GMGW-1 Participant Questionnaire

1st AIAA Geometry and Mesh Generation Workshop

The purpose of this document is to collect data for an assessment of the current state of the art in mesh generation for a variety of mesh types and a variety of software tools. The comparisons will be made in terms of the quality of each mesh submitted (either from a priori metrics or from the quality of the CFD solutions that were produced using the mesh) as well as the resources (human and computer) required to generate the meshes.

For GMGW-1, the geometry and meshes referred to below are for the NASA High Lift Common Research Model (HL-CRM).

Completion of this questionnaire is required of all participants in GMGW-1 and participants in the 3rd High Lift Prediction Workshop (HiLift-PW3) who generate their own meshes (versus using the supplied baseline meshes). A separate copy of this Questionnaire should be completed for each family of meshes.

# Geometry

1. Software
	1. What software tool(s) did you use to import and prepare the HL-CRM geometry model for meshing? Capstone
2. Import & Preparation for meshing
	1. Which of the supplied geometry files did you use:

[ ]  Native: NX (prt) file (HL-CRM gapped config)

[ ]  CREO file (HL-CRM gapped config)

[x]  IGS file (HL-CRM gapped config)

[ ]  STP file (HL-CRM gapped config)

[ ]  Parasolid (x\_t) (HL-CRM gapped config)

[ ]  Native: NX (prt) file (HL-CRM partially-sealed config)

[ ]  CREO file (HL-CRM partially-sealed config)

[ ]  IGS file (HL-CRM partially-sealed config)

[ ]  STP file (HL-CRM partially-sealed config)

[ ]  Parasolid (x\_t) (HL-CRM partially-sealed config)

* 1. What problems, if any, did you identify immediately after importing the geometry model (eg, missing geometry, poorly translated geometry, other)? One face missing, created and trimmed.
	2. What steps did you take after import to make the geometry model ready for meshing? (Choose all that apply)

[ ]  None

[ ]  Layering (hiding components)

[ ]  Simplification/defeaturing (removing components)

[x]  Repair (fixing/recreating components that didn’t import properly)

[x]  Modification (changing components)

[ ]  Shrink-wrapping

[x]  Other split the leading edge

* 1. What was required level of user expertise (novice, intermediate, expert) for this task? intermediate for repair; novice for mesh generation
	2. How long did import take (both elapsed time and labor required --- in hours)? 0.5

# Initial Meshing

1. What type of mesh family did you generate?

[ ]  Structured multi-block

[x]  Unstructured tetrahedra

[ ]  Unstructured hexahedra

[x]  Hybrid

[ ]  Overset

[ ]  Cartesian

[ ]  other (please specify      )

1. Surface Meshing
	1. What software tool(s) did you use to generate your initial surface mesh? Capstone
	2. How long did it take (elapsed time and labor – in hours)? 1
	3. Provide a brief description of how mesh resolution was specified (explicit user inputs, sources, curvature based sizing, background distribution function, …) topology-based sources, topology-based BL
	4. When/how did you judge surface mesh generation to be complete? When geometry is properly resolved.
2. Volume Meshing
	1. What software tool(s) did you use to generate your initial volume mesh? Capstone
	2. How long did it take (elapsed time and labor – in hours)? 3
	3. Provide a brief description of how mesh resolution was specified (explicit user inputs, sources, curvature based sizing, background distribution function, …) Same as during surface meshing. Capstone used unified mesh sizing for the entire process from edge, surface to volume meshing.
	4. For resolving surface boundary layers, what cell size growth rate did you use? Was it constant or variable? If variable, describe. Constant rate of 1.16 in volume, 1.2 on surfaces
	5. When/how did you judge volume mesh generation to be complete?
3. Adherence to HiLift-PW3 meshing guidelines
	1. To what extent did your mesh(es) adhere to the HiLift-PW3 meshing guidelines? partially
	2. Was it possible to adhere to the guidelines on the first attempt, or were there iterations involved? some requirement in the guideline can only be met approximately in Capstone's sizing approach.
	3. What were the reasons that you did not adhere to the guidelines? (chose all that apply)

[x]  The guideline does not pertain to the type of mesh generated

[ ]  The guidelines were (locally) inconsistent and therefore could not all be satisfied

[ ]  The tools used do not give enough control to adhere to the guideline

[ ]  Adhering to the guideline would have required more resources than were available

[x]  The guidelines were not appropriate for the CFD solver being used

[ ]  Other (describe):

1. A priori metrics (such as skew, or maximum stretching ratio, maximum deviation of mesh nodes from OML or …)
	1. What a priori metrics did you apply on the initial mesh?
	2. What was the average and range of the metrics? Not sure what this means.
	3. Did the a priori metrics point out any problems that needed to be fixed? If so, which metric and how many times did you need to re-mesh? No.
2. Were there any additional best practices that you used in generating the meshes? Require smoothness of the sizing field.
3. What was the required level of user expertise (novice, intermediate, expert) for this task? intermediate

# Adaptive Meshes (Only answer if you generated an adapted mesh)

1. What adaptive meshing strategy did you use (technique and software)?
2. What criteria were used for mesh adaptation (e.g., pressure, vorticity, …)?
3. What, if any, further treatments (e.g. smoothing) were applied? (Please describe )

# Mesh Families

1. What strategy did you use to generate the family of meshes (coarse, medium, fine, extra fine)? For example, did you generate the coarse mesh first and refine it, or did you start each mesh generation task essentially from the beginning? Coarse first, then refined.
2. In your opinion, what was the most time-consuming or tricky aspect of generating a family of meshes? Getting the initial set if sizing attributes.
3. How did the times (labor, CPU, etc.) needed to generate them compare? finer meshes took more CPU time, but not much more setup/labour.
4. Were there any problems that you encountered in one mesh resolution that you did not encounter in another resolution? coarser resolutions ran into invalidity issues.

# Post-Solution Mesh Modifications

1. After generating an initial flow solution, where additional mesh modifications made to improve solver convergence or solution accuracy? no.
2. Describe any post solution mesh modifications that were made? no
3. How long did these modifications take (elapsed time and labor – in hours)?

# I/O

1. In which format did you export your meshes? (CGNS, Solver-native, …): cgns, solver native.
2. What are the names of the files you uploaded to the GMGW-1 server? aiaa-hl-case1ab-apr05-aniso-Capstone-allTet-110M-SDey.cgns, aiaa-hl-case1ab-apr28-aniso-Capstone-Prism-Tet-Pyr-12M-SDey.cgns, aiaa-hl-case1ab-apr28-aniso-Capstone-allTet-32M-SDey.cgns

# Miscellaneous

1. Are there any other aspects of your HL-CRM mesh generation experience that you would like to draw our attention to?