

Quantitative Analysis of Fuel Consumption and Fuel Sediments Separation as a Function of Fuel Type and Ship Operation Mode on Product/Chemical Tanker Example

Dujmović, Josip; Miculinić, Rikard

Source / Izvornik: **Pomorstvo**, 2023, 37, 118 - 139

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

<https://doi.org/10.31217/p.37.1.10>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:187:043581>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-08-05**



Sveučilište u Rijeci, Pomorski fakultet
University of Rijeka, Faculty of Maritime Studies

Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Maritime Studies - FMSRI Repository](#)





<https://doi.org/10.31217/p.37.1.10>

Quantitative Analysis of Fuel Consumption and Fuel Sediments Separation as a Function of Fuel Type and Ship Operation Mode on Product/Chemical Tanker Example

Josip Dujmović*, Rikard Miculinić

University of Rijeka, Faculty of Maritime Studies, Studentska 2, 51000 Rijeka, Croatia, e-mail: josip.dujmovic@pfri.uniri.hr; rikard.miculinić@pfri.uniri.hr

* Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Fuel consumption onboard is influenced on several factors but most crucial is ship operation mode and fuel type in use. Conventional fuel preparation process onboard consists of several stages. One of the most essential processes is centrifugal separation treatment operation onboard, which consists of introducing fuel into the field of high centrifugal field, where impurities and sediments are separated from fuels. The quantity of separated sediments and impurities from the fuel is essential for accurate calculating the remaining fuel quantity on board (ROB). The purpose of this paper is to determine and verify the influence of potential factors that can affect the quantity of fuel consumption and separated sediments quantity from the fuel based on actual data from real product/chemical tanker powered by conventional fuels. By means of statistical analysis the average values, minimums, maximums, standard deviations, and variations, median and modes, standard errors for separated sludge from fuel, heavy fuel consumption (HSHFO) and diesel fuel consumption (LSMGO) during entire observed period and during specific operations modes are obtained. Furthermore, regression formulas between separated sediments from fuel vs fuel consumption during each ship operation mode are generated. Finally, by means of single and multifactorial analysis significant influence of ship operations mode on fuel consumption and separated quantity has been confirmed. This research contributed to find relations more accurately between separated sediments quantity to fuel consumption that might be used for more accurate emission calculation.

ARTICLE INFO

Original scientific paper

Received 31 August 2022

Accepted 7 June 2023

Key words:

Ship
Product/chemical tanker
Fuel consumption
Separation
Sludge
Fuel sediments

1 Introduction

During ship exploitation, the fuel intended for consumption undergoes through various preparation process to meet technical and technological requirements set by diesel engine manufacturer in terms of cleanliness and water content. Fuel preparation process consists of heating, settling, centrifugal separation and filtration. The mentioned centrifugal separation is the most essential fuel treatment operation on board, which consists of introducing fuel into the field of high centrifugal force, where impurities and sediments are separated from fuels. The quantity of separated sediments and impurities from the fuel is essential for calculating the exact fuel consumption and remaining fuel quantity on board (ROB). The quantity of separated sediments and impurities fuel may depend on various factors such as: fuel chemical composition, fuel

water content, fuel storage method, etc. However, during ship operation, all these factors cannot be established or measured onboard. For this research, factors such as consumed fuel quantity, consumed fuel type and the type of ship operations mode are defined and statistical analysis regarding separated fuel sediments quantity is performed based on actual data from ship. With this analysis influence of different ship operations modes, fuel type and consumed fuel quantity on the quantity of separated sediments and impurities¹ from the fuel is established.

¹ In this paper, all separated components from the fuel by means of centrifugal separation are hereinafter in this paper called sludge, according to [17]. These components mostly consist of insoluble elements in the fuel that have a higher specific density than the fuel itself, mostly consisting of elements of Na, K, Ca, Mg, water, ash and heavy abrasive particles (mainly Si and Al).

Results obtained by this research could be utilized for more accurate usage of “top-down” method for inventory emission assessment. There are two methods used in emission assessment as mentioned in Knežević et al. [1], “top-down” method and “bottom-up” method. “Top-Down” method has been presented by several studies in the past, such as Endresen et al. [2], Olivier et al. [3], Corbett et al. [4] and are based on the data on the total marine fuel sold to ship operator. Although this method might be favourable from data collecting standpoint, several challenges arise from different information’s between quantities of consumed fuel and fuel sold. Besides this, specific ship information and ship operational pattern is not considered in this method. Furthermore, another, “bottom-up” method have been developed where ship’s particulars have been considered. Numerous such studies have been made, as Cullinane et al. [5] where emission has been calculated based on estimated fuel consumption for vessel at berth. Some additional “bottom-up” studies are conducted like Zakić et al. [6], Radonja et al. [7], Dujmović et al. [8]. Therefore, results of this study might significantly contribute to improve accuracy of “top-down” method for particular vessel size/type.

Although, as mentioned, numerous studies have been made to process and simulate vessel fuel consumption quantity in different operational modes, the authors are not aware that research with similar methodology and outcomes has been conducted. However, some topics and areas in this research are covered in previous papers. The accuracy of fuel consumption calculation and separated fuel sediments quantity as a function of consumed fuel is presented in Dujmović et al. [9]. Simulation and application of marine fuel oil purifier and sludge generation based on fuel flow through purifier bowl on Alfa Laval S series purifier is described by Ying et al. [10]. Trodden et al. [11] describes methodology for associating ship activity with corresponding segments of data stream from a commercially available monitoring system. Thanh et al. [12] develop simplified ship fuel consumption model for ocean going container vessels by different sizes based on regression models. Bocchetti et al. [13] presents a statistical model which allows prediction of fuel consumption from set of navigational parameters and mission profile. Li et al. [14] presents calculation model of ship fuel consumption and provide energy consumption assessment index for single ship. Furthermore, different vessels type operational pattern-based fractions of total service time is presented in Banks et al. [15]. Besides this, VLCC² tanker operational pattern is presented by Iordanidis et al. [16].

2 Methodology and data sources

The research is based on extracts from official engine logbook from the product/chemical tanker. Due to the shipowner’s confidentiality and data protection requirements, detailed information about the ship cannot be fully

disclosed, and therefore the observed ship is hereinafter designated as M/V Vessel.

2.1 Data source particulars

The M/V Vessel is a product/chemical tanker with 49999 DWT and 29991 GT. It is powered by the two-stroke diesel engine MAN B&W 6G50ME-C9.5 with of MCR 7800 kW at 89.3 rpm. The specific consumption of the main engine is 163 + 5% g/kWh while burning diesel fuel with 42676.8 kJ/kg of lower heating value (LHV). In addition, three Auxiliary Engines Hyundai Himsen 6H21/32 are installed, each with an MCR 960 kW power at 720 rpm. The consumption of auxiliary engines is 186 + 5% g/kWh at nominal load. The exhaust boiler is of the Aalborg OL Automatic type, with a capacity of 18000 kg/h at 7 kg/cm² working pressure. The auxiliary steam boiler is of the Aalborg OC-TCi type, with furnace capacity of 2000 kg/h at 7 kg/cm² steam pressure.

Engine log extracts consist of two separate physical records:

1. Records of daily sounding (measurement) and content transfer of sludge tanks in engine room,
2. Fuel consumption flow meters statuses taken at any given time-significant moments.

The data processed in this paper refers to period from 22.02.2020 to 31.08.2020. The sample size selected is based on the data availability.

Daily sounding records consists of a one measurement per day of fuel separator sludge tank content and transferring records from one tank to another. The impact of separator consumed process water is considered by subtracting its amount from generated sludge. Therefore, the consumed process water is taken from the separator manufacturer instruction manual [18] as:

- HFO separator – Alfa Laval S948 – process water consumption is taken as 153 ltr/day for flushing frequency 60 min,
- DO separator – Alpha Laval P615 – process water consumption is taken as 178 ltr/day for flushing frequency 120 min,
- LO separator – Alpha Laval P615 – process water consumption is taken as 178 ltr/day for flushing frequency 120 min.

