




Ice Prediction Workshop Proposal for a V&V Technical Focus Group

Thomas Ozoroski
NASA Glenn Research Center, Icing Branch
1/14/2025



Motivation

- IPW2 incurred drastic differences in the C_p profiles and attachment line location
- The reason for these discrepancies are multifaceted
- Grid and solution convergence is influenced by the CFD solver, turbulence model, and flux schemes
- Lack of agreement in computational solutions leads to
 - Icing tools being applied to completely different solutions
 - Increased spread of icing results
- These issues impede conclusions and do not convey sound numerical practices being utilized to outside parties
- Improved consistency leads to improved conclusions




From IPW2 Comparisons by Blanchet Case 1, Slide 10

We don't have one problem to get right, we have two

Proposed Test Case

- CRM65 Midspan Hybrid Model (Similar to Test Case 1 from IPW2) but with the $\alpha = 0^\circ$ and $\vartheta = 0^\circ$ configuration (Ozoroski et al.)
- By using the 'nominal' configuration the comparisons become simpler
 - No more complicated rotation schemes for C_p
 - Separation is reduced and ceiling gap influences are decreased
 - Installation discrepancies are reduced
 - Overall, the problem is more well behaved
- The effort can leverage already obtained and usable experimental icing and pressure data for this configuration



Brief Condition Overview


Icing Time	T_0	Velocity	MVD
10 min	-11.3°C	130 kts	25.0 μm
20 min	-11.3°C	130 kts	25.0 μm






Evaluation Goals

- Evaluate each CFD grid computationally through a grid study and evaluation of attachment line parameters
- Evaluate icing codes based on properties such as
 - Mass
 - Volume
 - Maximum Local Collection Efficiency
 - Total Collection Efficiency
- Demonstrate convergence of both the CFD and Icing solutions
- Once we have a converged solution
 - Compare ice shapes (Participants)
 - Compare properties (Participants)
 - Compare to experimental data (Mass, Volume, Ice Shape)




Assuming Single Shot





Process Workflow





Additional Context

- The goal would be to evaluate icing tools on a consistent problem with consistent error
 - We know that SA, SA-rough, $k\omega$, etc. will converge to different flowfields
 - Use constant roughness height for rough-wall turbulence models
 - Solution convergence simply needs to family together
- We only do single-shot accretions to reduce temporal error and subsequent discretization errors
- We know ice density will play a role
 - Use a constant computational ice density value
 - For those unable to do that, show convergence of density
- An ideal situation would be a consistently used CFD solution
 - Problems with grid types, roughness, HTC, and solution compatibility
- Emphasis on converging to a computational solution and evaluate the modeling error as the main source of differences
- Try to pull uncertainty quantification into the results when possible



QUESTIONS AND FEEDBACK