the rock from the plate element \( dS \); \( S \) is the contact area between rock and plate; \( U_{rel} \) is the relative velocity between rock and plate element \( dS \).

Grounding over a rigid object is idealized by a conical rock with a rounded tip of radius \( R_R \) and semi-apex angle \( \phi \). The structural components depicted in Fig. 4 consist of the inner and outer shell of the hull, longitudinal girders, bulkheads, stiffeners, and transverse floors. Forces generated by individual structural components are resultant contact forces at a particular position along the grounding path. The hull outer bottom holds the structural components (floors, girders, bulkheads, and stiffeners) which are attached to the shell plate. Therefore, the global mode of deformation is governed by the outer hull plating.

Depending on the deformation mode of the ship’s bottom structure the vessel may experience stretching, bending and/or fracture [28]. The outer bottom of the hull while in contact with the rock, may tear the plate with a split angle \( \theta \) (Fig. 4). Practically, \( \theta \) represents the extent of the plate deformation ahead of the conical rock. Taimuri et al. [28], highlight the importance of properly evaluating the plate split angle by demonstrating a comparison of values obtained from the FEM solver against the theoretically minimized resistance force approach introduced by Simonsen [17]. It is confirmed that the implementation of varying plate tearing angles provides more realistic predictions of horizontal and vertical forces.

3.3. Fast contact detection algorithm for ship panel and rock

A fast contact detection algorithm has been developed to locate the interface between the ship panel hull and the tip of a conical rock [28]. The contact between the rock tip and hull panels activates the mechanism responsible for the movement of the ship and structural deformation due to impact loads. The outcome of the contact is hull penetration. Fig. 5a, illustrates the steps followed to locate the interface between the rock and hull panels. The coordinates of each triangular hull panel are defined in relation to the origin of the ship. These points are stored for the estimation of the contact search algorithm that operates as follows:

a) A grid is generated based on the main dimension of the hull and the number of blocks.

b) Panel IDs are stored in a specific block. The initialization steps point a) and b) occur only once.

c) The tip is defined as a point. From this point, a vector is assumed which is directed vertically towards the ship base (or seabed), Fig. 5b.

d) The relative distance between the ship origin and tip location helps identify the sub-block containing the rock.

e) The intersection between the tip vector and the hull panel is obtained using a Ray tracing algorithm [60,61].

f) Once the intersection is detected and based on the rock tip position and ship motions, the relative displacement is evaluated.

The displacement outputs from the contact search algorithm are utilized to estimate the structural deformation forces. Those are subsequently employed as an external force in the 6-DoF equation of motion (see Eq. (1)). Further details on the method can be found in [28].

4. Ship survivability following flooding condition

The method follows a non-zonal approach for damage stability assessment. Following damage, the survivability of a vessel is represented by an attained subdivision index ‘A’. According to SOLAS2020 [62], for a ship to survive in a flooding condition attained index \( A \) should be larger than or equal to the required index \( R \) which depends on number of people on board. The formulation of the attained subdivision index for grounding damages \( A_{GRD} \) used in the present model is given in Equation (3). This complies to the probabilistic damage stability criterion for ship survivability [32,35], expressed as:

\[ A_{GRD} = \min(\min(A_{GRD,ref} - 3, A_{GRD,ref}), A) \]

Fig. 4. Idealization of ship bottom structural particulars, conical rock details and definition of plate splitting angle.
\[
A_{GR} = \sum_{i} p_i s_i
\]

where, \(i\) represents the cases of a compartment or a group of compartments that are damaged; \(p_i\) is the associated probability that the compartments are damaged (p-factor) and \(s_i\) represents the safety degree (s-factor) after flooding.

The IMO SOLAS 2020 regulations require three different drafts to acquire the attained subdivision index. As this paper focuses on demonstrating the FSI method instead of its broader impact on regulatory development only one design draft is considered. The s-factor is calculated according to SOLAS 2020 Chapter II-1 Part B-1 Regulation 7-2. The p-factor is defined as

\[
p_i = \frac{n_i}{N_T}
\]

where, \(n_i\) shows the damage cases having the same groups of compartments being breached and \(N_T\) is the total number of performed simulations.

A Monte Carlo simulation is performed to generate the hull breaches (damage extents) by utilizing the deterministic FSI ship grounding dynamics solver described in Section 3. These damage statistics are transferred into the NAPA software, which can model the damaged rooms for each breach case and calculate \(A_{GR}\). The details of the modelling assumptions and the procedure for the evaluation of the p- and s-factors can be found in [63,64,46].