Fuel consumption records are based on fuel consumption flow meters readings that are registered in regular time periods (at 1200 hrs every day) and during change-over ship operation status (mode). Therefore, fuel consumption flow meter readings in engine room logbook were registered in the following moments and ship states:

- SBE – “Stand-By Engine” – Propulsion plant prepared for departure
- SOSp – “Start Of Sea Passage” – Start of a sea-journey (exiting port/anchorage limits)

² VLCC – Very Large Crude Carrier

- NOON – “Noon” – Regular daily flowmeter readings at 1200 hrs LT (local time)
- ESOP – “End Of Sea Passage” – End of the sea-journey (entering port/anchorage limits)
- FWE – “Finished With Engine” – Propulsion plant finished with operation/manoeuvring
- ANCH – “Anchorage” – Vessel secured at anchorage and propulsion plant is set on stand-by status.

The mentioned M/V Vessel use two different types of fuel during her operations:

- HSHFO – Heavy fuel with high sulphur content, >0.5% S
- LSMGO – low-sulphur diesel light diesel, <0.1% S

Therefore, in addition to the previously mentioned recordings during ship operation changeover, fuel consumption flowmeter readings were also recorded in engine room logbook during changeovers of fuel type consumption from HSHFO to LSMGO, according to the requirements of international and local regulations for exhaust gas emissions. The vessel is equipped with exhaust gas scrubber to ensure compliance of global IMO SOx emission while consuming heavy fuel with high sulphur content. As per available data in engine log book extract [19] on 25.07.2022. average sulphur content of HSHFO onboard was 3.014%.

To obtain a more uniform time periods distribution required for analysis fuel consumption flowmeters readings taken at different time points during day are minimized and grouped into periods of “one day”. The duration of “one day” is considered from 1200 hrs to 1200 hrs next day, a 24 hrs period but “one day” also includes the day duration of 25 hours and 23 hours, respectively, depending on the changing ships clock time while sailing through different time zones.

Defined basic ship’s operations modes during this research are:

1. Sailing,
2. Anchorage/Anchoring,
3. Manoeuvring and Port Stay (Mixed Operations)

In addition to the defined basic ship operations modes, a mixed ship operation mode definition is also used, whenever ship undergoes through two or more basic operations during “one day” period.

Accordingly, the following variables were collected and extrapolated from the engine room logbook extract used for analysis:

- The date and time,
- State of the ship’s operation (navigation, manoeuvring/port, anchorage) – nominal variable,
- Increase in fluid levels in the fuel separator sludge tank – continuous numerical variable,
- HSHFO main engine consumption – continuous numerical variable,
- HSHFO auxiliary engines consumption – continuous numerical variable,

- HSHFO steam generator consumption – continuous numerical variable,
- LSMGO main engine consumption – continuous numerical variable,
- LSMGO auxiliary engines consumption – continuous numerical variable,
- LSMGO steam generators consumption – continuous numerical variable,
- LSMGO inert gas generator consumption – continuous numerical variable,
- LSMGO HPP unit (High pressure pumps unit for cleaning/maintenance) consumption – continuous numerical variable.

2.2 Calculation methodology

The statistical analysis was performed with Microsoft Excel 2019 MSO program package, ver. 1808 with an additional tool pack set Analysis ToolPak-VBA.

Sample size for required confidence levels is calculated with Sample Size Calculator [20].

Modelling of descriptive statistics for continuous numerical variables are based on Šošić et al. [21], (1-8). Therefore, mean is calculated as per model (1):

$$\bar{x} = \frac{x_1 + \dots + x_n}{N} \quad (1)$$

where N is number of samples, while standard error is calculated

$$SE = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (2)$$

where σ is standard deviation. Standard deviation is calculated:

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (X_i - \bar{x})^2}{N}} \quad (3)$$

Median is calculated as per formula (4):

$$M_e = \begin{cases} \frac{x_{(\frac{n+1}{2})} + x_{(\frac{n}{2}+1)}}{2}; & \frac{N}{2} \neq INT \\ \frac{x_{(\frac{n+1}{2})}}{2}; & \frac{N}{2} = INT \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

and standard variance is calculated:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (X_i - \bar{x})^2}{N} \quad (5)$$

Kurtosis is calculated:

$$Kurt = \frac{\mu_4}{\sigma^4} \quad (6)$$

where μ_4 is fourth standardized moment calculated with model (7):

$$\mu_4 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (X_i - \bar{x})^2}{N} \tag{7}$$

while skewness is calculated as per model (8):

$$Skew = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (X_i - \bar{x})^3}{\sigma^3 * (N - 1)} \tag{8}$$

Correlation is presented by means of using Pearson correlation coefficient [21] and is calculated:

$$\rho_{x,y} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (X_i - \bar{x})(Y_i - \bar{y})}{\sigma_X * \sigma_Y} \tag{9}$$

where σ_x and σ_y are standard deviation of X and Y respectively. Therefore, correlation coefficient is calculated:

$$r = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i - n \bar{x} \bar{y}}{\sqrt{(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - n \bar{x}^2)(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2 - n \bar{y}^2)}} \tag{10}$$

Linear regression is presented with model (11):

$$y = a + b * x \tag{11}$$

where b is calculated:

$$b = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i - n \bar{x} \bar{y}}{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - n \bar{x}^2} \tag{12}$$

and a is calculated:

$$a = \bar{y} - b * \bar{x} \tag{13}$$

F-test is calculated as per model (14):

$$F = \frac{\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_2^2} \tag{14}$$

While T-test is used to compare mean values of different data groups as per model (15):

$$t = \frac{(\bar{x} - \mu)\sqrt{N}}{\sigma} \tag{15}$$

where μ is mean value of complete population.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is used to establish significant statistical difference between means from several samples and is calculated based on Šošić et al. [21], Tab. 1.

3 Analysis results

3.1 Ship operation modes distribution

The total distribution of hours spent in certain ship operation modes based on the total sum of hours is described in Tab. 2 and Fig. 1.

Table 2 Distribution of hours spent in individual ship operations modes 02/2020-08/2020 – M/V Vessel

| Ship's operations mode | Number of hours | % |
|------------------------|-----------------|--------|
| Sailing | 2871 | 62,1% |
| Anchorage | 362,28 | 7,8% |
| Manoeuvring/Port | 1391,92 | 30,1% |
| Total | 4625,2 | 100,0% |

Source: Authors




Figure 1 Distribution of hours spent in individual ship operations modes 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors

Table 1 Analysis of one-way ANOVA

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Squares (MS) | F |
|---------------------|--|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Within | $SS_w = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{j01}^l (X - \bar{X}_j)^2$ | $df_w = k - 1$ | $MS_w = \frac{SS_w}{df_w}$ | $F = \frac{MS_b}{MS_w}$ |
| Between | $SS_b = \sum_{j=1}^k (\bar{X}_j - \bar{X})^2$ | $df_b = n - k$ | $MS_b = \frac{SS_b}{df_b}$ | |
| Total | $SS_t = \sum_{j=1}^n (\bar{X}_j - \bar{X})^2$ | $df_t = n - 1$ | | |

Source: [21]

3.2 Analysis of the sludge separation from fuel during complete observation period

The observed sample was for 192 days, or 193 of total noon records. The total observed period was from 21.02.2020 to 31.8.2020. The total number of observations during this period were:

- 193 records of separator sludge tank soundings,
- 55 records of fluid transfer from purifier sludge tank,
- 414 records fuel consumption flowmeter readings and calculated fuel consumption for monitored previous period.

Records of fuel consumption flow meter status and calculated fuel consumption are boiled down to total of 193 regular intervals (noon to noon).

During mentioned period of 192-days there were total of 414 fuel flowmeter recordings in engine log book. This sample size would represent statistical dataset of 10 million entries with a 5% confidence interval. A 10 million fuel flowmeter logbook entries would represent the entire service life of a ship that is ranging from 18 -25 years as per Euronav [22].

The total number of purifier sludge tank quantity measurements is 192 performed during period of 193 days (avg. one measurement per day). This sample size, with 192 samples would adequately represent dataset of 347 samples with a 5% confidence interval, as per Sample Size Calculator [20].

The basic descriptive statistics analysis of aggregated input data for fuel consumption (HSHFO and LSMGO) and the separated sludge collected in the purifier sludge tank over observed period is shown in Tab. 3.

