



HiLiftPW-3

Next Steps, Overall Conclusions and Discussion

compiled by the HiLiftPW Committee

Next Steps

- Participants:
 - By August 15, 2017: Either (1) leave data as is (default), (2) submit corrected data, or (3) withdraw data
- Organizers:
 - By June 9, 2017: Determine list of invitees to SciTech 2018 and/or Aviation 2018 invited sessions
 - Will write summary paper for SciTech 2018, using corrected data

Overall Summary from HiLiftPW-3

- Code-to-code variation is similar to previous workshops
 - (For a given grid size)
 - Much larger CFD scatter near $C_{L,max}$ than at lower alphas
 - There is some evidence from the statistical analysis that use of Xfine grids (200-600 million grid points or more) might reduce some of the variation
 - From many of the individual presentations: finer grids are particularly needed when flow is separated
- Code verification matters
 - Verified codes agree better with each other compared to collective results
 - Verification removes one possible source of disagreement
- Predicting flow near $C_{L,max}$ is still a challenge for the community, as a whole
 - But sometimes individual participants/codes/models do better than others
 - Is there a specific reason(s) for this?
 - Or are they just lucky? (right answer for the wrong reasons)
 - Can we really tell w/o including tunnel walls, transition, and semi-span geometry?
- Addition of Geometry & Mesh Generation workshop
 - Was a new experience/experiment
 - Going forward: we hope to learn from each other and work closer together

Questions for Participants

- Generally:
 - How can we improve the workshop?
 - How did the joint GMGW / HiLiftPW experience work for you?
 - Should HiLiftPW-4 be done in a similar or different format?
- On a technical level:
 - How can we modify the workshop requirements for the next HiLiftPW so that we collectively learn more?
 - What kind of data do we need to collect to help increase our understanding?