5. Damage characteristics and input parameters

5.1. Ship damage profile following grounding

The deterministic damage profile computed from the rapid FSI method accounts for the maximum coordinates of the damage extents. The numerical assessment of ship grounding over a conical rock provides detailed deformation characteristics elaborated in Figs. 6-8. The location of the damage coordinates follows a right-handed coordinate system with the origin attached in way of the centerline and ship aft perpendiculars.

The first contact between the rock and hull bottom is denoted as \(X_F\). This is the point that governs the length of the damage, and transversal (starboard and portside) limits of the hull bottom \(b(X_F, z)\) depicted in Fig. 6. The vertical position of the first contact from the keel line is

![Fig. 5. Representation of the ship, rock, cartesian domain, intersection between the rock and panel, and the steps followed for rapid detection of contact.](image)

![Fig. 6. illustration of deterministic longitudinal and transverse damage extent of a ship. Top view XY plane. The x-axis points toward the bow (positive), the y-axis is positive towards the portside.](image)
profile using the following equation: (see Fig. 6,8). The center of measured damage is included in the damage 
where, \( \eta_{\text{dam}} \) defined as 

\[
\eta_{\text{dam}} = \frac{Y_{\text{dam}}}{b(X_F, z^*)}
\]

(5)

where, \( \eta_{\text{dam}} \) represents the non-dimensional center of measured damage with respect to the transverse limit of the hull at the very first contact. By utilizing the limits of the damage coordinates throughout the deterministic grounding simulation, a box shape damage profile is formed (see Fig. 9). This is then used for the evaluation of \( p \)- and \( s \)-factors.

Well-established probabilistic approaches for the assessment of damaged ship structures, build their models on the basis of historical records [36,35,32]. These damage distributions are based on statistical analysis of available data from past accidents. In these distributions the grounding data of passenger and container ships accounting for available accident records were combined [36]. The addition of container ships was considered useful attribute especially considering that grounding accidents involving passenger ships are very few.

Additionally, existing damage distributions do not account for detailed conditions of the ship structure, environmental conditions, and the influence of the surrounding environment. The probabilistic ship accident modeling based on historical data do not account for the influence of traffic conditions and associated navigational variables [2].

The historical probability density function simply provides the ship’s (longitudinal, transversal, and vertical) damage extent which depends on the design length, breadth, and draft of the ship. These models assume the “potential damage” that may extend beyond the vessel’s limit partially extending from either port- or starboard- side. These methods tend to overestimate the vertical and longitudinal extent of the damage.

The fundamental advantage of damage profile modelling, as presented here, is that it is based on actual damage, which is not only formed within the ship domain, but is also affected by the structural details, ship motions, environmental force, and maneuvering conditions. The documentation of this “potential damage” distribution can be found in the EMSA-III report [36].

During a grounding simulation, the ship will translate and rotate because of the influence of rock dynamics (forces) leading to structural deformation. Ship heave, roll and pitch motions may lead to varying penetrations along her length. Ship yaw, sway and roll will deform the structure transversely; and the combined 6-DoF motion during grounding will contribute to the total longitudinal damage length.

Notably, all these damage distributions are associated with environmental (deep and shallow waters) and operational (velocity, bathymetry and seabed profile) conditions.

### 5.2. Probabilistic distributions for a passenger ship before grounding

Simulations were based on the modern passenger vessel FLOODSTAND SHIP B [47] with structural details and principal particulars shown in Fig. 10. The subdivision of the vessel as shown in Fig. 11, illustrates the escape routes, unprotected openings, wattright compartments and cross-flooding pipes for the calculation of the \( s \)-factor. The validation of ship external dynamics (maneuvering) and internal mechanics (structural deformation) is presented in Taimuri et al. [28,44]. For the probabilistic assessment of the grounding of the ship, credible operating conditions are required to classify the grounding scenarios.

