	<b>ITTC – Recommended Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03 -04-02</b> Page 1 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

# ITTC Quality System Manual

## Recommended Procedures and Guidelines

### Guideline

## Validation and Verification of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities


7.5	Process Control
7.5-03	CFD
7.5-03-04	Manoeuvrability
7.5-03-04-02	Validation and Verification of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities

### Disclaimer

All the information in ITTC Recommended Procedures and Guidelines is published in good faith. Neither ITTC nor committee members provide any warranties about the completeness, reliability, accuracy or otherwise of this information. Given the technical evolution, the ITTC Recommended Procedures and Guidelines are checked regularly by the relevant committee and updated when necessary. It is therefore important to always use the latest version.


Any action you take upon the information you find in the ITTC Recommended Procedures and Guidelines is strictly at your own responsibility. Neither ITTC nor committee members shall be liable for any losses and/or damages whatsoever in connection with the use of information available in the ITTC Recommended Procedures and Guidelines.

Prepared by	Approved
Manoeuvring Committee of the 29 <sup>th</sup> ITTC	29 <sup>th</sup> ITTC 2021
Date 10/2020	Date 06/2021

	<b>ITTC – Recommended Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03 -04-02</b> Page 2 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

## Table of Contents

<p><b>1. PURPOSE OF GUIDELINE .....3</b></p> <p><b>2. VERIFICATION OF SIMULATIONS OF CAPTIVE MOTIONS .....4</b></p> <p>    2.1 Overview.....4</p> <p>    2.2 Steady straight-line motions .....4</p> <p>    2.3 Dynamic harmonic motions.....5</p> <p>    2.4 Steady circular motions .....7</p> <p><b>3. VERIFICATION OF DIRECT SIMULATION OF FREE RUNNING MANOEUVRES .....7</b></p> <p>    3.1 Overview.....7</p> <p>    3.2 Iterative convergence .....8</p> <p>    3.3 Grid and time step uncertainties.....9</p> <p>    3.4 Time integration model.....9</p>	<p><b>4. VERIFICATION FOR SIMULATIONS IN CONFINED AND RESTRICTED WATER..... 11</b></p> <p>    4.1 Overview..... 11</p> <p>    4.2 Single reference frame ..... 11</p> <p>    4.3 Multiple reference frames..... 11</p> <p><b>5. VALIDATION OF SIMULATIONS .12</b></p> <p>    5.1 Overview.....12</p> <p>    5.2 Steady straight-line and circular motions ..... 12</p> <p>    5.3 Dynamic harmonic motions.....12</p> <p>    5.4 Free running manoeuvres.....13</p> <p><b>6. REFERENCES ..... 13</b></p>
---	--

 INTERNATIONAL TOWING TANK CONFERENCE	<b>ITTC – Recommended Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03 -04-02</b> Page 3 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

## V&V of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities

### 1. PURPOSE OF GUIDELINE

The purpose of this document is to give guidelines for the Verification and Validation (V&V) of numerical RANS based simulations of manoeuvring capabilities. Two different situations are taken into account:

- I. *simulations of captive motion*
- II. *simulations of free running manoeuvres*

In the first case, the goal is the prediction of the hydrodynamic forces and moments acting on the ship during prescribed motions, which currently is a widely used approach. In the second case, focus is on prediction of the trajectory when the self-propelled ship is free sailing; only controlled by its control surfaces or other steering devices. This procedure gives guidelines for classical IMO manoeuvres, e.g. zig-zag and turning circle, but the principle can also be applied to more general cases.

In the present guideline the verification covers estimation of the simulation uncertainty, while the validation covers the comparison between computations and measurements taking into account both the simulation and measurement uncertainties. Specific methods for estimation of experimental uncertainty for captive and free running model tests are described in QM7.5-02-06-04 “*Uncertainty Analysis for Manoeuvring Predictions based on Captive Manoeuvring Tests*” and QM7.5-02-06-05, “*Uncertainty Analysis for free running manoeuvring model tests*”, respectively and will not be treated in this guideline.

QM7.5-03-01-01 “*Uncertainty Analysis in CFD, Verification and Validation Methodology*

and Procedures” provides the general methods to estimation of numerical errors and uncertainties, i.e. verification methods. Where possible, the present guideline utilizes this general theory in connection with the manoeuvring related application.