From the box plot (Fig. 2) it is visible that the HSHFO daily consumption value is scattered much wider than the daily consumption of LSMGO fuel. This can be explained that diesel fuel is used only in sulphur emission control areas and when entering ports where ship speeds are lower and consequently lower fuel consumption.




Figure 2 Box plot of averages, quartiles and max. daily fuel consumption over a complete period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors

Table 3 Basic descriptive statistical analysis of fuel consumption and separated sludge for the period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

| Sludge generation | | Fuel consumption HSHFO | | Fuel consumption LSMGO | | Total fuel consumption | |
|--------------------------|-------|--------------------------|--------|--------------------------|--------|--------------------------|--------|
| Mean | 0,143 | Mean | 12,493 | Mean | 2,877 | Mean | 15,370 |
| Standard Error | 0,009 | Standard Error | 0,635 | Standard Error | 0,243 | Standard Error | 0,490 |
| Median | 0,140 | Median | 16,500 | Median | 1,100 | Median | 18,100 |
| Mode | 0,140 | Mode | 0,000 | Mode | 0,600 | Mode | 20,000 |
| Standard Deviation | 0,119 | Standard Deviation | 8,828 | Standard Deviation | 3,375 | Standard Deviation | 6,814 |
| Sample Variance | 0,014 | Sample Variance | 77,926 | Sample Variance | 11,389 | Sample Variance | 46,425 |
| Kurtosis | 8,809 | Kurtosis | -1,328 | Kurtosis | 1,811 | Kurtosis | -0,636 |
| Skewness | 2,069 | Skewness | -0,284 | Skewness | 1,580 | Skewness | -0,361 |
| Range | 0,900 | Range | 37,150 | Range | 14,700 | Range | 37,000 |
| Minimum | -0,02 | Minimum | 0,000 | Minimum | 0,000 | Minimum | 1,550 |
| Maximum | 0,900 | Maximum | 37,150 | Maximum | 14,700 | Maximum | 38,550 |
| Sum | 27,6 | Sum | 2411,1 | Sum | 555,3 | Sum | 2966,4 |
| Count | 193 | Count | 193 | Count | 193 | Count | 193 |
| Largest (1) | 0,900 | Largest (1) | 37,15 | Largest (1) | 14,700 | Largest (1) | 38,550 |
| Smallest (1) | 0,000 | Smallest (1) | 0,000 | Smallest (1) | 0,000 | Smallest (1) | 1,550 |
| Confidence Level (95,0%) | 0,017 | Confidence Level (95,0%) | 1,253 | Confidence Level (95,0%) | 0,479 | Confidence Level (95,0%) | 0,967 |

Source: Authors




Figure 3 Histogram of the generated sludge per day from fuel by means of centrifugal separator during period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors




Figure 4 Distribution and cumulative frequency of the generated sludge per day from fuel by means of centrifugal separator during period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors

Minimum recorded value for separated sludge is -0.02 and was measured on 20.07.2020. Since in the mentioned period there were not any recorded content transfer operations to/from purifier sludge tank, we can attribute this reading as an error due to:

1. incorrectly performed sounding,
2. inability to accurately perform sounding due to ship operating conditions,
3. a decrease of sludge temperature in tank³,

4. an increase of sludge temperature in tank on level above water evaporation.

Therefore, for further analysis this value is increased to zero.

For the generated sludge per day histogram following calculation of the distribution classes is performed as per model (16) and data are distributed acc. to Tab. 4.

³ the temperature purifier sludge tank is not recorded in the engine room logbook

Table 4 Distribution of the separated sludge in m³ per day period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

| Bin | Frequency | Cumulative % |
|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| 0-0,11 | 38 | 19,69 |
| 0,11-0,23 | 4 | 21,76 |
| 0,23-0,34 | 120 | 83,94 |
| 0,34-0,45 | 19 | 93,78 |
| 0,45-0,56 | 8 | 97,93 |
| 0,56-0,68 | 3 | 99,48 |
| 0,68-0,79 | 0 | 99,48 |
| 0,79-0,90 | 0 | 99,48 |
| 0,9-... | 1 | 100,00 |

Source: Authors

Number of distribution classes for sludge generation/day for histogram is calculated by means of $2^k \geq n$ test where $n=193$ days and results are determined to be 8 and confirmed by model (16):

$$2^k = 2^8 = 256 \geq 193 \tag{16}$$

Therefore, the amount of sludge generation per day by means of centrifugal separator is presented in histogram (Fig. 3) and distribution diagram in Fig. 4.

In order to compare the separated sludge distribution (Fig. 3) to normal distribution, a zero hypothesis is set: “separated sludge frequency and the normal distribution are similar”. To test the differences of both distributions, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is used, and result is shown in Tab. 5.

Table 5 Calculated values for testing similarity of separated sludge with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test

| | |
|----------------------|---------------|
| Count | 193,000 |
| Mean | 0,143 |
| Stand. dev. | 0,119027571 |
| Maximum diff. | 0,3344 |

Source: Authors

Critical values are taken from the table of critical values [23], where for $n=193$, the limit value for $\alpha=0.05$ is calculated in (17).

$$Critical\ value = \frac{1,36}{\sqrt{n}} = 0,09789 \tag{17}$$

According to model (17), for 95% reliability is then confirmed that:

$$Maxium\ diff. > Critical\ value \tag{18}$$

and thus, it is confirmed that the values are not normally distributed, i.e. we reject the set hypothesis that the distribution of the separated sludge per day is based on normal distribution.

The overall dependence of the separated sludge from fuel in relation to total fuel consumption is analysed and the data dispersion is obtained where the data correlation is 0.2345 and is shown in Tab. 6.




Figure 5 Probability-Probability (P-P) plot of normal distribution cumulative frequency and sludge generation dataset cumulative frequency

Source: Authors




Figure 6 Dependence of the separated sludge to the total fuel consumption for the period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors

Table 6 Data correlation of the separated sludge in relation to the total fuel consumption for the period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Correlation

| | Sludge gen. | Cons. HSHFO | Cons. LSMGO | Total |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| Sludge gen. | 1,0000 | | | |
| Cons. HSHFO | 0,2949 | 1,0000 | | |
| Cons. LSMGO | -0,2979 | -0,7199 | 1,0000 | |
| Total | 0,2345 | 0,9390 | -0,4373 | 1,0000 |

Source: Authors

The dependence of separated sludge quantity to the total fuel consumption is described with linear regression formula (19):

$$y = 0,004x + 0,080 \tag{19}$$

where $R^2 = 0.055$. Calculated linear regression data are shown in Tab. 7.

In case of using logarithmic regression model (20):

$$y = 0,043 \ln(x) + 0,030 \tag{20}$$

where $R^2 = 0.049$. In the case of generating polynomial regression of the second order, and model (21) is obtained:

$$y = -0,00003x^2 + 0,004x + 0,076 \tag{21}$$

where $R^2 = 0.055$.

Table 7 Calculation of linear regression for generated sludge in relation to the total fuel consumption during the period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

| Regression Statistics | |
|------------------------------|----------|
| Multiple R | 0,2345 |
| R Square | 0,0550 |
| Adjusted R Square | 0,0500 |
| Standard Error | 0,1160 |
| Observations | 193,0000 |

| ANOVA | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------------|
| | <i>df</i> | <i>SS</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Signif. F</i> |
| Regression | 1,0000 | 0,1496 | 0,1496 | 11,1142 | 0,0010 |
| Residual | 191,0000 | 2,5706 | 0,0135 | | |
| Total | 192,0000 | 2,7202 | | | |

| | <i>Coeff's</i> | <i>Standard Error</i> | <i>t Stat</i> | <i>P-value</i> | <i>Lower 95%</i> | <i>Upper 95%</i> | <i>Lower 95,0%</i> | <i>Upper 95,0%</i> |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Intercept | 0,0802 | 0,0207 | 3,8836 | 0,0001 | 0,0395 | 0,1209 | 0,0395 | 0,1209 |
| Total fuel cons. | 0,0041 | 0,0012 | 3,3338 | 0,0010 | 0,0017 | 0,0065 | 0,0017 | 0,0065 |

Source: Authors

3.3 Analysis of the sludge separation from fuel during different ship operations modes

Due to the possibility ship operation mode influence on the amount of separated sludge from the fuel, we observe it in relation to different ship operations.