The operational and environmental factors that may contribute to a typical hard grounding scenario are modelled by random variables using the probability density function (pdf) of Youssef and Paik [43]. This model includes probability distributions of ship speed, trim angle, rock location with respect to ship centerline and rock profile for different types of vessels. Grounding characteristics (i.e., pdf of ship velocity, rock height, rock profile, rock eccentricity) were investigated for the following four conditions:

i) passenger vessel operational conditions, maneuvered in deep waters

ii) passenger vessel operational conditions, maneuvered in shallow waters

iii) All-types of vessels operating conditions, maneuvered in deep waters

iv) All-types of vessels operating conditions, maneuvered in shallow waters

The water is considered deep for sea depth to ship draft \( H/T \) ratio
that is greater than 100. Shallow water was assumed to be equally distributed in the range $1.35 \leq H/T \leq 2.78$. Shallow water statistics were derived from maritime accidents in the Baltic Sea between 1989 and 2018 [3]. Table 1, presents a summary of statistics for the operating probability distributions of passenger vessels and All-types of vessels. This includes input pdf of rock eccentricity $Y_{GR}$, ship impact velocity $V_i$, rock depth $D_p$ (which is the initial height of the rock-tip from keel line), rounded tip radius of rock $R_R$, and cone semi apex angle $\phi$. The position of the rock tip was modelled as a uniform distribution with the bounds $X \in [-B/2, B/2]$, where the ship’s centerline is considered zero.

The rock model by Youssef and Paik [43] is a paraboloid. The rock is formed from the damaged database of the EU GOALDS project [34]. Accordingly, the length, width and depth of the damage extents were utilized to create paraboloid rock parameters distribution. Contrary to this, in the present method, a conical rock is considered with a rounded tip radius and semi-apex angle. Therefore, it was assumed that the radius of the tip is 12.5 % of the width of the rock. The semi-apex angle was formed by averaging the width and length of the paraboloid rock as follows:

$$\phi = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{l + w}{4d}\right) \quad (6)$$

In the above equation $l, w$ and $d$ are the distribution of length, width and depth of the rock as per Youssef and Paik [43].

6. Results and discussion

6.1. Probability distributions of grounding scenarios

Monte Carlo simulations were used to evaluate the degree of the damage, structural failure forces, and ship motions. A pseudorandom number generator based on Mersenne Twister [65] was implemented to produce input conditions based on the probability distributions indicated in Table 1. To account for uncertainties in input conditions (forces, motions, and A-index) a set of five repetitions with 20,000 simulations (5-different starting seeds and 4 conditions defined in Section 5.2) were considered. This is consistent with a recent analysis by EMSA [36], which recommends running 10,000 scenarios with five distinct seeds to achieve a reasonably adequate confidence interval for damage breaches.

Histograms of the randomly generated samples from the given input probability distributions displayed in Table 1 are shown in Fig. 12. Input factors were impact velocity, rock eccentricity, penetration depth, rock tip radius, apex angle, and sea depth to ship draft ratio for All-types of vessels and the passenger vessel. The sample means of the input distribution with 95 % confidence interval is shown in Fig. 13. An important observation from the statistical analysis [43] is that the mean value of penetration depth and rock tip radius encountered by passenger vessel is greater than the statistics for All-types of vessels, where the mean value of penetration depth and tip radius is 80 % and 45 % higher respectively.
6.2. Derivation of damage extents distributions

Based on the grounding accident statistics displayed in Fig. 12, damage data were derived from a two-way coupled internal and external mechanics model (Section 3). The rapid FSI grounding dynamics method used in this work was numerically validated against LSDYNA-MCOL simulations [28]. For completeness, a brief discussion of the FSI approach employed for deterministic generation of damage extents is presented in Appendix A. Ship survivability assessment relies on the location and extents (longitudinal, transverse, vertical) of damage. For validation purposes, results from numerical simulations were compared against the damage extents of the historical grounding data EMSA [35,36]. Fig. 14 illustrates a summary of the statistics based on EMSA data sets and Monte Carlo simulations utilizing the deterministic crashworthiness FSI technique introduced in this paper (see Section 5.2). Comparisons are based on probability distributions corresponding to available data sets (i.e., All-types of vessels and passenger vessel). It is shown that the center of damage ($\eta_{\text{dam}}$) from historical data (Fig. 14a) follows uniform distribution. On the other hand, the deterministic model shows a bimodal distribution (Fig. 14 b and c), with a mean of around $\pm 0.29$. Damage length, breadth, and penetration are normalized by the length between the ship’s perpendicular $L_{pp}$, beam of the ship $B$, and potential penetration factor $L_{a,p,\text{max}}(B) = L_{a,\text{max}}(B) = \min\{0.503+0.636, T\}$, respectively.