**Verification** is the process for assessing the numerical uncertainty  $U_{SN}$  and, if the conditions permit, the estimation (both in sign and value) of the simulation numerical error  $\delta_{SN}(t_i)$  and the uncertainty in this estimation. Assuming that round-off errors are negligible, the numerical error is decomposed into contributions from iterative convergence  $\delta_I(t_i)$ , grid convergence  $\delta_G(t_i)$ , time step convergence  $\delta_T(t_i)$  and other parameters  $\delta_P(t_i)$ :

$$\delta_{SN}(t_i) = \delta_I(t_i) + \delta_G(t_i) + \delta_T(t_i) + \delta_P(t_i) \quad (1)$$


Correspondingly the numerical uncertainty is then given by:

$$U_{SN}(t_i) = U_I(t_i) + U_G(t_i) + U_T(t_i) + U_P(t_i) \quad (2)$$

which assumes that the uncertainties are independent. This assumption will be used for all summations of numerical uncertainties in the procedure.

**Validation** is the process where benchmark experimental data  $D$  and simulation data  $S$  is compared in order to estimate validation uncertainty  $U_V$  and possible numerical modelling errors.

The comparison error  $E$  is defined as the difference between the experimental data  $D$  and the simulation value  $S$  (eventually the corrected value  $S_C$ ):

 INTERNATIONAL TOWING TANK CONFERENCE	<b>ITTC – Recommended Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03 -04-02</b> Page 4 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

$$E(t_i) = D(t_i) - S(t_i) = \delta_D(t_i) - (\delta_{SM}(t_i) + \delta_{SN}(t_i)) \quad (3)$$

The validation uncertainty  $U_V$  is defined as:

$$U_V^2(t_i) = U_{SN}^2(t_i) + U_D^2(t_i) + U_{input}^2(t_i) \quad (4)$$

The numerical simulation is validated at level of  $U_V$  when the simulation error is:

$$|E(t_i)| < U_V(t_i) \quad (5)$$

Here everything is written as a function of time, but, of course, this definition can be applied either for  $L_2$  norm values, time instant values or harmonics, depending on how the analysis is carried out (QM7.5-03-01-01).

## 2. VERIFICATION OF SIMULATIONS OF CAPTIVE MOTIONS

### 2.1 Overview

The captive motions cover Planar Motion Mechanism (PMM) test and Circular Motion type test (CMT).

The PMM test consists of two types of tests; the static straight-line test (static drift, static rudder etc.) and the dynamic harmonic motion test (pure sway, pure yaw, etc.). In CFD simulations the first type is typically treated as steady computations and the hydrodynamic forces and moments will in this case just be constant numbers.

The second type of test is treated as transient computations, since the flow is not steady due to the dynamic motion of the ship. In this case the solver is run to converge on each time step. In this way the solution will show the development of the flow in time and the hydrodynamic forces and moments will be represented as time series.

Consequently, verification of the static simulations will be focused on constant force or moment values, while the dynamic simulations will cover verification of time series for forces and moments, either on time level or through Fourier Series.

In this guideline the numerical error  $\delta_{SN}$  will cover contributions from the iterative solution procedure and the grid for steady simulations and contributions from the iterative solution procedure, the grid and the time step size for transient simulations.


### 2.2 Steady straight-line motions

The focus in the static captive tests is the computation of the hydrodynamic forces and moments, i.e. on the forces  $X$  and  $Y$  plus the yaw moment  $N$  for the 3DOF case and the forces  $X$  and  $Y$  plus yaw and heel moments  $N$  and  $K$  for the 4DOF case. For a given computed quantity  $S$ , for instance  $Y$ , the related numerical uncertainty must be estimated.

For the iterative component or the statistical convergence, the uncertainty can be estimated by means of the convergence history of the considered quantity, which typically shows some oscillations throughout the solution. The running mean  $RM_Q$  of the force or moment quantity is used to estimate  $U_{I,Q}$ . Subscript  $Q$  represents  $X$ ,  $Y$ ,  $N$  or  $K$ . With  $RM_{Q,max}$  and  $RM_{Q,min}$  being the maximum and minimum of the running mean oscillations towards the end of the RM history, respectively, the iterative uncertainty can be estimated by

$$U_{I,Q} = \left| \frac{1}{2} (RM_{Q,max} - RM_{Q,min}) \right| \quad (6)$$

It can be noted that  $U_{I,Q}$  can be reduced by running the simulation longer.

 INTERNATIONAL TOWING TANK CONFERENCE	<b>ITTC – Recommended Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03 -04-02</b> Page 5 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

With respect to the grid uncertainty  $U_{G,Q}$ , it is estimated according to the approach given in Section 4 of QM7.5-03-01-01. The procedure is based on grid convergence studies obtained with a minimum of three systematically refined grids,  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$  and  $G_3$ . The relation between the cell sizes in the three grids is determined by  $r_G = \Delta x_{G2}/\Delta x_{G1} = \Delta x_{G3}/\Delta x_{G2}$ , which is the grid refinement factor. Using  $r_G = 2$ , means that the cell size is doubled between grids, but it often results in some of the grids becoming either too coarse or too fine. Instead it is recommended to use  $r_G = \sqrt{2}$  instead. Usage of  $r_G$  values smaller than  $r_G = \sqrt{2}$  is possible, but it may be difficult to obtain grid convergence due to very small changes in solutions between grids.

