





# METODOLOGIE E TECNOLOGIE PER LO SVILUPPO DI UN NUOVO VELIVOLO

# Computational Fluid Dynamics and Wind Tunnel Testing

F. Nicolosi, A. De Marco, P. Della Vecchia, S. Corcione, D. Ciliberti, V. Cusati



2° Incontro - Napoli, 14 Giugno 2014 Scuola Politecnica e delle Scienze di Base Piazzale V. Tecchio 80, 80125 Napoli

### **CFD – Historical notes**

- → Lewis Fry Richardson ("Weather prediction by numerical process", 1922)
- → Early CFD calculations during the 1940s using <u>ENIAC</u> (first electronic generalpurpose <u>computer</u>)
- → Francis H. Harlow, Los Alamos National Lab
- → A.M.O. Smith of Douglas Aircraft in 1967 (Panel Methods)
- PanelCodesBoeing(PANAIR),Lockheed(Quadpan),Douglas(HESS),McDonnellAircr aft(MACAERO),NASA(PMARC) and AnalyticalMethods(VSAERO)
- → Profile (Eppler) , XFOIL(Drela), (1980)
- → Transonic modeling (Jameson) 1975
- → MGAERO <u>cartesian</u> mesh code. NASA CART3D code, Lockheed's SPLITFLOW code and <u>Georgia Tech</u>'s NASCART-GT. 3-D AIRPLANE code (Jameson) whith unstructured tetrahedral grids.



#### **CFD – Some Notes**

→ The Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes equations (or RANS equations) are time-averaged equations of motion for <u>fluid flow</u>. The RANS equations are primarily used to describe <u>turbulent flows</u>.



- → Each model, each approach (potential, panel method, full potential, inviscid + b.l., viscous, 2-D or 3-D) can be extremely useful to perform the design and the analysis of an aircraft.
- 1) 2-D (inviscid+b.l.) airfoil analysis and design (XFOIL, MSES, JAVAFOIL, in house)



1.2

2) 2-D multi-component airfoil analysis and design



Drela M. Newton solution of coupled viscous/inviscid multielement airfoil flows. AIAA Paper 90-1470, June 1990.





Figure 5.- Comparison of theoretical and experimental lift distribution on a swept wing with and without fuselage. A = 8;  $\lambda$  = 0.45;  $\Lambda$  = 45°; a\* = 0.1;  $\alpha$  = 4.7°.

4) 3-D Panel Method + b.l. (ex. VSAERO)

- (Attached incompressible flow, complex geometry)
- Steady /Unsteady
- Skill required for meshing
- Large PC workstations
- Accuracy in prediction of longitudinal and lateraldirectional derivatives (linear range), downwash, skin friction drag, vortex drag(winglet), propulsive effects
- Computing time (1 aoa, complex geometry) on workstation => about 1 hr.



7



Experiment within wind tunnel



#### 5) 3-D Euler

-

- (Attached compressible flow, complex geometry)
- Steady / Unsteady
- Skill required for meshing
- Large PC workstations or Parallel Computing
- Accuracy in prediction of longitudinal and lateraldirectional derivatives (linear range), downwash, skin friction drag, vortex drag(winglet), propulsive effects and shock waves.
- Computing time (1 aoa, complex geometry) workstation => about 3 hr.

![](_page_8_Figure_8.jpeg)

#### 6) 3-D Navier-Stokes (RANS)

- (Turbulent and separated flow, compressible flow, complex geometry)
- Steady / Unsteady
- Very High Skill required for meshing
- Workstations or Parallel Computing
- Interaction between components, separated flow, stall, wake indirect effects.
- From CAD to results => about 10 days
- Computing time (1 aoa, normal case geometry) on workstation => about 3 hr.
- 128 CPU => about 1 hr

![](_page_9_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Figure_1.jpeg)

### **CFD – The complete process**

![](_page_11_Figure_1.jpeg)

- It is very important to work on tools to allow automatic interface between different software and format.
- Possible integration of CFD in a Multi-Disciplinary Optimization Framework

# **CFD – The complete process**

- Communication in Aircraft Design
- > Development of a Design Framework coupling different tools and disciplinary analysis
- Concept-design and high-fidelity analysis

![](_page_12_Figure_4.jpeg)

COMMUNICATION IN AIRCRAFT DESIGN: CAN WE ESTABLISH A COMMON LANGUAGE? B. Nagel, D. Böhnke, V. Gollnick, P. Schmollgruber, A. Rizzi, G. La Rocca, J. J. Alonso

# **CFD – Computational Load**

How the CFD mesh has to be detailed ? How many Volume Cells ?