The bimodal distribution could be attributed to FSI deterministic damage extents, for which the center of the damage ($Y_{\text{dam}}$) varies as ship dynamics account for motions in 6-DoF (see Fig. 6, Fig. 8 and Appendix A). Furthermore, the hull bottom limits $b(X, z')$ are different from the bow to the forebody of the ship. Amidships this limit tends to be equal to the ship’s breadth. The location of the rock ($Y_{GR}$) is uniformly distributed. According to Equation (5), the value of $\eta_{\text{dam}}$ forms a distribution with two peaks. The ESMA distribution, on the other hand, explicitly considers a uniform distribution for the value of the nondimensional center of measured damage $\eta_{\text{dam}}$.

Figure 15 illustrates the distribution of damage extent statistics. The mean result of the damage length ($L_x$) from the rapid FSI solver is 55 % higher than the EMSA historical data set. On the other hand, the rapid FSI method shows a decrease in the mean value of damage width ($L_y$) and penetration ($L_z$). When considering passenger vessel distribution, the damage width and penetration shows approximately 28 % lower mean in comparison to historical data. The correlation between the mean and median values of damage extents suggests right-skewed data with a larger tail at the upper end, since the mean is greater than the median. Moreover, the median of the extent of deterministic damage is higher than that of historical data. From an overall perspective, it appears that passenger ship input conditions result in significantly greater mean values for damage width (80 %) and penetration (72 %) than non-passenger input conditions. Furthermore, there is not much of

---

Fig. 11. Passenger vessel watertight subdivision, cross flooding pipes, and unprotected openings for damage stability calculations.
For the four distinct scenarios outlined in section 5.2, the non-dimensional center of location of the rock was fit with a bimodal distribution. For the rest of the damage dimensions a Weibull distribution was used.

Equations (7) and (8) describe the fitted bimodal and Weibull probability density functions, respectively.

\[
\text{Bimodal distribution} : f(x; \mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) = \frac{p}{\sigma_1 \sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu_1)^2}{2\sigma_1^2}} + \frac{(1-p)}{\sigma_2 \sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu_2)^2}{2\sigma_2^2}}
\]

(7)

\[
\text{Weibull distribution} : f(x; \alpha, \beta) = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \left(\frac{x}{\alpha}\right)^{\beta-1} e^{-\left(\frac{x}{\alpha}\right)^\beta}
\]

(8)

where, \(\mu\) and \(\sigma\) are the mean and standard deviations of the normal distribution; \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) are scale and shape factors. Table 2, contains the parameters of the fitted pdfs, and Appendix B demonstrates histograms of the damage extents from numerical simulations and fitted distributions.

6.3. Distribution of maximum forces, deformation energy and ship motions

Structural failure loads and ship motion amplitudes were attained from numerical ship grounding simulations accounting for the external dynamics conditions, shown in Table 3. The details of the histogram and fitted distributions of the maximum grounding forces for four cases are given in Appendix C. It was found that the numerically simulated longitudinal resistance force has a generalized extreme value distribution (Equation (9)). On the other hand, the vertical and transversal structural resistance values display a log-logistic distribution (Equation (10)). The maximum total deformation energy of the structure shows a gamma distribution (Equation (11)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Input probability density functions of ship operating conditions and environmental conditions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input rock eccentricity pdf. Passenger ships and all-types of vessels. Location of the rock from ship centerline (Y_{ca}) is in meter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentricity (x = Y_{ca})</td>
<td>Uniform distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parameters</td>
<td>(f(x) = \frac{1}{b-a}) (x \in [a; b]); (a = -B/2); (b = B/2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Velocity pdf before grounding event. Passenger ships and all-types of vessels. Impact velocity \(V_i\) is normalized by service speed \(V_s\).

| Velocity pdf before grounding event. | Normal distribution |
| parameters | \(f(x; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}\) |

Input initial rock height above keel line (rock depth) pdf before grounding event.. Passenger ship and all-types of vessel. The depth of the rock \(D_R\) is normalized by draft \(T\) of the ship.

| Penetration pdf | Normal distribution |
| parameters | \(f(x; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}\) |

Table 2, contains the parameters of the fitted pdfs, and Appendix B demonstrates histograms of the damage extents from numerical simulations and fitted distributions.
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Fig. 12. Input values for stochastic grounding simulation. Random samples generated from the input probability distribution a) All-types vessel and b) Passenger vessels distributions.
The statistical assessment of the mean value of the structural grounding forces and amplitudes of the ship with 95 % confidence interval is shown in Fig. 17. Compared to All-types of vessel (Table 1), passenger vessel input pdfs were shown to have substantially higher mean values of structural resistance forces and ship amplitudes (the resistance force is 2.5 to 4.5 higher and the ship amplitude is 1.5 to 2 times higher). This may be attributed to the depth of penetration of the rock, which has a lower mean value in the all types of vessels data set (see Fig. 13).