The changes in solutions between coarse and medium grids,  $\varepsilon_{G32,Q} = S_{G3,Q} - S_{G2,Q}$ , and between medium and fine grid,  $\varepsilon_{G21,Q} = S_{G2,Q} - S_{G1,Q}$ , are used to calculate the convergence ratio  $R_{G,Q} = \varepsilon_{G21,Q}/\varepsilon_{G32,Q}$  for any simulated force or moment quantity  $Q$ . Based on this, three conditions can occur:

- i)  $0 < R_G < 10 < R_{G,Q} < 1$ , grid convergence,
- ii)  $R_{G,Q} < 0$ , oscillatory convergence and
- iii)  $1 < R_{G,Q}$ , grid divergence.

In condition iii) no uncertainty can be estimated. This could indicate that even finer grids should be used. In condition ii) the uncertainty is estimated by

$$U_{G,Q} = \left| \frac{1}{2}(S_{G,Q,\max} - S_{G,Q,\min}) \right| \quad (7)$$

where  $S_{G,Q,\max}$  and  $S_{G,Q,\min}$  are the maximum and minimum values of  $S$  obtained with the three grids. In some cases, a factor of safety can be used. In condition i) it is possible to use the

generalized Richardson extrapolation in accordance with QM7.5-03-01-01.

With estimates for  $U_{I,Q}$  and  $U_{G,Q}$  the simulation uncertainty can be estimated for the relevant quantities based on

$$U_{SN,Q} = U_{I,Q} + U_{G,Q} \quad (8)$$

Note that if grid error correction has been applied in the assessment of the grid uncertainty the following quantities must be applied for validation in section 5.2.

$$S_{CQ} = S_Q - \delta_{G,Q} \quad (9)$$

$$U_{SCN,Q} = U_{I,Q} + U_{GC,Q} \quad (10)$$

### 2.3 Dynamic harmonic motions

In the CFD based simulations of the harmonic motions like the pure sway or pure yaw PMM conditions, the results are presented as time series of forces and moments.





Figure 1 Grid uncertainty for the yaw moment.

In principle it is possible to do the verification at each instance of time, i.e. perform grid convergence studies at each time step. But usually it is difficult to obtain uncertainty estimates at all time steps with the methods in QM7.5-03-01-01. Figure 1 shows an example for the KCS container ship from SIMMAN2008, Simonsen

 INTERNATIONAL TOWING TANK CONFERENCE	<b>ITTC – Recommended Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03 -04-02</b> Page 6 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

and Stern (2008). The observed divergence and missing estimates are quite common over the considered PMM period  $T$ .

Performing a time step study is not trivial, since only coinciding instances in time from the three studies can be covered. Further, same time intervals are required in the measurement for the validation. Finally, for the iterative component or the statistical convergence, it does not make sense to use the running mean to estimate the iterative uncertainty. The reason is that the motion dominated oscillations of the signal will give relatively large variation in the running mean even if subsequent periods of the signal are quite similar.

Instead of making the verification on the time series directly, it is recommended to approximate the time series of the forces and moments with Fourier Series, as it is done in Sakamoto (2009) and Sakamoto et al. (2012):

$$F(t) = a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \cos(n\omega t + \varphi_n) \quad (11)$$

where  $a_n$  is the  $n^{\text{th}}$  order Fourier harmonic and  $\varphi_n$  the corresponding phase angle. The idea is to select an order of the approximation that gives a good representation of the time series and then perform the verification on the Fourier coefficients and phases. With this approach both iterative, grid and time step studies can be performed. Note that the same order must be used for the measured data in the validation process.

For the iterative component, the uncertainty is estimated by means of the convergence history of the Fourier coefficients. The approach is based on marching harmonic analysis as presented in Yoon (2009). Here, the convergence history of the Fourier harmonics is estimated by applying Fourier analysis on a window covering a single period of the time series, and then stepping the window throughout the time series.