- For Longitudinal analysis in symmetrical condition half number of cells required
- For flapped configuration and analysis with propeller the number of cells should be increased
- Boundary layer modeling (Higher Re, thinner the b.l.)

![](_page_13_Figure_5.jpeg)

# **CFD – Computational Load**

#### **Super Computing**

- Parallel Computing (i.e. 164 CPU)
- Fast upload and download
- RAM and Storage Capabilities (GB)
- VERY COMPLEX problem (steady condition) (i.e. Complete Aircraft with flap and propulsive effects) => about 17-20 mill. Cells., 1 angle of attack
- Comp. Time (8 CPU) => 2 days 10 days (?)

(128 CPU) => 8 hr. - 34 hr.

![](_page_14_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Figure_10.jpeg)

Figure 77: CPUs scalability for a body-vertical configuration with 1  $800\,000$  polyhedral cells.

#### WIND-TUNNEL TESTS ARE CRUCIAL FOR AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

Wind tunnel test: 5500 hrs for A380

15000 hrs Boeing 787

Aerodynamics in the Design Process

![](_page_15_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_6.jpeg)

#### WIND-TUNNEL TESTS ARE CRUCIAL FOR NEW AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

Through CFD complementary activity the goal is to reduce wind-tunnel test days => 1500 for A350

![](_page_16_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_5.jpeg)

A380-800 Testing Days

![](_page_16_Figure_7.jpeg)

#### → WIND-TUNNEL TESTS ARE CRUCIAL FOR NEW AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

Low-Speed Tests

![](_page_17_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_4.jpeg)

ONERA F1

DNW

High-Speed Tests (Pressurized & Cryogenic)

![](_page_17_Picture_8.jpeg)

ARA

Dynamic Tests

![](_page_17_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_12.jpeg)

ETW

![](_page_17_Picture_14.jpeg)

W

ONERA S1

![](_page_17_Picture_17.jpeg)

# **Critical Aerodynamic Items**

#### Aerodynamic Design of a Regional Turboprop - Critical Items

#### → WING

- Airfoils
- AR, taper ratio, twist
- Winglet, Dihedral

#### → HIGH-LIFT SYSTEM

- Flap (2-D and 3-D)

#### → FUSELAGE

- Section and Fineness ratio
- Nose and Tail

#### → KARMAN/FAIRING

- Karman shape
- Fairing shape and wheel bay
- → NACELLE (and Prop. effects)
  - Nacelle shape
  - Prop. Effects on wing and tail

#### → TAIL

- Vertical tail, dorsal fin
- Horizontal tail

![](_page_18_Figure_20.jpeg)

#### WING – Airfoil

#### → Thickness ratio

- Cruise drag
- Stall behavior
- Wing weight
- Fuel tank Volume

#### → Airfoil shape

- Laminar flow ?
- Cruise drag, climb drag, max lift

#### → L.e. radius

- Clmax and stall behavior

#### → Airfoil camber

- Clmax and stall behavior
- wing moment coefficient (tail eq. loads)

![](_page_19_Figure_15.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

### **CFD Application for Regional Tprop**

#### Airfoil aerodynamic analysis in ICE condition

![](_page_27_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **WING** Aerodynamics

Wing spanwise aerodynamic load
(Correct estimation of structural loads)

![](_page_29_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_4.jpeg)

Nicolosi F., Pascale L. "*Design and Aerodyanmic analysis of a light twin-engine propeller aircraft*" 26th ICAS Congress, 2008

#### WINGLET Design

- → Induced drag reduction
- Improved Climb capabilities (OEI)
- For high wing-loading aircraft (like ATR) gain also in cruise condition
- Increased wing structural bending

![](_page_30_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

"Aerodynamic guidelines in the design and optimization of new regional turboprop aircraft» F. Nicolosi, P. Della Vecchia, CEAS 2011 Conference