In deep-water conditions, there is a very minor increase in grounding forces and ship amplitudes. This could be attributed to the ship’s resistance, which is somewhat higher in shallow waters. Table 3 summarizes the statistics on grounding forces and ship motions. After fitting the distributions, a nonparametric (Wilcoxon rank-sum) test was carried out to validate the fitted population distributions against the grounding samples. This represents the fitted pdfs for the cases of the structural resistance force, ship motions and deformation energy (see Appendix C and D).

**Generalized Extreme Valuedistribution**: $f(x; \xi, \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma} \exp \left( - \left( 1 + \xi \left( \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \right) \right)^{1+\xi} \right) \left( 1 + \xi \left( \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \right) \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{\Gamma(1/\xi)} (13)$

**Logistic Distribution**: $f(x; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{e^{-\left( \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \right)}}{\sigma \left( 1 + e^{-\left( \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \right)} \right)} (14)$

**Gamma Distribution**: $f(x; \alpha, \beta) = \frac{x^{\alpha-1} e^{-\left( x/\beta \right)}}{\beta^\alpha \Gamma(\alpha)} (15)$

**Half Normal Distribution**: $f(x; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\left( \frac{x - \mu}{\sigma} \right)^2} (12)$

**Lognormal Distribution**: $f(x; \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{x \sigma \sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\left( \frac{\ln(x) - \mu}{\sigma} \right)^2} (13)$

**Burr Type XII Distribution**: $f(x; \lambda, c, k) = \frac{k c x^{k-1} e^{-\left( \frac{cx}{\lambda} \right)^k}}{\lambda^k \Gamma(1/k)} (14)$

### 6.4. Calculation of the A-index

The ship’s survivability level in the event of a grounding is expressed as the A-index of Equation (3). This value determines if the vessel can withstand certain damages while still ensuring the safety of the crew and passengers. In order to calculate the A-index, we must consider damaged compartments which are flooded. In bottom grounding scenarios floodwater progresses upwards through hull internal openings such as staircases and trunks (see Fig. 11). Therefore, most onerous design assumptions consider all rooms in the same watertight compartment to be flooded simultaneously. Cross-flooding in the double bottom void spaces may be considered for damage cases where only one side of the connection is breached. In this study, for each damage case, the $s$-factor was calculated according to SOLAS Ch. II-1, considering also escape routes. Progressive flooding along the bulkhead deck was not considered, and instead, immersion of such openings was accounted for in the evaluation of the $s$-factor.

Damage stability analysis was performed for the design draft condition using damage extents acquired from the deterministic FSI Monte Carlo simulations. The attained index was obtained separately for 4 different impact scenarios, under realistic conditions with 95 % confidence interval (see Fig. 18). Additionally, a comparison is also made with the attained index from a historical dataset [36]. The difference between deep and shallow water conditions is not substantial. However, the confidence interval is a little wider in the case of shallow water. This illustrates the additional variability in the sample due to the influence of increased resistance of the ship and can be reduced by increasing the number of simulations to get closer to the population mean. Another important finding is that of the historical damage distribution (EMSA-grounding dataset Fig. 18), where the attained index is much lower than numerically estimated FSI results. However, this is not particularly surprising given that the historical data distributions overestimate the horizontal and vertical extent of damage (Figs. 15 and 16). Furthermore, it should be noted that this applies just to the studied case (FLOOD-STAND SHIP B) and does not necessarily apply to other ships.

Notwithstanding the above, it is obvious that input conditions based on vessel statistics (in this case passenger vessels) may yield a different
Fig. 14. Non-dimensional output of probability density function. (a) Damage extents from historical data set of EMSA [36]; (b) Damage extents from the input distribution of All-Types of vessels, and (c) Damage extents from the input distribution of passenger vessels.
Fig. 14. (continued).

Fig. 15. Box plots of damage extents computed from different probability density functions in deep and shallow water, and details from historical data.
Fig. 16. Illustrations of damage extent distributions according to historical data and FSI simulations. The dashed encircled region shows potential damage, where the extent of damage is outside the ship domain.