During the total period of 192 days, according to the distribution in Tab.1., total of 105 full days ship was employed in navigation. During this period, in case of 80 days the amount of separated sludge from the fuel was 0.14 m³/day.

During the ship stay on anchorage, through 14 full days, 8 full days the production of separated sludge were 0 m³/day. The amount of separated sludge during manoeuvring and relocation in ports has two maximums of 0.14 m³/day and 0 m³/day respectively.

3.3.1 Analysis of the sludge separation from fuel during navigation

The basic descriptive statistics analysis of aggregated input data for fuel consumption (HSHFO and LSMGO) and the separated sludge collected in the purifier sludge tank during 105 full days while ship was employed in navigation is shown in Tab. 8.

The dispersion of the fuel consumption values during the navigational period should be lower than during entire observed period. Obtained values for the minimum and maximum (indicated with grey colour in Tab. 8) represent

single dataset of the observed variable and they significantly stand out from other values, which are more grouped. By comparing that dataset with M/V Vessel machinery plant technical details (i.e. main engine power, specific fuel consumption) obtained minimum and maximum values are found to be “technically impossible”. Therefore, further analysis is performed by examining the engine logbook extract [19] and is confirmed that the maximum value for fuel consumption figure (37,150) is obtained during observed period of 46.8 hours, which does not correspond to the 1-day methodology taken. Moreover, the fuel consumption minimum value (1,450) corresponds to fuel consumption measured during period of 1.2 hours, which does not correspond to the research methodology taken. In this case, these two parameters are rejected from observation/calculation to have accurate data which corresponds to the chosen methodology. Furthermore, the inaccuracy of the values is confirmed by the G-test (22):

$$Q_{calc} = \frac{|37,15 - 20,7|}{(37,15 - 0)} = 0,443 \quad (22)$$

The number of samples in model (22) was taken 105, and accordingly is calculated $Q_{calc} > Q_{crit}$ we can reject accuracy and define that the value of consumption of 37,15 mt/day is an error. In that case, by rejecting values, new descriptive statistics calculations with the base of 103 samples is performed and shown in Tab. 9.

Table 8 Basic descriptive statistical analysis of fuel consumption and separated sludge during navigation for period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

| | Sludge generation | Fuel Cons. HSHFO | Fuel Cons. LSMGO | Fuel Cons. Total |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Mean | 0,172 | 19,453 | 1,027 | 20,480 |
| Standard Error | 0,011 | 0,349 | 0,171 | 0,305 |
| Median | 0,140 | 20,100 | 0,600 | 20,800 |
| Mode | 0,140 | 20,000 | 0,600 | 20,000 |
| Standard Deviation | 0,109 | 3,574 | 1,753 | 3,121 |
| Sample Variance | 0,012 | 12,776 | 3,072 | 9,742 |
| Kurtosis | 19,198 | 12,082 | 26,281 | 22,476 |
| Skewness | 3,574 | -0,746 | 4,886 | -0,359 |
| Range | 0,900 | 35,700 | 12,900 | 37,000 |
| Minimum | 0,000 | 1,450 | 0,000 | 1,550 |
| Maximum | 0,900 | 37,150 | 12,900 | 38,550 |
| Sum | 18,080 | 2042,600 | 107,800 | 2150,400 |
| Count | 105,000 | 105,000 | 105,000 | 105,000 |
| Largest (1) | 0,900 | 37,150 | 12,900 | 38,550 |
| Smallest (1) | 0,000 | 1,450 | 0,000 | 1,550 |
| Confidence Level (95,0%) | 0,021 | 0,692 | 0,339 | 0,604 |

Table 9 Revised descriptive statistical analysis of fuel consumption and separated sludge during navigation for period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

| | Sludge generation | Fuel Cons. HSHFO | Fuel Cons. MGO | Fuel Cons. Total |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Mean | 0,173 | 19,456 | 1,032 | 20,488 |
| Standard Error | 0,011 | 0,257 | 0,174 | 0,177 |
| Median | 0,140 | 20,100 | 0,600 | 20,800 |
| Mode | 0,140 | 20,000 | 0,600 | 20,000 |
| Standard Deviation | 0,110 | 2,604 | 1,767 | 1,794 |
| Sample Variance | 0,012 | 6,778 | 3,123 | 3,218 |
| Kurtosis | 18,853 | 5,960 | 25,866 | 0,078 |
| Skewness | 3,539 | -1,806 | 4,855 | -0,414 |
| Range | 0,900 | 17,200 | 12,900 | 8,900 |
| Minimum | 0,000 | 6,700 | 0,000 | 15,800 |
| Maximum | 0,900 | 23,900 | 12,900 | 24,700 |
| Sum | 17,840 | 2004,000 | 106,300 | 2110,300 |
| Count | 103,000 | 103,000 | 103,000 | 103,000 |
| Largest (1) | 0,900 | 23,900 | 12,900 | 24,700 |
| Smallest (1) | 0,000 | 6,700 | 0,000 | 15,800 |
| Confidence Level (95,0%) | 0,022 | 0,509 | 0,345 | 0,351 |

Source: Authors

Number of distribution classes for sludge generation/day for histogram during navigation is found to be 7 and is determined by a $2^k \geq n$ test, where $n = 105$ days and therefore reads:

$$2^k = 2^7 = 128 \geq 104 \quad (23)$$

Therefore, the amount of sludge generation per day during navigation is presented in histogram (Fig. 6) and distribution diagram (Fig. 7):

The overall dependence of the generated sludge quantity in relation to the total fuel consumption during navigation period, is shown in Fig. 8, where the data correlation is 0.0635 (Tab. 10), which is significantly less than when observing entire 192-day period.




Figure 7 Histogram of the generated sludge per day from fuel during navigation during period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors




Figure 8 Distribution of the generated sludge per day from fuel during navigation during period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors




Figure 9 Dependence of the separated sludge to the total fuel consumption during navigation in period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors

Table 10 Data correlation of the separated sludge in relation to the total fuel consumption during navigation in period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Correlation

| | Sludge gen. | Cons. HSHFO | Cons. LSMGO | Total |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| Sludge gen. | 1,0000 | | | |
| Cons. HSHFO | 0,1380 | 1,0000 | | |
| Cons. LSMGO | -0,1387 | -0,7263 | 1,0000 | |
| Total | 0,0635 | 0,7359 | -0,0690 | 1,0000 |

Source: Authors

From Tab. 10. is evident that the correlation between total fuel consumption during navigation and the sludge extraction from fuel is 0,063, which is less than when observing the entire period correlation of 0,23. The correlation between heavy fuel consumption and the separated sludge from fuel during the navigational period is 0,138, which is significantly lower than the observed correlation over the entire period of 0,29.

The dependence of separated sludge quantity to the total fuel consumption during navigation is described with linear regression formula (24):

$$y = 0,0039x + 0,0933 \tag{24}$$

where $R^2 = 0,0040$. Calculated linear regression data are shown in Tab. 11.

Table 11 Calculation of linear regression for generated sludge in relation to the total fuel consumption during navigation in period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

| Regression Statistics | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------------|--|--|
| Multiple R | 0,0635 | | | | | | |
| R Square | 0,0040 | | | | | | |
| Adjusted R Square | -0,0058 | | | | | | |
| Standard Error | 0,1104 | | | | | | |
| Observations | 103,0000 | | | | | | |
| ANOVA | | | | | | | |
| | <i>df</i> | <i>SS</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Signif. F</i> | | |
| Regression | 1,0000 | 0,0050 | 0,0050 | 0,4095 | 0,5237 | | |
| Residual | 101,0000 | 1,2307 | 0,0122 | | | | |
| Total | 102,0000 | 1,2356 | | | | | |

| | <i>Coeff's</i> | <i>Standard Error</i> | <i>t Stat</i> | <i>P-value</i> | <i>Lower 95%</i> | <i>Upper 95%</i> | <i>Lower 95,0%</i> | <i>Upper 95,0%</i> |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Intercept | 0,0933 | 0,1253 | 0,7448 | 0,4581 | -0,1552 | 0,3419 | -0,1552 | 0,3419 |
| Total fuel cons. | 0,0039 | 0,0061 | 0,6399 | 0,5237 | -0,0082 | 0,0160 | -0,0082 | 0,0160 |

Source: Authors

In case of using logarithmic regression, model (25) is generated:

$$y = 0,0737 \ln(x) - 0,0492 \tag{25}$$

where $R^2 = 0.0036$.