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

"Aerodynamic guidelines in the design and optimization of new regional turboprop aircraft» F. Nicolosi, P. Della Vecchia, CEAS 2011 Conference

#### High Lift System

For a Regional Turboprop with 90 pax ground performances are particularly critical

- → Max lift coefficient in landing conditions ( >2.6)
- → Good aerodynamic efficiency in take-off setting (first seg. Climb)
- Single slotted flap vs Fowler flap (higher lift vs higher pitching moment ?)
- System and actuation (weight and costs) => Simple high lift system

![](_page_34_Figure_7.jpeg)

#### High Lift System Aerodynamic calculations ... some example

→ Gap and Overlap Optimization

![](_page_35_Figure_3.jpeg)

High Lift System Aerodynamic calculations ... some example 3-D CFD RANS Calculations – AIAA Workshop on high-lift devices  $\rightarrow$ **DLR F11- Model** (Eurolift project) 3.5 Mach=0.17 Re=15 mill. 3.5 2.5 2.5 Ч 1.5 Ч 1.5 Experimental Numerical - Inviscid Numerical - Viscous Incompressible Experimental Numerical - Viscous Compressible Numerical - Inviscid 0.5 Numerical - Viscous Incompressible Numerical - Viscous Compressible 05 -5 10 15 20 25 -10 0 5 30 alpha 0.2 0.3 CD 0.5 0.1 0.4 0.6

*Numerical Aerodynamic Analysis on a Trapezoidal Wing with High-Lift Devices : A Comparison with Experimental Data.* P. Della Vecchia, D. Ciliberti, AIDAA Congress, Sept 2013

High Lift System Aerodynamic calculations ... some example

#### → 3-D CFD RANS Calculations – AIAA Workshop on high-lift devices

![](_page_37_Figure_3.jpeg)

*Numerical Aerodynamic Analysis on a Trapezoidal Wing with High-Lift Devices : A Comparison with Experimental Data.* P. Della Vecchia, D. Ciliberti, AIDAA Congress, Sept 2013

High Lift System Aerodynamic calculations ... some example

![](_page_38_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Figure_1.jpeg)

Cruise Drag gain : about 3-4 drag counts

![](_page_39_Figure_3.jpeg)

Results obtained through panel code + b.l. calculations. Skin friction + pressure drag.

![](_page_39_Figure_5.jpeg)

"Aerodynamic guidelines in the design and optimization of new regional turboprop aircraft» F. Nicolosi, P. Della Vecchia, CEAS 2011 Conference

#### Fuselage Nose – Investigation for New Design Procedure df Pressure Coefficient 0.040000 0.36000 Y X 0.68000 1.0000 Ln 1.1 - FR<sub>n</sub> = 1.2 1.1 M = 0.52 $\blacksquare$ FR<sub>n</sub>= 1.4 1.08 $Re_{Lf} = 202 E6$ – FR<sub>n</sub>= 1.6 1.05 1.06 $FR_{n} = 1.7$ 1.04 1 $\frac{C_{D}}{C_{D_{ref}}}$ $\frac{C_{M_{\alpha}}}{C_{M_{\alpha_{ref}}}}$ 0.95 1.02 1 0.9 0.98 0.85 0.96 0.8 L 1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.7 1.8 0.94 36 38 40 42 44 46 50 52 54 48 FRn ψ (deg)

Fuselage Tail – Investigation for New Design Procedure

![](_page_41_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Figure_1.jpeg)

"Aerodynamic guidelines in the design and optimization of new regional turboprop aircraft» F. Nicolosi, P. Della Vecchia, CEAS 2011 Conference

![](_page_43_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Figure_1.jpeg)

"Aerodynamic guidelines in the design and optimization of new regional turboprop aircraft» F. Nicolosi, P. Della Vecchia, CEAS 2011 Conference

**4** Abreast

#### Fuselage fineness ratio

Abreast vs 5 Abreast
Horizontal and Vertical tail area must be resized

![](_page_45_Picture_3.jpeg)

 Preliminary Semi-Empirical Drag Calculation on assumed geometries

	4-Ab	5-Ab
CDo	0.0260	0.0277

Detailed CFD analysis: What is the price of higher comfort?