### Table 2
Characteristics of the numerically simulated damage extent fitted with selected pdf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>All-types of vessel Input Distribution</th>
<th>Passenger vessel Input Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deep water</td>
<td>Shallow water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-0.5 \leq \eta_{\text{dam}} \leq 0.5$ &amp; Bimodal &amp; $\rho$ &amp; 0.5048 &amp; 0.4999 &amp; 0.5049 &amp; 0.5024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\mu_1$ &amp; -0.2678 &amp; -0.2681 &amp; -0.2893 &amp; -0.2909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\mu_2$ &amp; 0.2709 &amp; 0.2714 &amp; 0.2929 &amp; 0.2934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma_1$ &amp; 0.1088 &amp; 0.1098 &amp; 0.1094 &amp; 0.1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma_2$ &amp; 0.1087 &amp; 0.1088 &amp; 0.1091 &amp; 0.1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.06 \leq L_g \leq 220 (m)$</td>
<td>Weibull &amp; $\alpha$ &amp; 82.7427 &amp; 83.2484 &amp; 85.5418 &amp; 86.0419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$ &amp; 1.5925 &amp; 1.6083 &amp; 1.8515 &amp; 1.8824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.0005 \leq L_g \leq 27.1 (m)$</td>
<td>Weibull &amp; $\alpha$ &amp; 1.8666 &amp; 1.8302 &amp; 3.4517 &amp; 3.3751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$ &amp; 1.2068 &amp; 1.2020 &amp; 1.7340 &amp; 1.7991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.0001 \leq L_g \leq 3.3 (m)$</td>
<td>Weibull &amp; $\alpha$ &amp; 0.4636 &amp; 0.4585 &amp; 0.8325 &amp; 0.8261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$ &amp; 1.2432 &amp; 1.2520 &amp; 1.8190 &amp; 1.8244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3
Characteristics of the numerically simulated maximum grounding forces and maximum ship motions fitted with select pdf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>All-types of vessel Input Distribution Deep waters</th>
<th>Passenger vessel Input Distribution Deep waters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shallow waters</td>
<td>Shallow waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.003 \leq F_x \leq 120 (MN)$ &amp; Generalized Extreme Value &amp; $\xi$ &amp; 0.6061 &amp; 0.6014 &amp; 0.6472 &amp; 3.8819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\mu$ &amp; 1.5687 &amp; 1.5727 &amp; 0.6457 &amp; 3.8859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma$ &amp; 2.1647 &amp; 2.1748 &amp; 0.6472 &amp; 3.8819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.0001 \leq F_F \leq 71 (MN)$ &amp; Log-logistic &amp; $\mu$ &amp; -2.5278 &amp; -2.5428 &amp; -1.1224 &amp; -1.1429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma$ &amp; 1.0085 &amp; 1.0006 &amp; 0.9393 &amp; 0.9261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.01 \leq F_Z \leq 365 (MN)$ &amp; Log-logistic &amp; $\mu$ &amp; 1.4992 &amp; 1.5046 &amp; 2.1602 &amp; 2.1571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma$ &amp; 0.3551 &amp; 0.3566 &amp; 0.5523 &amp; 0.5522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.1 \leq E_{\text{Def}} \leq 1695 (MJ)$ &amp; Gamma &amp; $\alpha$ &amp; 0.68 &amp; 0.70 &amp; 1.04 &amp; 1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$ &amp; 226.37 &amp; 214.74 &amp; 263.80 &amp; 262.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 \leq H_{\text{ave}} \leq 5.9 (m)$ &amp; Log-normal &amp; $\mu$ &amp; -2.9065 &amp; -2.9119 &amp; - &amp; -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma$ &amp; 0.8720 &amp; 0.8732 &amp; - &amp; -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 \leq H_{\text{ave}} \leq 0.8 (m)$ &amp; Weibull &amp; $\alpha$ &amp; - &amp; - &amp; 0.1644 &amp; 0.1637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$ &amp; - &amp; - &amp; 1.5953 &amp; 1.5891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 \leq R_{\text{oll}} \leq 47 (\degree)$ &amp; Generalized Extreme Value &amp; $\xi$ &amp; 0.5154 &amp; 0.5006 &amp; - &amp; -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\mu$ &amp; 0.6813 &amp; 0.6838 &amp; - &amp; -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\alpha$ &amp; 0.7075 &amp; 0.7121 &amp; - &amp; -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 \leq R_{\text{oll}} \leq 17 (\degree)$ &amp; Half-normal &amp; $\mu$ &amp; - &amp; - &amp; 3.7200 &amp; 3.6515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 \leq F_{\text{pitch}} \leq 12.5 (\degree)$ &amp; Burr Type XII &amp; $\lambda$ &amp; 0.0336 &amp; 0.0299 &amp; 0.3961 &amp; 0.3980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$c$ &amp; 1.4452 &amp; 1.5229 &amp; 1.1903 &amp; 1.1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$k$ &amp; 1.2419 &amp; 1.1149 &amp; 5.9175 &amp; 5.9394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 \leq Y_{\text{aw}} \leq 200 (\degree)$ &amp; Burr Type XII &amp; $\lambda$ &amp; 0.1198 &amp; 4.7616 &amp; 4847.6680 &amp; 12.7788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$c$ &amp; 0.7689 &amp; 0.7988 &amp; 0.8930 &amp; 0.9758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$k$ &amp; 5.9728 &amp; 4.0276 &amp; 989.6583 &amp; 7.2762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The penetration height of the rock was 75% greater for the case of “passenger vessel input” distribution as compared to “All-types of vessel input” distributions (see Fig. 13). As a result, more rooms are penetrated vertically, which means that flooding is not limited to the double bottom, resulting in a significantly lower s-factor and, eventually, a lower $A$. In each case, $A$ is notably higher than the required subdivision index ($R = 0.8675$) as per SOLAS2020 Chapter II-1 Part B-1 Regulation 6.