The running mean  $RM_{Q,n}$  of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  harmonic is used to estimate  $U_{I,Q,n}$ . Subscript  $Q$  represents,  $X$ ,  $Y$ ,  $N$  or  $K$ , while  $n$  represent the order of the harmonic. With  $RM_{Q,n,\max}$  and  $RM_{Q,n,\min}$  being the maximum and minimum of the running mean oscillations towards the end of the RM history, respectively, the iterative uncertainty can be estimated by:

$$U_{I,Q,n} = \left| \frac{1}{2} (RM_{Q,n,\max} - RM_{Q,n,\min}) \right| \quad (12)$$


The grid uncertainty for the  $n^{\text{th}}$  harmonic  $U_{G,Q,n}$  is estimated according to the approach given in Section 4 of QM7.5-03-01-01. There are alternative procedures that consider the discretisation error/uncertainty due to time and space simultaneously (see e.g. Fathi et al, 2011). These will not be described here as the CFD committee's V&V approach is followed. Minimum three systematically refined grids,  $G_1$ ,  $G_2$  and  $G_3$  must be applied using constant grid refinement factor  $r_G$ . Guidelines for selection of  $r_G$  are the same as for the steady straight-line test described above.

The changes in simulated harmonics between coarse and medium grids,  $\varepsilon_{G_{32},Q,n} = S_{G_{3,Q,n}} - S_{G_{2,Q,n}}$ , and between medium and fine grid,  $\varepsilon_{G_{21},Q,n} = S_{G_{2,Q,n}} - S_{G_{1,Q,n}}$ , are used to calculate the convergence ratio  $R_{G,Q,n} = \varepsilon_{G_{21},Q,n} / \varepsilon_{G_{32},Q,n}$ . Based on this, three conditions can occur:

- i)  $0 < R_G < 10 < R_{G,Q,n} < 1$ , grid convergence,
- ii)  $R_{G,Q,n} < 0$ , oscillatory convergence and
- iii)  $1 < R_{G,Q,n}$ , grid divergence.

In condition iii) no uncertainty can be estimated. In condition ii) the uncertainty is estimated by



 INTERNATIONAL TOWING TANK CONFERENCE	<b>ITTC – Recommended  Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03  -04-02</b> Page 7 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solu-  tions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Ca-  pabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

$$U_{G,Q,n} = \left| \frac{1}{2}(S_{G,Q,n,\max} - S_{G,Q,n,\min}) \right| \quad (13)$$

where  $S_{G,Q,n,\max}$  and  $S_{G,Q,n,\min}$  are the maximum and minimum values of  $S$  obtained with the three grids. In condition i) it is possible to use the generalized Richardson extrapolation as proposed in QM7.5-03-01-01.

Finally, for the time component the uncertainty can be estimated by a systematic variation of the time step size. It is recommended to consider three time steps related by a time step refinement factor of 2. For each of the simulations with different time steps Fourier analysis is performed to compute the harmonics for the relevant forces and moments. Afterwards the changes in the  $n^{\text{th}}$  harmonic between large and medium time steps,  $\varepsilon_{t_{32},Q,n} = S_{t_{3,Q,n}} - S_{t_{2,Q,n}}$ , and between medium and small time step,  $\varepsilon_{t_{21},Q,n} = S_{t_{2,Q,n}} - S_{t_{1,Q,n}}$ , are used to calculate the convergence ratio  $R_{t,Q,n} = \varepsilon_{t_{21},Q,n} / \varepsilon_{t_{32},Q,n}$ . As for the grid uncertainty three conditions can occur:

i)  $0 < R_G < 10 < R_{t,Q,n} < 1$ , time step convergence,

ii)  $R_{t,Q,n} < 0$ , oscillatory convergence, and

iii)  $1 < R_{t,Q,n}$ , time step divergence.

In condition iii) no uncertainty can be estimated. In condition ii) the uncertainty is estimated by

$$U_{t,Q,n} = \left| \frac{1}{2}(S_{t,Q,n,\max} - S_{t,Q,n,\min}) \right| \quad (14)$$

where  $S_{t,Q,n,\max}$  and  $S_{t,Q,n,\min}$  are the maximum and minimum values of  $S$  obtained with the three time steps. In condition i) it is possible to use the Richardson extrapolation as proposed in QM7.5-03-01-01.

With estimates for  $U_{I,Q,n}$ ,  $U_{G,Q,n}$  and  $U_{t,Q,n}$  at hand the simulation uncertainty can be estimated for the relevant quantities based on

$$U_{SN,Q,n} = U_{I,Q,n} + U_{G,Q,n} + U_{t,Q,n} \quad (15)$$

Note that if grid and/or time step error corrections have been applied in the assessment of the grid or time step uncertainties the following quantities must be applied for validation in section 5.3.

$$S_{cQ,n} = S_{Q,n} - \delta_{G,Q,n} - \delta_{t,Q,n} \quad (16)$$

$$U_{ScN,Q,n} = U_{I,Q,n} + U_{Gc,Q,n} + U_{tc,Q,n} \quad (17)$$

## 2.4 Steady circular motions


The CMT consists of circular motions, which based on a moving reference frame approach can be treated as steady computations. Therefore, verification can be done by following the same approach as used for the static PMM condition described in paragraph 2.1.

