

CFD simulations done for ACS project

Manfred Gawlas

03.03.2024

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Goal of simulations	2
1.2	Software used	2
2	Solidworks	3
2.1	Tutorials	3
2.2	SolidWorks basics	3
2.3	First simulation - Sternik 1.5	4
2.4	First parametric for all values done by Piotrek - Sternik 1.5	7
2.5	Second parametric by Manfred and Piotrek - Sternik 1.5	7
2.6	Same parametic study for Sternik 1.5 but with different mesh by Manfred	10
2.7	Similar study but for (-30; 30) (0; 30) angles for Sternik 1.5 by Manfred	13
2.8	Parametric study for Sternik 1.5 for (-30; 30) (-30; 30) by Piotrek	19
2.9	Parametric study for Sternik 1.5 with angle of attack and sideslip	24
2.10	Important problem with Solidworks	26
2.11	Parametric study for Sternik 1.5 with angle of attack and sideslip by Piotrek	27
2.11.1	Canard angles of (20, 20) degrees	27
2.11.2	Canard angles of (0, 0) degrees	29
2.12	The problematic (0, 20) degrees study	31
2.13	Same (0, 20) study on the old assembly	35
2.13.1	Comparison of the results	37
2.13.2	Same cannard on new assemby by Piotrek	38
2.14	Parametric for angles of cannards for angle of attack of 0 degrees by Piotrek	40
2.15	Why not use global angles for parametric studies	42
2.16	Conclusion	44
2.17	Full heatmap parametric study for different velocities	44
3	Ansys	57
3.1	Tuturials	57

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Goal of simulations

The ultimate goal of this study was to develop a understanding and ability to preform parametric studies of the flows for ACS rockets, that studied the forces and torques depening on the angle of attack, angle of sideslip and angles of conards. This ability would be then used to get aerodynamic coefficients for a specific rocket models, like Sterink 1.5 or Sternik 2.0 and then for project Unite with Sweedish team.

1.2 Software used

Models were created in Solidworks and then exported to the following programs for flow simulations. For Solidworks we could simply use it right away, but for Ansys Fluent we had to export it to .step file format.

During the course of this project, the following programs were used for flow simulations:

1. Solidworks Flow Simulations
2. Ansys Fluent
3. OpenFOAM

Solidworks Flow Simulations was used for the initial simulations, as it was the easiest to use and the fastest to set up. It was used to get a general idea of the flow around the rocket and was simple in setting up parametric studies. Few parametric studies were done in Solidworks Flow Simulations that were analyzed and many graphs were created in hope to get a better understanding of processes that are happening and to check whether the results make any sense. However, many results were not as expected and the decision was made to switch to Ansys Fluent, to chcek if the Simulations are of any value.

Ansys Fluent was used to get more accurate results and to check if the results from Solidworks Flow Simulations were correct. However it proved to be a lot harder to used then Solidworks and we are currently still working on getting the results from it.

OpenFOAM was only used by Jacek to get some results for the Sterink 1.5 model, but after some meshes and learning how to use it, it was decided to not use it for the rest of the project, since rest of the team was not familiar with it and it was not worth the time to learn it and Jacek had to focus on other stuff.

Chapter 2

Solidworks

2.1 Tutorials

Here I'll provide a few tutorials on how to use SolidWorks to create the assemblies needed for the parametric studies.

- SolidWorks basics of flow simulation
- All you need guide for parametric studies in solidwoks for ACS.

2.2 SolidWorks basics

It all comes down to having simple models, that are full and having whole body in one part and canards in another. This is needed for the parametric studies assembly.

We conducted a few simulations for Sternik 1.5 model, which were dependant on 4 parameters:

- Canard 1 angle
- Canard 2 angle
- Angle of attack
- Angle of sideslip

In whole phase of early studies, we would only parametrise 1 or 2 parameters, since it allowed us to generate graphs which we could understand and analyze.

Together with Piotrek, we used Origin Pro for data analysis, which allowed us to generate cool 3d heatmaps, which were very useful for understanding the forces and moments acting on the model.

Bellow you will find a few screenshots of the simulations we conducted and the heatmaps we generated. Then I will write about problems we encountered and how we solved them.

IMPORTANT!!! Positive values of canard angles mean that cannard is rotated in outer clockwise direction. This means that if both canards have same value of angle, then high value of torque in Y(roll) should be observed and for torque X, Z should be near 0.

2.3 First simulation - Sternik 1.5

This one is just the images of pressures etc for a very particular mesh. Just to document how it looks.




Figure 2.1: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.2: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.3: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.4: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.5: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.6: Sternik 1.5 model

2.4 First parametric for all values done by Piotrek - Sternik 1.5

This one generated all forces and moments for (-30, 30) degrees for both canards. You can find results in the Parametric_Study_obie_lotki_Piotrek_PIERWSZA.xlsx file.

We didn't do any heatmaps for this one, since we were just testing the parametric study feature.