In the case of generating polynomial regression of the second order, model (26) is generated:

$$y = 0,011x^2 - 0,0423x + 0,554 \tag{26}$$

where $R^2 = 0.0061$.

In the case of generating polynomial regression of the 4th order, model (27) is generated:

$$y = -0,0001x^4 + 0,0078x^3 - 0,2065x^2 + 2,3329x - 9,2796 \tag{27}$$

where $R^2 = 0.0146$.

3.3.2 Analysis of the sludge separation from fuel during ship's anchorage stay

The basic descriptive statistics analysis of aggregated input data for fuel consumption (HSHFO and LSMGO) and

Table 12 Basic descriptive statistical analysis of fuel consumption and separated sludge during the ship's anchorage stay for the period 02/2020-08/2020

| | Sludge generation | Fuel Cons. HSHFO | Fuel Cons. MGO | Fuel Cons. Total |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Mean | 0,0686 | 1,2643 | 3,3643 | 4,6286 |
| Standard Error | 0,0241 | 0,4157 | 0,3866 | 0,2819 |
| Median | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 3,8000 | 4,3500 |
| Mode | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 4,0000 | 4,0000 |
| Standard Deviation | 0,0900 | 1,5554 | 1,4467 | 1,0548 |
| Sample Variance | 0,0081 | 2,4194 | 2,0929 | 1,1126 |
| Kurtosis | 0,4177 | -1,5849 | -0,4225 | 4,8900 |
| Skewness | 1,0411 | 0,5290 | 0,2183 | 2,2503 |
| Range | 0,2800 | 4,1000 | 4,7500 | 4,0000 |
| Minimum | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 1,6000 | 3,6000 |
| Maximum | 0,2800 | 4,1000 | 6,3500 | 7,6000 |
| Sum | 0,9600 | 17,7000 | 47,1000 | 64,8000 |
| Count | 14,0000 | 14,0000 | 14,0000 | 14,0000 |
| Largest (1) | 0,2800 | 4,1000 | 6,3500 | 7,6000 |
| Smallest (1) | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 1,6000 | 3,6000 |
| Confidence Level (95,0%) | 0,0520 | 0,8981 | 0,8353 | 0,6090 |

Source: Authors




Figure 10 Histogram of the generated sludge per day from fuel during anchorage stay for period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors




Figure 11 Distribution of the generated sludge per day from fuel during anchorage stay for 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors

the separated sludge collected in the separator sludge tank during 14 full days while ship was at anchorage is shown in Tab. 12.

For the calculation of distribution classes number for sludge generation/full day for histogram generation is determined by a $2^k \geq n$ test (28), where $n=14$ days and therefore reads:

$$2^k = 2^4 = 16 \geq 14 \quad (28)$$

Accordingly, the class size is determined to be 0.07.

The overall dependence of the generated sludge quantity in relation to the total fuel consumption during anchorage stay, is shown in Fig. 11, where the data correlation is 0.0993 (Tab. 13), which is significantly less than when observing entire 192-day period (0,2345).

Table 13 Data correlation of the separated sludge in relation to the total fuel consumption during anchorage stay for period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Correlation

| | Sludge gen. | Cons. HSHFO | Cons. LSMGO | Total |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| Sludge gen. | 1,0000 | | | |
| Cons. HSHFO | 0,2342 | 1,0000 | | |
| Cons. LSMGO | -0,1794 | -0,7554 | 1,0000 | |
| Total | 0,0993 | 0,4386 | 0,2576 | 1,0000 |

Source: Authors




Figure 12 Dependence of the separated sludge to the total fuel consumption during anchorage stay for period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors

The correlation between heavy fuel consumption and the sludge generation from fuel during the anchorage stay is 0,2342, which is lower than observed correlation over the entire period of 0,29.

The regression formula for linear regression in this case is (29):

$$y = 0,0085x + 0,0293 \tag{29}$$

where $R^2 = 0,0099$. Calculated linear regression data are shown in Tab. 14.

In case of using logarithmic regression, a model (30) is obtained.

$$y = 0,0526 \ln(x) - 0,0111 \tag{30}$$

where $R^2 = 0.0128$.

In the case of generating polynomial regression of second order, model (31) is generated where $R^2 = 0.0177$.

$$y = 0,0078x^2 + 0,0971x - 0,2045 \tag{31}$$

In the case of generating polynomial regression of the third order, model (32) is generated where $R^2 = 0.187$.

$$y = 0,0282x^3 - 0,473x^2 + 2,5688x - 4,4585 \tag{32}$$

Table 14 Calculation of linear regression for generated sludge in relation to the total fuel consumption during anchorage stay for period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

| Regression Statistics | |
|-----------------------|---------|
| Multiple R | 0,0993 |
| R Square | 0,0099 |
| Adjusted R Square | -0,0727 |
| Standard Error | 0,0932 |
| Observations | 14,0000 |

| ANOVA | | | | | |
|------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | df | SS | MS | F | Signif. F |
| Regression | 1,0000 | 0,0010 | 0,0010 | 0,1195 | 0,7356 |
| Residual | 12,0000 | 0,1043 | 0,0087 | | |
| Total | 13,0000 | 0,1054 | | | |

| | Coeff's | Standard Error | t Stat | P-value | Lower 95% | Upper 95% | Lower 95,0% | Upper 95,0% |
|------------------|---------|----------------|--------|---------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Intercept | 0,0293 | 0,1162 | 0,2526 | 0,8049 | -0,2238 | 0,2825 | -0,2238 | 0,2825 |
| Total fuel cons. | 0,0085 | 0,0245 | 0,3456 | 0,7356 | -0,0449 | 0,0619 | -0,0449 | 0,0619 |

Source: Authors

3.3.3 Analysis of the sludge separation from fuel during mixed operations

Mixed ship operations in this view includes all operations for 24 hours periods (day) on whom vessel was not only in navigation or only at anchorage stay. In this group are the days spent during the port stay, manoeuvring, relocation, etc.

The basic descriptive statistics analysis of aggregated input data for fuel consumption (HSHFO and LSMGO) and the separated sludge collected in the purifier sludge tank

during 74 full days while ship was under mixed operations is shown in Tab. 15.

Distribution of generated quantity of sludge per days for the vessel operating in mixed operations in presented in Fig. 13. The number of histogram classes is 7 and is determined by a $2^k \geq n$ test where it is $n = 74$ days, and therefore it reads:

$$2^k = 2^7 = 128 \geq 74 \tag{33}$$

Distribution of histogram cumulative functions shown in Fig. 14 layout.