7. Conclusions

This paper presented a probabilistic method for the assessment of damage extents following ship hard grounding. The method is based on a rapid FSI model that accounts for structural and hydrodynamic topologies, ship dynamics and operational conditions. The new aspect of the method is damage profile modelling, which is based on the so-called actual damages. This means that the damage profile is generated not just inside the ship’s domain, but also takes into consideration structural topology, vessel kinematics, environmental forces, and maneuvering motions. The purpose of this approach is to generate realistic probabilistic damage datasets that can be used to assess ship damage stability or structural integrity.

Comparisons of the extents of damage derived from the new method against EMSA historical data records indicated larger estimates of the ship’s damage length following grounding. However, the width and penetration depths are predicted to be smaller, and this could be attributed to oversimplified assumptions of historical data “potential damage” records. Because of the influence of ship evasiveness, the higher estimation of damage width and penetration depth from historical data may be valid. Notwithstanding this, the historical probabilistic damage estimates did not consider the operating conditions, structural arrangement (single bottom, double bottom, watertight compartments, etc.), and the profile of the seabed.

The model considered only the influence of conical rock profiles, straight-line ship operations and neglected side grounding scenarios. Accordingly, future work could focus on modelling paraboloid forms of rock and ship evasive actions and modelling side grounding damages that may be orthogonal to the vessel’s center plane. Such developments could have a significant impact on the development of future IMO SOLAS damage stability regulations and the development of criteria.
Fig. 19. Side (B/4) grounding of a passenger ship. Velocities, displacements, forces and energy. a) Surge, heave and pitch motions and b) Sway, roll and yaw motions c) Sliding forces and deformation energy of side (B/4) grounding of a passenger ship.

Fig. 20. Off-center grounding LSDYNA-MCOL validation study, rock fastened in between two longitudinal girders.
implemented in intelligent Decision Support Systems (DSS). The probabilistic model presented in this work is limited to a specific ship design and structural arrangement of a modern passenger vessel. Consequently, future research on situations involving various ship types and structural configurations can assist us in integrating the probabilistic models for damaged ship survivability assessment.
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Appendix A: Validation study of an off-center grounding

Results of the off-center (B/4) grounding of the passenger vessel are shown in Fig. 19. The results of the surge, heave, and pitch motions match well with the values available from the validation study. The total length of damage of the ship is the same as that of the ship completely passing over the rock. The surge velocity from the LS-DYNA simulation and the rapid FSI model shows that the contact between the ship and the rock separates after 30.6 and 33.2 s, respectively, which can be seen as a constant surge velocity (see Fig. 19a), after almost 30 s.

The present model shows on average 8.5% lower values of horizontal resistance in comparison to validation case Fig. 19c. The vertical force is within 3%, and the trend of the force fits well with the simulations. The variation of vertical force is also realized in heave motion. It has slightly less heave amplitude due to lower force. The difference in the surge velocity corresponds to the lower estimation of the horizontal force in a simplified model.