2.5 Second parametric by Manfred and Piotrek - Sternik 1.5

This one was done for (0, 30) degrees for both canards. You can find results in the CFDPiotrekManfredACS.xlsx file.

This time heatmaps were generated, which allowed us to understand the forces and moments acting on the model. We then analysed the results and with Jacek and Piotrek came to a conclusion that it all looks good.




Figure 2.7: Sternik 1.5 model





Figure 2.8: Sternik 1.5 model



Aktywuj sy

Figure 2.9: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.10: Sternik 1.5 model

The important take away from this is that we were able to generate heatmaps for all forces that made sense.

Also we can see the local maximums and minimums for torques for the angle of 20 degrees. Jacek said that this is a good sign, since in literature there is said that maximum should be at around that value.

2.6 Same parametric study for Sternik 1.5 but with different mesh by Manfred

This one is basicly the same as the previous one, but with a different mesh. I wanted to replicate the results from the previous study and learn how to make parametric studies by myself. The results are ParametricStudy80k0-30-30-30_Manfred.xlsx.

The heatmaps are not as good as the previous ones, but they still show the same trends. Maximums and minimums are not visible this time, but this could be because of baddly made mesh. The quality of mesh was better tho, it was 80k cells and 16k cells for the boundary layer.

IMPORTANT TAKE AWAY. In solidworks you cannot change the parameter angle in assembly in sketch to negative value. Thats why later we went for default being 90 degrees or by hand 10 and for -10 = 170 degrees.

Also comparison of the results from the previous study and this one is bellow.




Figure 2.11: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.12: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.13: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.14: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.15: Sternik 1.5 model

Important take away is that the results are very similar, which is a good sign, but different meshes can give different results.

Also dont forget about negative values of angle not working.

2.7 Similar study but for (-30; 30) (0; 30) angles for Sternik 1.5 by Manfred

Basicly we wanted to make full bigger study, this time only 12k cells, so a small number, but results were similar and symetries would happen now. For symetric maps take into account that the lower part of heatmap may have inverted colours.

The results are in the ParametricStudy12k_-30-30_0-30.xlsx file.




Figure 2.16: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.17: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.18: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.19: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.20: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.21: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.22: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.23: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.24: Sternik 1.5 model

2.8 Parametric study for Sternik 1.5 for (-30; 30) (-30; 30) by Piotrek

This time its a full study for all angles. I cant find the results but here are the heatmaps and mesh settings.

Status	Calculation
Total cells	14,136
Fluid cells	14,136
Fluid cells contacting solids	2,118
Iterations	50

Figure 2.25: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.26: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.27: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.28: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.29: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.30: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.31: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.32: Sternik 1.5 model

For comparison, results of Torque X for same study but with angle of attack of 10 degrees are bellow. As you can see, nothing of the old results is visible. We tried to analyze the results, but only conclusion we came is that non linear nature of this problem is very hard to imagine.




Figure 2.33: Sternik 1.5 model

Aktywui s'

2.9 Parametric study for Sternik 1.5 with angle of attack and sideslip

Here is where to change the parameters in general settings of the simulation. Just change it to 3D vector.

There are also how you should change the angles of attack and sideslip in parametric study. BUT WE WILL LATER DISCUSS WHY NOT TO DO THAT.




Figure 2.34: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.35: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.36: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.37: Sternik 1.5 model

2.10 Important problem with Solidworks

For some reason, when testing and analysing simulations for attack of 10 degrees, problems with non-symmetrical turbulences started to appear. After analysing the problem, it was found that changing the point of the beginning of the coordinate system to peak of the model solved the problem.

However, later when parametric studies for angles of attack were made, some unexpected results appeared. Those results were significantly different from ones acquired for earlier assembly.

This was finally the reason why we stopped for some time working with Solidworks and decided that Ansys is a better tool for this kind of simulations.




Figure 2.38: Symmetrical turbulences for new assembly




Figure 2.39: New assembly

2.11 Parametric study for Sternik 1.5 with angle of attack and sideslip by Piotrek

Here is where problems started to arise with Solidworks. Simulations for the attack angle As were made, but the results were not as expected. Below are the graphs for the study.

The results are in the PiotrekSymulacje2702.opju file.

2.11.1 Canard angles of (20, 20) degrees

This results seem to make sense, however are still very hard to imagine. This one is for the mesh of 93k cells.




Figure 2.40: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.41: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.42: Sternik 1.5 model

2.11.2 Canard angles of (0, 0) degrees

This one seems to be the way we predicted, however you can see wild fluctuations in torque X.




Figure 2.43: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.44: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.45: Sternik 1.5 model

2.12 The problematic (0, 20) degrees study

This time it was JOVER. The results were very strange and we couldnt understand them. Those were just wrong. Especially the torque Z, which for angle of attack of 0 degrees had value of 0.

Also the graph for torque X was "heresy" as Piotrek said.

Later I remade the study with different mesh, but the results were the same. This meant that either we had no idea about what we got, and what we should have gotten or something went wrong.