Table 15 Basic descriptive statistical analysis of fuel consumption and separated sludge during the ship operating in mixed operations for the period 02/2020-08/2020

| | Sludge generation | Fuel Cons. HSHFO | Fuel Cons. MGO | Fuel Cons. Total |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Mean | 0,1161 | 4,7405 | 5,4111 | 10,1516 |
| Standard Error | 0,0146 | 0,6528 | 0,4307 | 0,5294 |
| Median | 0,1400 | 3,1100 | 4,9250 | 10,3500 |
| Mode | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 1,3000 | 15,4000 |
| Standard Deviation | 0,1257 | 5,6158 | 3,7048 | 4,5537 |
| Sample Variance | 0,0158 | 31,5374 | 13,7258 | 20,7362 |
| Kurtosis | 1,7459 | -0,2269 | -0,3083 | -0,9237 |
| Skewness | 1,3674 | 0,9546 | 0,6722 | 0,2838 |
| Range | 0,4900 | 19,1500 | 14,7000 | 17,5000 |
| Minimum | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 2,3000 |
| Maximum | 0,4900 | 19,1500 | 14,7000 | 19,8000 |
| Sum | 8,5900 | 350,8000 | 400,4200 | 751,2200 |
| Count | 74,0000 | 74,0000 | 74,0000 | 74,0000 |
| Largest (1) | 0,4900 | 19,1500 | 14,7000 | 19,8000 |
| Smallest (1) | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 0,0000 | 2,3000 |
| Confidence Level (95,0%) | 0,0291 | 1,3011 | 0,8583 | 1,0550 |

Source: Authors




Figure 13 Histogram of the generated sludge per day from fuel during mixed operations for period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors




Figure 14 Distribution of the generated sludge per day from fuel during mixed operations for 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors

Table 16 Data correlation of the separated sludge in relation to the total fuel consumption during mixed operations for period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Correlation

| | Sludge gen. | Cons. HSHFO | Cons. LSMGO | Total |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| Sludge gen. | 1,0000 | | | |
| Cons. HSHFO | 0,1269 | 1,0000 | | |
| Cons. LSMGO | -0,2567 | -0,5894 | 1,0000 | |
| Total | -0,0523 | 0,7537 | 0,0867 | 1,0000 |

Source: Authors

The overall dependence of the generated sludge quantity in relation to the total fuel consumption during mixed vessel operations, is shown in Fig. 14, where the data correlation is -0.0523 (Tab. 16).

The regression formula of linear regression in this case is:

$$y = 0,0014x + 0,1307 \tag{34}$$

where $R^2 = 0.0027$. Values for linear regression are specified in Tab. 17.




Figure 15 Dependence of the separated sludge to the total fuel consumption during mixed vessel operations for period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

Source: Authors

Table 17 Calculation of linear regression for generated sludge in relation to the total fuel consumption during mixed operations for period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

| Regression Statistics | |
|-----------------------|---------|
| Multiple R | 0,0523 |
| R Square | 0,0027 |
| Adjusted R Square | -0,0111 |
| Standard Error | 0,1264 |
| Observations | 74,0000 |

| ANOVA | | | | | |
|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------------|
| | <i>df</i> | <i>SS</i> | <i>MS</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>Signif. F</i> |
| Regression | 1,0000 | 0,0031 | 0,0031 | 0,1972 | 0,6583 |
| Residual | 72,0000 | 1,1498 | 0,0160 | | |
| Total | 73,0000 | 1,1530 | | | |

| | <i>Coeff's</i> | <i>Standard Error</i> | <i>t Stat</i> | <i>P-value</i> | <i>Lower 95%</i> | <i>Upper 95%</i> | <i>Lower 95,0%</i> | <i>Upper 95,0%</i> |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Intercept | 0,1307 | 0,0361 | 3,6214 | 0,0005 | 0,0588 | 0,2027 | 0,0588 | 0,2027 |
| Total fuel cons. | -0,0014 | 0,0032 | -0,4441 | 0,6583 | -0,0079 | 0,0050 | -0,0079 | 0,0050 |

Source: Authors

Therefore, in case of using logarithmic regression, a model (35) is obtained, where $R^2 = 0.0028$.

$$y = 0,013 \ln(x) - 0,1456 \tag{35}$$

In the case of generating polynomial regression of the second order a model (36) is obtained where $R^2 = 0.0051$.

$$y = 0,003x^2 - 0,079x - 0,1593 \tag{36}$$

In case of using polynomial regression of the fourth order a model (37) is obtained where is $R^2 = 0,0146$.

$$y = 0,0005x^4 + 0,0012x^3 - 0,0197x^2 + 0,1242x - 0,1303 \tag{37}$$

Further comparison is made by dividing mixed ship operations that lasts one day (also 23-25 hours) into different specific operational profile as:

- The combination of navigation and vessel anchorage stay,
- The combination of navigation and vessel port stay,
- The combination of vessel anchorage stays and port stay,
- The combination of navigation, anchorage stay and port stay.

Different distributions of separated sludge quantities per day are generated and presented in Fig. 16 and Fig. 17.




Figure 16 Distribution of separated fuel quantity from fuel per day during mixed operation different specific operational profile for the period 02/2020 -08/2020

Source: Authors




Figure 17 Distribution of separated fuel quantity from fuel per day during mixed operation different specific operational profile for the period 02/2020 -08/2020

Source: Authors

4 Hypotheses testing

4.1 Testing the difference in the separated sludge quantity from fuel in different ship's operation modes by means of T-test using an F-test

As the distribution of the separated sludge quantity per day from the fuel is not distributed acc. normal distribution, as previously proven by the formula (3). For proper testing of hypothesis whenever there is significant difference in separated quantity during different vessel operations a T-test with using of F-test is performed. In this case, the hypothesis is examined, whether there are differences in the separated sludge per day during navigation in comparison with mixed operations.

Set hypothesis are:

- Zero hypothesis (H_0): There is no strong statistical evidence that difference in separated sludge from fuel per day during navigation operations and during mixed operations is significant
- Alternative hypothesis (H_1): The resulting differences in the amount of separated sludge from fuel per day during navigation operations and per day in mixed operations are statistically significant.

With a T-test, testing of the significance of the difference between arithmetic means is performed. Considering that there are two different data sets available, first approach is to perform the variance test with an F-test where result are presented in (38) which is calculated as per model (14).

$$p = 0,215 \Rightarrow p > 0,05 \tag{38}$$

Therefore, with a reliability of more than 95%, it is accepted assumption that the samples have approximately equal variances and thereby a one-way homoscedastic T-

test is further performed. The result obtained is indicated in the formula (39).⁴

$$p = 0,00079 \Rightarrow p < 0,01 \tag{39}$$

In case of using a two-way T-test the result is presented in model (40).

$$p = 0,00158 \Rightarrow p < 0,01 \tag{40}$$

Accordingly, with a level of significance $p < 0.01$ (i.e. with an accuracy of 99%) we can conclude that there is a significant statistical difference in the amount of separated sludge from the fuel per day during the navigational period versus during mixed ship operations. Therefore, alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted.

4.2 Testing of the differences in the amount of separated sludge in different ship operation modes by analysing variance with ANOVA test

4.2.1 Testing of the amount of separated sludge from fuel in relation to ship operation modes by single-factor analysis of variance

During different ship operations (in the case three data sets – navigation, anchorage, mixed operations) there are different sizes of data sets. By means of single-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA test) we are testing if there is a significant difference in arithmetic means? The data sets are grouped as mentioned before, according to the different ship operations mentioned in Tab. 2.

⁴ Homoscedastic T-test – defined as a type 2 T-test with the existence of approximately equal variance

Table 18 Calculated single-factor ANOVA test for separated sludge quantity during different ship operations for the period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

| SUMMARY | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Groups | Count | Sum | Average | Variance | | |
| Navigation | 103 | 17,84 | 0,173203883 | 0,012114144 | | |
| Maneuvering/Port (Mix Oper.) | 74 | 8,59 | 0,116081081 | 0,015794021 | | |
| Anchorage | 14 | 0,96 | 0,068571429 | 0,008105495 | | |
| ANOVA | | | | | | |
| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F | P-value | F crit |
| Between Groups | 0,225110298 | 2 | 0,112555149 | 8,484586012 | 0,000296561 | 3,043979683 |
| Within Groups | 2,493977661 | 188 | 0,013265839 | | | |
| Total | 2,719087958 | 190 | | | | |

Source: Authors

Calculation presented in Tab. 18, a P-value is established and according to the formula (41) we get:

$$p = 0,0002965 \Rightarrow p < 0,01 \quad (41)$$

Therefore, it can be concluded, with 99% accuracy, that there is present a statistically significant difference between the arithmetic means of the observed samples of the separated sludge quantity from fuel per day during various ship operations.

4.2.2 Testing the amount and type of consumed fuel in relation to ship operation modes by multi-factor analysis of variance

Considering that different type of fuel is consumed during different ship's operations, a multi-factor analysis of variance is performed to compare the impact of ship's operations mode (navigation and mixed operations) on the consumed fuel type quantity, as shown in Tab. 19.