## 3. VERIFICATION OF DIRECT SIMULATION OF FREE RUNNING MANOEUVRES

### 3.1 Overview

The main objective of free running tests is prediction of the trajectory as a consequence of the prescribed motion of the control surfaces, e.g. the rudder. Tests or simulations are conducted to evaluate ship manoeuvring capabilities.

This section deals with the direct simulations of a manoeuvre, i.e. the trajectory, using a CFD solver.

	<b>ITTC – Recommended Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03 -04-02</b> Page 8 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

The focus is on classical IMO manoeuvres like the  $\pm 35^\circ$  turning circle and  $10^\circ/10^\circ$  and  $20^\circ/20^\circ$  zigzag tests.

Compared to CFD based PMM simulation, the free running simulation is complicated by the integration in time of rigid body motion (Newton second law) in the time loop of the RANS solver.

Ship motions are usually solved for in body-reference frame to simplify the inertia matrix. RANS equations may be solved in the earth reference frame or in the body reference frame. The latter requires the inclusion of the centrifugal force for the fluid due to frame acceleration. This is an additional difficulty in the discretized equations.

The time step is involved in many different parts of the solver (propeller running, wave run-up, courant number, Newton second law) and the verification and validation processes should be conducted carefully.

Moreover, simulations are driven by forces and no more prescribed by ship velocities. More specific motions are included by:

- using appendages controllers,
- imposing the propulsion point,
- performing simulations with 3 to 6 degrees of freedom.

This influences both verification and validation since they will be carried out on position and heading and not on forces.

It is possible to perform the verification process at each time step of the motion time series with the methods in QM7.5-03-01-01 using a global convergence ratio and L2 norm of solution change over the period of time of interest.

This method can relatively easily be applied to grid studies, but convergence studies towards the time step are difficult as described earlier in connection with the dynamic PMM simulation.

Concerning, the iterative component or the statistical convergence, the uncertainty is difficult to estimate over time directly based on RM since the time series has now an unsteady behaviour due to the motion of the ship.

A more practical approach is to consider global parameters as tactical diameter or advance in the verification, instead of the time series.

For the verification of turning circles it is recommended to consider the following global parameters:

- Tactical diameter
- Advance
- Transfer
- Yaw rate (once steady, see Figure 2)
- Peak yaw rate
- Drift angle (once steady, see Figure 2)
- Speed loss
- Heel angle (if 4 DOF)


For zigzag test, relevant parameters are:

- First and second overshoot angles
- First and second overshoot time
- Peak yaw rate
- Period

### 3.2 Iterative convergence

For free running computations, the iterative convergence error is due to the inner iterations for implicit methods, or due to the number of sub iterations for pseudo compressible methods.



 INTERNATIONAL TOWING TANK CONFERENCE	<b>ITTC – Recommended  Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03  -04-02</b> Page 9 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solu-  tions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Ca-  pabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

To estimate iterative uncertainties, solutions are computed for different values of inner or sub iterations ( $S_{k1}, S_{k2}, \dots S_{kn}$ ). The largest variation between solutions is then taken as the uncertainty in the same way as done for static conditions:

$$U_I = \left| \frac{1}{2} (\text{MAX}(S_{ki, i=1\dots n}) - \text{MIN}(S_{ki, i=1\dots n})) \right| \quad (18)$$

### 3.3 Grid and time step uncertainties

Grid and time uncertainties are estimated by a generalized Richardson extrapolation. Solutions on minimum three grid levels and three different time steps with a systematic grid and time step refinement ratios  $r_G$  and  $r_t$  are required. For the selection of refinement ratios see the recommendation given in relation to the static analysis above. The remaining verification process for the global parameter of interest can be done in the same way as used for the steady straight-line motion in 2.2. The only difference is that the verification is performed with global parameters instead of forces.

By focussing on the global manoeuvring parameters both flow and motion solvers are checked at the same time. From a practical point of view this is the most straightforward verification approach. In case a more detailed verification of the body motion integration scheme is required, the approach in 3.4 can be followed. This approach however requires access to the source code and is most suitable for code developers.

Figure 2 shows an example of time series of velocity drop, yaw rate and drift angle for a steady turning circle simulation from Dubbioso et al. (2012).