![](_page_45_Figure_7.jpeg)

# **CFD Application – Effect of Aerodynamic Impr.**

Δ V<sub>MAX</sub> (kts)

**Global Aerodynamic Improvements** 

- → Flight Max Cruise Speed
  - @ 20 kft altitude 10 drag count => 4 KTAS

#### Obtainable drag saving (cruise, 20 kft)

Fuselage Karman-3.5 drag countsFuselage nose-3.5Fuselage fairing-2.0Fuselage tail-2.0Winglet-8.0

**TOTAL Drag saving about -20 drag counts** 

#### Possible Performance Improvements

Cruise Flight Speed Global Fuel Mission Saving (same flight speed) Improved OEI Climb and Ceiling (Winglet)

![](_page_46_Figure_9.jpeg)

- 40 Kg (-6÷7 %)

Πkft

→ 5kft → 10kft → 15kft → 20kft

-<del>▼</del>- 25kft

10

# **CFD Application – Nacelle and Propeller Effects**

#### Nacelle and propeller

#### → CFD RANS Calculations

- Nacelle shape Optimization
- Effect of nacelle and propeller on wing aerod.
- Detailed study of propeller position
  - (streamwise, spanwise and vertical)
- Propeller indirect effects on tail

![](_page_47_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Picture_10.jpeg)

# Wind-Tunnel Tests – Nacelle and Propeller Effects

![](_page_48_Figure_1.jpeg)

1.0

1.0

![](_page_49_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Control Surfaces**

#### Detailed RANS analysis of control surfaces

Control surfaces 2-D and 3-D efficiency

2.5

- High angles (non-linearity)
- Interference effects
- Hinge moment measurement

![](_page_50_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Figure_8.jpeg)

Nicolosi, F., Della Vecchia, P., Ciliberti, D. "Aerodynamic interference issues in aircraft directional control," ASCE's Journal of Aerospace Engineering, Ref.: Ms. No. ASENG-649R2

![](_page_51_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Horizontal tailplane

#### Design of P2012 Aircraft – Horizontal tail position

- Different position investigated
- Wing wake interaction for different flap setting
- CFD RANS and Wind-Tunnel Tests

![](_page_52_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Picture_8.jpeg)

### Wind-Tunnel Tests – Tail Design

![](_page_53_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Critical Experimental Activities for Tprop

- → Airfoil tests (high speed) (M=0.50)
- Airfoil tests (low-speed) (flap optimization)
- Airfoil tests ICE condition
- → 3-D Model Tests (cruise)

Lift, Drag, Stability Derivatives, Control Derivatives

#### → 3-D Model Tests (high-lift)

Max lift, stall path, wake effects, propeller effects. Aerodynamic effect of landing gear Tests in ground effect

#### → 3-D HALF Model Tests (cruise)

Wing lift distribution, propeller effects, winglet effects

#### → 3-D HALF Model Tests (high-lift)

Flap effects, lift distribution, propeller effects

#### Dynamic Model Tests

Aeroelastic effects, flutter

#### Airframe Noise Tests

Noise Measurement

![](_page_54_Picture_17.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Picture_18.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Picture_19.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Picture_20.jpeg)

#### Tests

#### Airfoil tests (high speed) (M=0.50) $\rightarrow$

Aerodynamic characteristics (lift, drag, cm) Pressure distribution Critical Mach number Transition (Low Turbulence Tunnel) Behavior with contaminated I.e.

Airfoil tests (low-speed) (flap optimization)  $\rightarrow$ 

> Flap position optimization Tests of different flap system Pressure distribution Hinge moment measurement Behavior with contaminated I.e.

#### Airfoil tests in $\rightarrow$ **ICE** conditions

(Ice accretion measurement)

![](_page_55_Picture_8.jpeg)

#### Tests

#### Complete Aircraft Powered Wind-Tunnel Model

- > stability and control at different thrust conditions
- different engine nacelles
- take-off and approach conditions
- control surfaces, winglets, Landing gear
- Modular model (prop on/off, tail on/off, l.gear in/out)
- Engine Simulation

It is very important to measure the propeller effects Some aerodynamic derivative can be influenced by propeller effects

The A/C high-lift design performances (Low Noise while High Lift maintain)

![](_page_56_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Picture_12.jpeg)