Table 19 Calculated multi-factor ANOVA test to compare the impact of quantities and types of consumed fuel in relation to different types of ship operations for the period 02/2020 – 08/2020 – M/V Vessel

| SUMMARY | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|----------|----------------|---------------|
| Navigation | Fuel consumption HSHFO | Fuel consumption LSMGO | Total | | | |
| Count | 74 | 74 | 148 | | | |
| Sum | 1451 | 64,55 | 1515,55 | | | |
| Average | 19,60811 | 0,872297 | 10,2402 | | | |
| Variance | 4,583906 | 1,491996 | 91,37193 | | | |
| Maneuvering/Port (Mix Oper.) | | | | | | |
| Count | 74 | 74 | 148 | | | |
| Sum | 350,8 | 400,42 | 751,22 | | | |
| Average | 4,740541 | 5,411081 | 5,075811 | | | |
| Variance | 31,53743 | 13,72577 | 22,59081 | | | |
| Total | | | | | | |
| Count | 148 | 148 | | | | |
| Sum | 1801,8 | 464,97 | | | | |
| Average | 12,17432 | 3,141689 | | | | |
| Variance | 73,57487 | 12,74229 | | | | |
| ANOVA | | | | | | |
| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F | P-value | F crit |
| Sample | 1973,65 | 1 | 1973,65 | 153,7736 | 1,18E-28 | 3,873502 |
| Columns | 6037,549 | 1 | 6037,549 | 470,4056 | 8,31E-63 | 3,873502 |
| Interaction | 6967,22 | 1 | 6967,22 | 542,8393 | 1,42E-68 | 3,873502 |
| Within | 3747,754 | 292 | 12,83477 | | | |
| Total | 18726,17 | 295 | | | | |

Source: Authors

To properly compare the impact of the consumed fuel quantity during different ship operation modes, each data-set size is reduced to the same number of samples which in this case is the 74. For the test purpose, three different hypotheses are set so that multi-factor ANOVA test can be performed:

- Hypothesis H_1 : Is there a significant impact of the type of ship's operation mode on the fuel quantity consumed (ignoring the fuel type in use),
- Hypothesis H_2 : Is there a significant impact of the fuel type on the fuel quantity consumed (ignoring the type of ship's operation mode),
- Hypothesis H_3 : Is there a statistically significant influence between the type of ship's operation modes (navigation or mixed operation) and the fuel type consumed when influencing the fuel quantity consumed.

Calculated p-values, presented in Tab. 19 and based on set hypothesis, following conclusions were drawn out:

- Hypothesis H_1 : P-value related to the impact of ship's operation mode type on fuel quantity consumed is 1.18×10^{-28} . Therefore, with a probability of >95%, it's confirmed that there is statistical significance on influence of ship's operation mode on the consumed fuel quantity (ignoring the type of fuel consumed). This claim can be supported by the fact that mixed ship operations represent fuel consumption while the ship was in port and/or anchorage, where the main engine was mainly stopped. Based on descriptive statistical analysis arithmetic means of the consumed fuel quantity during navigation is 10.24 mt/day, while for mixed operations is 5.07 mt/day.
- Hypothesis H_2 : the calculated p-value is 8.31×10^{-63} , which confirms the hypothesis that with a probability >95%, there is present statistically significant influence of the fuel type in use on the amount of fuel consumed. This claim can be supported by the fact that LSMGO fuel is mainly consumed in port areas where fuel consumption is lower. The average consumption of HSHFO fuel is 12.17 mt/day while the consumption of LSMGO is 3.14 mt/day.
- Hypothesis H_3 : the calculated p-value is 1.42×10^{-68} , and therefore confirms hypothesis, with a probability > 95%, that there is a significant statistical interaction between the fuel type consumed and ship operation modes on fuel quantity consumed. During navigation operations, the average consumption of HSHFO is 19.6 mt/day while LSMGO is 0.87 mt/day. During mixed operations, the average consumption of HSHFO is 4.74 mt/day while the LSMGO is 5.41 mt/day.

5 Discussion

Basic analysis of the ship operation modes shows that the ship spent 62.1% of the time in navigation, 7.8% of the time at the anchorage and 30.1% of the time in mixed operations consisting of port stay, manoeuvring, relocating,

and anchorage stay. This is different from VLCC operation mode time distribution presented by Iordanidis et al. [16], where 70.2% of the time vessel spend in navigation. However, distribution of operational modes greatly depends of vessel type and area of vessel employment. Paper by Iordanidis et al. had review operational modes of a very large crude carrier (VLCC) while in this paper a product/chemical tanker has been monitored.

By means of basic descriptive statistics analysis several values has been calculated for separated sludge from fuel, heavy fuel consumption (HSHFO) and diesel fuel consumption (LSMGO) during entire observed period. Values for fuel consumption quantities and the separated sludge quantities were found dispersed in amounts from 0 mt/day to 0.9 mt/day for separated sludge quantity, from 0 mt/day to 23,9 mt/day for HSHFO consumption and from 0 mt/day to 12.9 mt/day for the LSMGO consumption. Therefore, it was calculated that on average 0.8% of fuel quantity has been removed from fuel during navigation. This quantity has to be deducted from bunkered fuel quantity if vessel generated emission from vessel is calculated using a "Top-Down" method. Separated components from fuel during anchor stay represents on average 1.2% of consumed fuel, while during mixed operations represent on average 1.0% of consumed fuel. Correlation between separated sludge and total fuel consumption is found to be 0.234, however it greatly varies when compares to different vessel operation modes (e.g. 0.099 during anchorage, 0.063 during navigation). Separated sludge figures present significant difference from the findings in Dujmović et al. [9], where during steaming was identified 0.15% and 0.26% of separated components from consumed quantity of fuel. However, the percentage of 0.8% to 1.2% are in line with guidelines from International Maritime Organization [24]. Correlation between separated sludge from fuel and consumed HFO quantity during complete period is found to be low, 0.23. This is mainly due to scattered quantities of both, fuel consumption quantity as well of separated sludge quantity. By testing those date by means of using different regression models, a very low R square values are obtained (from 0.0027 to 0.187) which is direct consequence of data scattering. Based on that it can be concluded that separated sludge form fuel is not directly influenced by consumed fuel quantity and another influencing factor should be investigated. This might present further research area in this field.

The resulting distribution of the separated sludge quantity per day during complete period is not normally distributed that is confirmed with Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. However, it is confirmed that quantity of separated components from fuel rise as total fuel consumption falls, that is confirmed also by means of one-way ANOVA test.

By means multifactorial variance analysis a several hypotheses were tested and confirmed with reliability of 95%; that there is present statistical significance impact of ship's operations type on total fuel quantity consumed. Furthermore, it was found statistical influence of fuel type

in use on the fuel quantity consumed and influence of ship's operation mode on the type and quantity of fuel consumed. This finding corresponds to the fact that during port stay and anchorage fuel with lower sulphur content (LSMGO as recorded in Engine Log Book) is consumed to meet emission requirements. During navigation at open sea or outside special emission areas another type of fuel is used (HSHFO as recorded in Engine Log Book).

Main objective of paper is to present statistical quantitative analysis of consumed fuel and generated in real operating environment of product/chemical tanker example. It also presents quantitative analysis of separated components from fuel based on ship operation mode and fuel type in use. The values obtained for these can be used for more accurate emission estimation/calculation while using "Top-Down" method. Methodology used is adapted to appropriate use of data recorded in Engine Logbook and Daily Sounding Logs onboard a ship. This kind of analysis also represents potential approach to use daily recorded data from vessel crew.

Future research in this field would dismember fuel consumption according particular machinery/equipment. This would present additional view on distribution of consumed fuel and its usage during different operation modes. Potential further research area is to include further analyse of fuel stability and its influence on separated sludge quantity from long time storage.

6 Conclusion

A quantitative analysis of fuel consumption and sludge generation from fuel by means of centrifugal separation is performed based on engine logbook extracts for 29991 GT chemical/product tanker for period 22.02.2020 – 31.08.2020. Analysis is performed and adjusted based on technical characteristics of the ship's propulsion and auxiliary systems. Variables extracted from the engine logbook machine are: date and time of readings, ship operation type, level increase in fuel separator sludge and the consumption of each particular type of fuel for each individual fuel consumer since last recordings. Some of logbook records are recorded for different time duration and therefore are brought down to a time frame of one day regardless of its time duration. To accurately calculate the separated sludge level increase fuel separator sludge tank, the amount of separator process water consumed was subtracted from generated level based on the operational process parameters for fuel separator.