Figure 2: Numerical and experimental time series of velocity drop, drift angle and yaw rate in a turning circle simulations, (Dubbioso et al. 2012).

### 3.4 Time integration model

Free running simulations require to solve the rigid-body equations for the ship. As the hydrodynamic forces are derived from the Navier Stokes (NS) solver, they are on the right-hand

 INTERNATIONAL TOWING TANK CONFERENCE	<b>ITTC – Recommended  Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03  -04-02</b> Page 10 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solu-  tions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Ca-  pabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

side of the body equations. Specifically, hydrodynamic forces include added mass force in line with ship acceleration. These forces may lead to an unstable resolution of the rigid body equation terms which are dependent on ship acceleration and are on both sides of the equations, see 7.5-02-06-03 section 3.5.

A common solution to overcome this problem is to decrease the time step to reduce integration errors. Another solution is to use a dummy added mass to re-enforce the left hand side of the rigid body equation which stabilizes the set of equations. So, one has to fix the time step and the dummy added mass accordingly.

Verification of the time integration model and the time step is difficult to achieve since it is embedded into the solver and linked to the hydrodynamic force and then to the time step of the accurate resolution of the NS equations. Different ways are possible to verify both the time step for the rigid body equations resolution:

Verify with a known problem which can be solved analytically and with a time constant similar to what is expected during the manoeuvre (response to step function or other). The equation  $\frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = ((a^2 - 1)x - 2a\cos(t)) \cdot e^{-at}$  with  $a = -0.05$  has the analytical solution  $x = \sin(t) \cdot e^{-at}$ . Numerical solutions of this equation using Predictor and Predictor-corrector schemes have been evaluated for different time steps and are presented below.

Depending of the time integration scheme, the required time step to reach convergence is different.




Figure 3 : Verification of the time –integration scheme on a known solution.


Simulate free roll motion using only hydrostatic force. This way the time resolution of the rigid body is disconnected from the RANS equations' resolution. Any viscous damping or added mass effect is neglected and only a restoring moment is considered. For small heel angles the hydrostatic restoring moment is assumed linear.

The roll equation is then similar to a pendulum equation without damping (19). The solution is periodic and the frequency can easily be checked.

$$I_{oy}\ddot{\theta} + mgl\theta = 0 \text{ and } T = 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{I_{oy}}{mgl}} \quad (19)$$

With  $I_{oy}$  the moment of inertia about the roll axis,  $\theta$  the roll angle,  $m$  mass of the system and  $l$  the length of the pendulum.

Roll motion is a good candidate for time scheme verification since it is a high frequency motion which should require the smallest time step, see 7.5-02-06-03 section 3.5.

	<b>ITTC – Recommended Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03 -04-02</b> Page 11 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

## 4. VERIFICATION FOR SIMULATIONS IN CONFINED AND RESTRICTED WATER

### 4.1 Overview

Usually, ship motions and flow equations are solved separately. Ship motions are computed in a ship-fixed reference frame and the flow equations are solved in either the inertial frame or a frame moving at constant velocity compared to the earth system.

Simulations in confined and restricted water lead to additional complexity. Not only the flow is influenced by the ship motions but also by the bottom, the side walls, banks or other ships moving closely.

Due to this complexity of the flow geometry, it is sometime necessary to use different reference frames to perform the simulations.

### 4.2 Single reference frame

If there is no time dependency in the mesh configuration (i.e. a straight canal, ship sailing in constant shallow water, or two ships with no relative velocities), a single reference frame can be used to solve the flow motion with specific boundary conditions for restricted and shallow water. These specific boundary conditions express that in a reference frame moving with the ship the boundary conditions for the velocity on the walls is not zero, see QM7.5-03-04-01.

The main boundary conditions applied are moving boundary conditions and slip-wall boundary conditions. It should be checked that the boundary conditions are consistent in the reference frame where the flow equations are solved and that they do not induce any spurious velocities or pressure near the boundaries.

Moreover, for restricted and shallow water, the grid has to be dense enough to propagate the wave and pressure fields up to the wall. If computations are performed in very shallow water or in very restricted water, the mesh density between the ship and the wall should be able to model interactions between the boundary layers of the ship and the wall. In this case, the grid density up to the walls has to be included in the grid uncertainty analysis.


### 4.3 Multiple reference frames

If the mesh geometry or configuration changes during the simulations, it is then necessary to use different reference frames to solve the flow equations. For example, applications concerning a ship passing another ship or a ship sailing along a bank of finite length are usually treated using a multiple frames approach.

For this approach the overset technique is often used. In this case a grid is linked to the canal geometry/passing ship and another grid is linked to the ship. The flow equations are solved in the two different reference frames of the different grids and flow information is passed from one grid to the other, see Mousaviraad et al. (2016).