Significant differences in roll motions are found during grounding. Sway motion is underpredicted (Fig. 19b). The FEM simulation shows that the rock is in between two longitudinal girders, which delays the rolling of the ship and causes a steady increase of the roll motion (see Fig. 20). The underestimation of the transverse force (rock in between two longitudinal girders) by the simplified model leads to higher roll and ultimately affects the swaying and yawing of the ship.

The trend of the sway directional lateral force is different; the average force is within 2% of the FEM simulation. The total deformation energy and sliding energy are within 10% and 4% respectively Fig. 19c.

The largest values in the validation of the simplified FSI method against LSDYNA simulations are shown in Table 4. This shows the details of maximum damage extents, forces, deformation energy, and ship motions of the passenger ship off-center grounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LSDYNA</th>
<th>Present simplified FSI method</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Extent (m)</td>
<td>119.13</td>
<td>119.8</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum width (m)</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum penetration (m)</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner bottom breach</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Longitudinal Force (MN)</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Transverse Force (MN)</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Vertical Force (MN)</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Deformation Energy (MJ)</td>
<td>507.4</td>
<td>468.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Heave (m)</td>
<td>0.1366</td>
<td>0.1302</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Roll (deg)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Pitch (deg)</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Yaw (deg)</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. Fitted probability distribution of damage extents

a) Fitted bimodal distribution of the dimensionless position of the center of damage $\eta_{\text{dam}}$. Histograms display numerically calculated deterministic values against fitted pdfs. Input conditions consider deep and shallow waters with operating distributions of passenger vessels and all-types of vessels.
b) Fitted Weibull distribution of damage length $L_x$ in meters. Histograms display numerically calculated deterministic values against fitted pdfs. Input conditions consist of deep and shallow water with operating distributions of passenger vessels and all-types of vessels.

![Graph showing fitted Weibull distribution of damage length $L_x$.](image)

c) Fitted Weibull distribution of damage width $L_y$ in meters. Histograms display numerically calculated deterministic values against fitted pdfs. Input conditions consist of deep and shallow water with operating distributions of passenger vessels and all-types of vessels.

![Graph showing fitted Weibull distribution of damage width $L_y$.](image)
d) Fitted Weibull distribution of damage penetration $L_d$ in meters. Histograms display numerically calculated deterministic values against fitted pdfs. Input conditions consist of deep and shallow water with operating distributions of passenger vessels and all-types of vessels.

Appendix C. Fitted probability distribution of maximum structural resistance force

![Graphs showing fitted probability distributions of maximum structural resistance forces](image)

a) Fitted generalize extreme value distributions of maximum longitudinal structural resistance forces (MN) during a grounding event. Histograms display numerically simulated grounding forces and fitted pdfs. Input conditions account for deep and shallow waters for both passenger vessels and all-types of vessels.

![Graphs showing fitted distributions of maximum transversal structural resistance forces](image)

b) Fitted loglogistic distribution of maximum transversal structural resistance force (MN) during a grounding event. Histograms display numerically simulated grounding forces and fitted pdfs. Input conditions account for deep and shallow waters for passenger vessels and all-types of vessels.
c) Fitted log-logistic distribution of maximum vertical structural resistance force (MN) during a grounding event. Histograms display numerically simulated grounding forces and fitted pdfs. Input conditions consider deep and shallow waters with operating distributions of passenger vessels and all-types of vessels.

d) Fitted gamma distribution of total structural deformation energy (MJ) during a grounding event. Histograms display numerically simulated grounding energy and fitted pdfs. Input conditions consider deep and shallow waters with operating distributions for passenger vessels and all-types of vessels.
Appendix D: Fitted probability distribution of maximum ship motions

a) Fitted lognormal (All-types of vessels) and Weibull (Passenger vessels) distributions of maximum heave motion during a grounding event. Histograms display numerically simulated grounding ship motions and fitted pdfs.
b) Fitted generalize extreme value (All-types of vessels) and half normal (Passenger vessels) distributions of maximum roll motion during a grounding event. Histograms display numerically simulated grounding ship motions and fitted pdfs.

c) Fitted Burr type XII distributions of maximum pitch motion during a grounding event. Histograms display numerically simulated grounding ship motions and fitted pdfs. Input conditions account for deep and shallow waters for passenger vessels and all-types of vessels.
d) Fitted Burr type XII distributions of maximum yaw motion during a grounding event. Histograms display numerically simulated grounding ship motions and fitted pdfs. Input conditions account for deep and shallow waters for passenger vessels and all-types of vessels.
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