Btw the mesh was still 93k cells.

This one was also redone by me for same assembly, but with different mesh, however resoults were still flawed.




Figure 2.46: Sternik 1.5 model





Figure 2.47: Sternik 1.5 model



Aktvwu

Figure 2.48: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.49: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.50: Sternik 1.5 model

2.13 Same (0, 20) study on the old assembly

As the results were very strange, I decided to remake the study on the old assembly. Values of torques will vary, since the point of the coordinate system was changed, but overall change in the values should be the same. Also take into note that my study was low quality, so fluctuations may be high.

Quick note, mesh was 12k cells and I used other standard so the look at those with perspective of them being symmetrical to ones before.




Figure 2.51: Piotrek's angles




Figure 2.52: Manfred's angles




Figure 2.53: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.54: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.55: Sternik 1.5 model

2.13.1 Comparison of the results

As you can see, the results are symmetrical for the torque X and Y, but the torque Z is not. Also, for this assembly, the torque Z for angle of attack of 0 degrees is not 0 and in general graph is a lot more probable than for the new assembly.

This means that the new assembly is not good for parametric studies, but honestly we have no idea why.

2.13.2 Same cannard on new assembly by Piotrek




Figure 2.56: WHOPA GAMMA STYLE




Figure 2.57: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.58: Sternik 1.5 model

2.14 Parametric for angles of canards for angle of attack of 0 degrees by Piotrek

For X and Y it makes sense, but for Z it doesn't. Goodnight.




Figure 2.59: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.60: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.61: Sternik 1.5 model




Figure 2.62: Piotrek is on grindset

2.15 Why not use global angles for parametric studies

After that I did huge study for angles of attack and sideslip for (0,0), (0, 20), (20, 20) and (20, 0) degrees of canards. I won't dive into the results, since it's too much and we didn't even bother to analyze them.

However here we noticed that if you use global angles for parametric studies, when changing the angle of attack and the angle of sideslip mesh will change. And it well change in a way that if you have 24k for (0, 0) degrees, you will have maybe 4k for (0, 20) degrees.

And I don't have to explaing that for mesh 4k, your results will be very different from reality. Underneath you can see cells for the same mesh setting in the same parametric study.

If for some reason someone CRAZY will want to see the results, they are in the ParametricStudy48kNatarcie.xlsx file and graphs in opracowanie48kNatarcie.opju file.




Figure 2.63: lalala




Figure 2.64: lalala




Figure 2.65: lalala

2.16 Conclusion

Solidworks is a great tool for simple simulations, but for more complex ones, it's not the best. Also, the parametric studies here are simple to learn, so its a good tool for beginning.

However, in the end we decided to focus on pushing forward with Ansys, since it's a better tool for this kind of simulations and we had 2 major problems with Solidworks:

- Problems with symetries in turbulences
- Problems with mesh scaling down when changing angles of attack and sideslip

However it's simple to fix the secound one, just do the angles of attack and sideslip in the assembly in same way that you do the canard angles.

2.17 Full heatmap parametric study for different velocities

This study was done on computing cluster, for which we are very grateful. This allowed us to do a very large parametric study, which would be impossible to do on a single PC. The results are presented in the following pages.

1. Parameters of this study were canard angles in range of -30 to 30 with step of 5 degrees and velocities of 34, 68, 102 m/s.
2. Mesh was pretty good with 80k cells. It was also made in a way, which we found to be the giving closest results to the very fine mesh.
3. In total $13 \times 13 \times 3 = 507$ simulations were done. This is 20% of the minimal version of full parametric study for Sternik 1.5.

The goal of this study was to generate accurate heatmaps of forces and moments for Sternik 1.5, but also to study the influence of Mach number on the aerodynamic coefficients. Thanks to never before seen quality of the results, it is possible to see the very non-linear nature of the aerodynamic coefficients of such project.

STERNIK 1.5


CFD - Solidworks

01.05.2024


Manfred i Piotrek

1. $v = 34 \text{ m/s}$


1.1 Force X




1.2 Force Y




1.3 Force Z




1.4 Torque X




1.5 Torque Y



1.6 Torque Z




1.7 Force – general




2. $v = 68 \text{ m/s}$


2.1 Force X




2.2 Force Y




2.3 Force Z




2.4 Torque X




2.5 Torque Y



2.6 Torque Z




2.7 Force – general




3. $v = 102 \text{ m/s}$


3.1 Force X




3.2 Force Y




3.3 Force Z




3.4 Torque X




3.5 Torque Y



3.6 Torque Z



3.7 Force – general



Chapter 3

Ansys

3.1 Tutorials

Well the simulations here are not as simple to make as in Solid, this is a very complex tool. But all you need to know(probably) is in those two tutorials made by Hindu men. Always believe in Hindu men when it comes to Ansys.

- Yellow tutorial
- Grey tutorial

Also Kacper got a lot of help from laboratories in the university. Overall Kacper is the one working with Ansys, so if you have any questions, ask him.