Basic analysis of the ship operation modes shows that the ship spent 62.1% of the time in navigation, 7.8% of the time at the anchorage and 30.1% of the time in mixed operations consisting of port stay, manoeuvring, relocating, and anchorage stay that lasted less than a one day.

Basic analysis obtains results of average values, minimums, maximums, standard deviations, and variations, median and mode, standard errors for separated sludge from

fuel, heavy fuel consumption (HSHFO) and diesel fuel consumption (LSMGO) during entire observed period. Values for fuel consumption quantities and the separated sludge quantities were found dispersed in amounts from 0 mt/day to 0.9 mt/day for separated sludge quantity, from 0 mt/day to 20.9 mt/day for HSHFO consumption and from 0 mt/day to 12.9 mt/day for the LSMGO consumption. An average 0.8% of fuel quantity has been removed from fuel during navigation Separated components from fuel during anchor stay represents on average 1.2% of consumed fuel, while during mixed operations represent on average 1.0% of consumed fuel. The resulting distribution of the separated sludge quantity per day during complete period is not normally distributed that is confirmed with Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. However, it is confirmed that quantity of separated components from fuel rise as total fuel consumption falls

Further correlation analysis between the separated sludge quantity and fuel consumption of different types shows that correlates with the HSHFO consumption with a factor of 0.29 while with the LSMGO consumption with -0.29. The quantity of separated sludge in correlation to total fuel consumption is further expressed with different regression models; linear, logarithmic, and polynomial where R^2 ranges from 0.049 to 0.055. Low R^2 is a result of large data dispersal. This kind of analysis is performed for each type of ship operations: during the navigation, ship's anchorage stays and during mixed ship operation mode.

By means of F-test with a reliability of 99% it is concluded that there is a significant statistical difference in the separated sludge quantity from the fuel between navigational period and mixed operations. By means of one-way ANOVA test, with 99% reliability is proven statistically significant difference in the arithmetic means of separated sludge from fuel during various ship operations.

Funding: The research presented in the manuscript did not receive any external funding.

Author Contributions: Research, Josip Dujmović; Writing, Josip Dujmović; Analysis, Josip Dujmović; Review and editing, Rikard Miculinić; Super visioning, Rikard Miculinić; Verification, Josip Dujmović.

References

- [1] Knežević, V., Radonja, R., Dundović, Č. (2018). Emission Inventory of Marine Traffic for the Port of Zadar. *Pomorstvo*, 32 (2). pp. 239-244. <https://doi.org/10.31217/p.32.2.9>.
- [2] Endresen, Ø., Bakke, J., Sørgård, E., Berglen T.F., Holmvang, P. (2005). Improved modelling of ship SO₂ emissions-a fuel-based approach. *Atmospheric Environment*, 39 (20). pp. 3621-3628. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2005.02.041>.
- [3] Olivier, J. G. J., Van Aardenne, J.A., Dentener, F.J., Pagliari, V., Ganzeveld, L.N., Peters, J.A.H.W. (2005). Recent Trends in Global Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Regional Trends 1970–2000 and Spatial Distribution of Key Sources in 2000. *Environmental Sciences*, 2 (2-3). pp. 81–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15693430500400345>.

- [4] Corbett, J.J., Fishbeck, P.S., Pandis, S.N. (1999). Global Nitrogen and sulfur inventories for oceangoing ships. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 104 (D3). pp. 3457-3470. doi:10.1029/1998JD100040.
- [5] Cullinane, K., Tseng, P.H., Wilmsmeier, G. (2013). Estimation of container ship emissions at berth in Taiwan. *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation*, 10 (5). pp. 466-474. DOI: 10.1080/15568318.2014.975303.
- [6] Zakić, A., Ivče, R., Radonja, R. (2022). Emission Inventory of Ships at the Port of Dubrovnik. *The International Journal on Marine Navigation and Safety of Sea Transportation*, 16 (2). pp. 219-223. DOI: 10.12716/1001.16.02.03.
- [7] Radonja, R., Ivče, R., Zekić, A., Catela, L. (2020). Emission Inventory of Marine Traffic for the Port of Rijeka. *Pomorstvo*, 34 (2). pp. 387-395. <https://doi.org/10.31217/p.34.2.19>.
- [8] Dujmović, J., Krljan, T., Lopac, N., Žuškin, S. (2022). Emphasis on Occupancy Rates in Carbon Emission Comparison for Maritime and Road Passenger Transportation Modes. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering*, 10 (4). p. 459. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jmse10040459>.
- [9] Dujmović, J., Bernečić, D. (2021). Deviations and errors review on measuring and calculating heavy fuel oil consumption and fuel stock onboard vessels equipped with volumetric fuel consumption flowmeters. *Pomorstvo*, 35 (2). pp. 297-307. <https://doi.org/10.31217/p.35.2.12>.
- [10] Ying, L., Jianbo, S. (2017). Research on Simulation and Application of Marine Oil Purifier System. In Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Information, Cybernetics and Computational Social Systems (ICCSS), Dalian, China, 24-26 July 2017; <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCSS41225.2017>.
- [11] Trodden, D.G., Murphy, A.J., Pazouki, K., Sargeant, J. (2015). Fuel usage data analysis for efficient shipping operations. *Ocean Engineering*, 110 (B). pp. 75-84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oceaneng.2015.09.028>.
- [12] Thanh, L., Lee, G., Kim, H., Woo, S-H. (2020). Voyage-based statistical fuel consumption models of ocean-going container ships in Korea. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 47 (3). pp. 304-331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03088839.2019.1684591>.
- [13] Bocchetti, D., Lepore, A., Palumbo, B., Vitiello, L. (2013). A Statistical Control of the Ship Fuel Consumption. In Proceedings of the International Conference on the Design, Construction and Operation of Passenger Ships, London, United Kingdom, 20-21 November 2013.
- [14] Li, J., Jia, Y. (2020). Calculation Method of Marine Ship Fuel Consumption. In Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Materials, Science, Energy Technology and Environmental Engineering, Shanghai, China, 7-9 August 2020; doi:10.1088/1755-1315/571/1/012078.
- [15] Banks, C., Turan, O., Incecik, A., Theotokatos, G., Izkan, S., Shewell, C., Tian, X. (2013). Understanding ship operating profile with an aim to improve energy efficient ship operations. In Proceedings of the Low Carbon Shipping Conference, London, United Kingdom, 2013.
- [16] Iordanidis, A., Batistatos, N., Dimakopouloos, S., Morifonos, C., Hatzigrigoris, S. (2008). Improving energy efficiency – Shipboard energy audit. In Proceedings of the 2nd International Symposium on Ship Operations, Management and Economics 2008, Athens, Greece, 17-18 September 2008.
- [17] Luzer, J., Spinčić, A. (2013). Enciklopedijski brodstrojarski rječnik (Englesko-hrvatski), Školska knjiga, Zagreb.
- [18] Alfa Laval (2019). Final Drawings for Centrifugal Separator, M/V Vessel.
- [19] Engine logbook extract for M/V Vessel for period 02/2020 – 08/2020.
- [20] Calculator.net (8 April 2022). <https://www.calculator.net/sample-size-calculator.html>.
- [21] Šošić, I., Serdar, V. (2002). Uvod u Statistiku, Školska knjiga, Zagreb
- [22] Euronav (2017). The Basic of the Tanker Shipping Market, Retrieved 07.05.2021. from the World Wide Web: <https://www.euronav.com/media/65361/special-report-2017-eng.pdf>.
- [23] Real-statistic.com (8 April 2022). <https://www.real-statistics.com/statistics-tables/kolmogorov-smirnov-table/>
- [24] International Maritime Organization (2016). MEPC.1/Circ.867, Unified Interpretations of Regulations 1.24, 12, 27 and 28.3.3 of MARPOL Annex I.