A second methodology based of sliding grids may also be used. A grid is then linked to the canal geometry while a second grid, moving with the ship, slides on the first one. This technique imposes some restrictions on the ship motions since the interface on which the grids slide on each other has to be straight or regular, as presented in Toxopeus and Bhawsinka (2016).

The last option is to use a remeshing technic in which the mesh deforms locally around the moving object and in case the mesh quality decreases the flow domain is remeshed, see Randeni et al. (2015).

 INTERNATIONAL TOWING TANK CONFERENCE	<b>ITTC – Recommended  Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03  -04-02</b> Page 12 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solu-  tions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Ca-  pabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

As for the single reference frame case, it should then be checked that the boundary conditions are consistent in the several reference frames where the flow equations are solved, as information exchanges between the different grids and reference frames may certainly not create any spurious or unphysical flow.

## 5. VALIDATION OF SIMULATIONS

### 5.1 Overview

Using the terminology from QM7.5-03-01-01, validation is defined as a process for assessing simulation modeling uncertainty by using benchmark experimental data and, when conditions permit, estimating the sign and magnitude of the modeling error  $\delta_{SM}$  itself as described in QM7.5-03-01-01. To determine if validation has been achieved, the comparison error  $E$  is compared to the validation uncertainty  $U_V$ , which is the combined uncertainty of the measured data  $U_D$  and the simulation uncertainty,  $U_{SN}$ . If  $|E| < U_V$ , the combination of all the errors in  $D$  and  $S$  are smaller than  $U_V$  and validation is achieved at the  $U_V$  level. If  $U_V < |E|$ , the sign and magnitude of  $E \approx \delta_{SM}$  can be used to make modeling improvements. It should be noted that high simulation and data uncertainties will make it easier to obtain validation, but at a high level. One should aim for low level validation as this indicates that the simulation is a good representation of reality. To obtain low level validation and more accurate results it is therefore important to have simulations and measurements with low uncertainties.

### 5.2 Steady straight-line and circular motions

Assuming that measured force or moment data is available together with the corresponding

data uncertainty and that the verification procedure above has given the simulation uncertainty related to the computed force and moment results, the comparison error and validation uncertainty is determined on the basis of the equations:

$$E_Q = S_Q - D_Q \quad (20)$$

$$U_{V,Q}^2 = U_{D,Q}^2 + U_{SN,Q}^2 \quad (21)$$

or with correction

$$E_Q = S_Q - D c_Q \quad (22)$$

$$U_{V,Q}^2 = U_{D,Q}^2 + U_{ScN,Q}^2 \quad (23)$$

Based on this, it can be determined if validation has been obtained or if modelling errors are present, indicating that the simulation model should be improved. If  $|E_Q| < U_{V,Q}$ , validation is achieved at the  $U_{V,Q}$  level and if  $U_{V,Q} \ll |E_Q|$ , the sign and magnitude of  $E_Q$  approximately equals the modelling error,  $E_Q \approx \delta_{SM,Q}$ , which indicates the error introduced by the numerical model. Better validation can be obtained if the model is improved and the modelling error is reduced.

### 5.3 Dynamic harmonic motions


Following the same idea as used for the validation of the static straight line test, the comparison error and validation uncertainty for the  $n^{th}$  harmonic can be estimated from

$$E_{Q,n} = D_{Q,n} - S_{Q,n} \quad (24)$$

$$U_{V,Q,n}^2 = U_{D,Q,n}^2 + U_{SN,Q,n}^2 \quad (25)$$

or with correction

$$E_{Q,n} = D_{Q,n} - S c_{Q,n} \quad (26)$$

 INTERNATIONAL TOWING TANK CONFERENCE	<b>ITTC – Recommended  Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03  -04-02</b> Page 13 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

$$U_{V,Q,n}^2 = U_{D,Q,n}^2 + U_{ScN,Q,n}^2 \quad (27)$$

If  $|E_{Q,n}| < U_{V,Q,n}$ , validation is achieved at the  $U_{V,Q,n}$  level and if  $U_{V,Q,n} \ll |E_{Q,n}|$ , the sign and magnitude of  $E_{Q,n}$  approximately equals the modelling error,  $E_{Q,n} \approx \delta_{SM,Q,n}$ , which indicates the error introduced by the numerical model. Again if the model is improved and the modelling error is reduced better validation can be obtained. So the modelling error can help guiding the need for model improvement.

#### 5.4 Free running manoeuvres

For the validation, experimental data in terms of time histories of the ships trajectory must be available.