Fokker F27 powered model (TU Delft)

![](_page_56_Figure_14.jpeg)

#### 3-D High-Lift (Low Speed Configuration), Re 3 and 6 mil., Mach=0.15-0.20 $\rightarrow$

3-D Tests and Half-Model Tests Tail off and Tail on measurements Measurement of max lift coeff., pitching moment Drag/Efficiency (take-off) Reynolds number effects

![](_page_57_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### → Wind-Tunnel Tests vs Flight Tests

![](_page_58_Picture_2.jpeg)

DEVELOPMENT OF HIGH-LIFT SYSTEMS FOR THE BOMBARDIER CRJ-700 Fassi Kafyeke, François Pépin and Cedric Kho (Bombardier) ICAS 2002 Conference

![](_page_58_Picture_4.jpeg)

Trimmed lift curves

![](_page_58_Figure_6.jpeg)

#### → Tests in ground effect

![](_page_59_Figure_2.jpeg)

 A380 complex high-lift configuration incl. landing gear

1

H BAL

![](_page_59_Picture_4.jpeg)

Wind Tunnel Experiment

Airbus A380: Solutions to the Aerodynamic Challenges of Designing the World's Largest Passenger Aircraft. A. Flaig, AIRBUS

![](_page_60_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### → 3-D Aeroacustic Tests

![](_page_61_Picture_2.jpeg)

**Recent AIRBUS Noise Tests** 

![](_page_62_Figure_1.jpeg)

Measurement and control of aircraft landing gear broadband noise

Yong Li a,\*,1, Malcolm Smithb, Xin Zhanga, Aerospace Science and Technology, 2012

(c) Slotted undertray

#### → Advanced WT Tests: Gust Load Alleviation (GLA) CONTROL SYSTEM

- a) A/C with flexible wing WT model
- b) Model gust alleviation devices active
- c) Model system sensors models active in the loop with control laws
- d) Model control law engineering model in the loop with GLA devices
- e) Wind tunnel gust generator (wind tunnel air flow direction changes).

![](_page_63_Picture_7.jpeg)

### Conclusions

- All CFD Methods (from 2-D panel method to complex 3-D unsteady RANS) are extremely useful for the preliminary and detailed design of new aircraft
- → Computational tools allow the analysis of very complex phenomena
- → In the preliminary design phase it is very important to build a <u>Multi-Disciplinary Design Framework</u> linking CFD tools with CAD, Structure, Weight, Systems, Aeroelasticity, Flight Mechanics and Flight Dynamics
- → Possibility to reduce wind-tunnel tests work
- → Wind-tunnel tests to exploit several critical items (i.e. ICE, Propeller effects, etc.)
- → Wind-tunnel tests addressed to the assessment of an optimal configuration

#### CFD, WIND-TUNNEL and FLIGHT TESTS MUST BE CONSIDERED COMPLEMENTARY TOOLS

#### Industrial Remarks

![](_page_65_Figure_1.jpeg)

- The matured experience and the data-base of an aircraft producer is really  $\rightarrow$ relevant to have good estimation of the aerodynamics and to get a successful design
- Many aerodynamic characteristics can not be calculated with CFD or measured  $\rightarrow$ in Wind-tunnels during the design phase.

#### **Industrial Remarks**

The BWB concept will be converted in a real commercial aircraft project ?

![](_page_66_Picture_2.jpeg)

- New Technologies must be tested extensively, however usually it is not so easy to translate them in safe and certifiable concepts.
- → Aerodynamic is not the only relevant item for an aircraft !

#### **A New Turboprop ?**

![](_page_67_Picture_1.jpeg)

### **Questions ?**

"Nella società, sia gli ottimisti che i pessimisti hanno un ruolo. L'ottimista inventa l'aereo, il pessimista il paracadute." George Bernard Shaw

La tecnologia non tiene lontano l'uomo dai grandi problemi della natura, ma lo costringe a studiarli più approfonditamente. Antoine de Saint Exupéry

*"Inventare un aereo è nulla. Costruirne uno è qualcosa. Farlo volare è tutto." Otto Lilienthal, pioniere dell'aviazione* 

THANK YOU

# **ANY QUESTIONS ?**

fabrnico@unina.it