Validations have to be done at the same scale as the tests and results can be analysed in terms of:

- Time histories of position and heading
- Global manoeuvre parameters (tactical diameter, 1<sup>st</sup> overshoot, etc ...)

Typically, the uncertainties are not available for the time series themselves, but even so it is recommended to make a qualitative comparison between measured and calculated trajectory.

On the level of the global manoeuvre parameters, the validation can be performed according to the same approach as used for the static motions in Section 5.2.

If validations show large discrepancies, for free-running computations, the modelling errors may be due to:

- Propeller modelling: computations including running propeller have been performed


by Carrica et al. (2008). Computational effort is very important (mesh-time step) but no model is introduced in the simulations. Common practise use models like actuator discs or BEM model. Work of Broglia et al. (2011) show that the model should include a lateral force to get more accurate results on a steady turning manoeuvre.

- Turbulence modelling: computation of flow past a ship hull with drift and yaw may be sensitive to the turbulence model. Flow separation may occur on the aft part of the hull which strongly influences the hydrodynamic forces on the hull and the flow past the propeller (wake fraction) and the rudder. Also the modelling of rudder stalling may be influenced by the turbulence model.
- Free surface modelling: in CFD it is possible to perform the simulations with or without free surface. For ships operating at low Froude numbers, sometimes the free surface is neglected to simplify the computations. However, when simplifying the simulation, it is important to keep in mind that it will influence the simulation results.

#### 6. REFERENCES

- Broglia, R., Durante, D., Dubbioso, G. and Di Mascio, A., (2011) "Turning Ability Characteristics Study of a Twin Screw Vessel by CFD", International Conference on Computational Methods in Marine Engineering, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Carrica P.M., Paik K.J., Hosseini H.S., Stern F. (2008) "URANS analysis of a broaching event in irregular quartering seas", J. Mar. Sci. Tech., vol 13, pp. 395-407.
- Dubbioso, G., Durante, D., Broglia, R., Di Mascio, A. (2012) "CFD Manoeuvring of a twin



	<b>ITTC – Recommended Procedures and Guidelines</b>	<b>7.5-03 -04-02</b> Page 14 of 14	
	<b>Validation and Verification of RANS Solutions in the Prediction of Manoeuvring Capabilities</b>	Effective Date 2021	Revision 02

- Screw Vessel with different stern appendages configuration”, 29<sup>th</sup> ONR, Gothenburg.
- Fathi, F., L. Eça, B. Borsboom (2011), An example of code verification in the simulation of wave propagation. 30<sup>th</sup> OMAE, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, June
- Mousaviraad, S. M., Sadat-Hosseini, S. H., Carrica, P. M., & Stern, F. (2016). Ship–Ship interactions in calm water and waves. Part 2: URANS validation in replenishment and overtaking conditions. Ocean Engineering, 111, pp. 627-638.
- Randeni, S., Leong, Z. Q., Ranmuthugala, D., Forrest, A., Duffy, J. (2015). Numerical investigation of the hydrodynamic interaction between two underwater bodies in relative motion. Applied Ocean Research, 51, pp. 14-24.
- Sakamoto, S., (2009) “URANS and DES Simulations of Static and Dynamic Maneuvering for Surface combatant”, Doctor of Philosophy degree in Mechanical Engineering, The University of Iowa, May.
- Sakamoto, S, P. Carrica and F. Stern (2012) “URANS Simulations of Static and Dynamic Maneuvering for Surface combatant: part 1. Verification and validation for forces, moment and hydrodynamic derivatives”, J. of Marine Science and Technology. Online version, June 2012.
- Stern, F., Agdrup, K., Kim, S., Cura Hochbaum, A., Rhee, K., Quadvlieg, F., ... Gorski, J., (2011), "Experience from SIMMAN 2008 — The First Workshop on Verification and Validation of Ship Maneuvering Simulation Methods", Journal of Ship Research, Vol. 55, No.2, pp. 135–147.
- Simonsen, C.D. and F. Stern, (2008), “RANS simulation of the flow around the KCS container ship in pure yaw”, Poster and paper from SIMMAN2008 proceedings, 2008.
- Toxopeus, S. and Bahwinska, K. (2016) “Calculation of Hydrodynamic Interaction Forces on a Ship Entering a Lock Using CFD”, 4<sup>th</sup> MASHCON, Hamburg, Germany, pp. 305-314.
- Yoon, H.Y. (2009) “Force/Moment and Phase-Averaged Stereo PIV Flow Measurements for Surface Combatant in PMM Maneuvers”, Doctor of Philosophy degree in Mechanical Engineering, The University of Iowa, May 2009.