

# Recommended Practice

## Code Verification in Computational Fluid Dynamics

AIAA standards are copyrighted by the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA), 12700 Sunrise Valley Drive, Reston, VA 20191-5807 USA. All rights reserved.

AIAA grants you a license as follows: The right to download an electronic file of this AIAA standard for temporary storage on one computer for purposes of viewing, and/or printing one copy of the AIAA standard for individual use. Neither the electronic file nor the hard copy print may be reproduced in any way. In addition, the electronic file may not be distributed elsewhere over computer networks or otherwise. The hard copy print may only be distributed to other employees for their internal use within your organization.



AIAA R-141-2021

# **Recommended Practice for Code Verification in Computational Fluid Dynamics**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
<b>FOREWORD</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW</b> .....	<b>4</b>
1.1 WHAT IS CODE VERIFICATION AND WHY IS IT IMPORTANT? .....	4
1.2 SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THIS RECOMMENDED PRACTICE .....	6
1.3 OVERVIEW OF CODE VERIFICATION PROCEDURES.....	7
1.4 RESPONSIBILITY FOR CODE VERIFICATION .....	9
<b>2 FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS IN CODE VERIFICATION</b> .....	<b>11</b>
2.1 DEFINITIONS FOR DISCRETIZATIONS, NUMERICAL SCHEMES, AND NUMERICAL SOLUTIONS..	11
2.2 ORDER OF ACCURACY OF DISCRETE SOLUTIONS.....	14
2.3 CALCULATING THE ERROR FOR CODE VERIFICATION .....	16
<b>3 RECOMMENDED CODE VERIFICATION PROCEDURE</b> .....	<b>18</b>
3.1 ESTABLISHING A CODE VERIFICATION PLAN AND ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA .....	18
3.2 TYPES AND SOURCES OF REFERENCE SOLUTIONS .....	19
3.3 THE USE OF SYSTEMATIC MESH AND TIME-STEP REFINEMENT .....	20
3.3.1 <i>Systematic Mesh Refinement</i> .....	20
3.3.2 <i>Time-Step Refinement</i> .....	21
3.3.3 <i>Elimination and Bounding of Other Sources of Error</i> .....	22
3.3.4 <i>Computational Models with Inherent Grid-Size Dependence</i> .....	23
3.3.5 <i>Coupled-Multiphysics Computational Models</i> .....	23
3.4 DOCUMENTATION AND ARCHIVING OF RESULTS .....	24
<b>4 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1 EXAMPLES OF CODE VERIFICATION</b> .....	<b>27</b>
APPENDIX 1.1 CODE VERIFICATION USING A TRADITIONAL ANALYTICAL SOLUTION .....	27
Appendix 1.1.1 <i>Additional Derivation Details of Appendix 1.1</i> .....	29
APPENDIX 1.2 CODE VERIFICATION USING THE METHOD OF MANUFACTURED SOLUTIONS .....	35
Appendix 1.2.1 <i>Additional Derivation Details of the Manufactured Solution of Appendix 1.2</i> .....	37
APPENDIX 1.3 CODE VERIFICATION USING A BENCHMARK COMPUTATIONAL SOLUTION.....	38
APPENDIX 1.4 OTHER CODE VERIFICATION EXAMPLES FROM THE LITERATURE.....	42
<b>APPENDIX 2 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CODE VERIFICATION PRACTICE</b> .....	<b>43</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3 THE METHOD OF MANUFACTURED SOLUTIONS</b> .....	<b>46</b>
<b>NOMENCLATURE AND SYMBOLS</b> .....	<b>48</b>
<i>Subscripts</i> .....	49
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b> .....	<b>50</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>51</b>

## Foreword

This Recommended Practice is intended for: (1) code developers and their managers; (2) researchers, analysts, and applications engineers who use CFD codes for investigation, design, or analysis; and (3) managers who have the ultimate responsibility of deciding on the reliability of computational simulation results used in making decisions.

At the time the AIAA R-141-2021 was completed and approved, the AIAA Committee on Standards for CFD, which is the author of this Recommended Practice, had the following members:

Urmila Ghia, Chairperson  
Sami Bayyuk  
John Benek  
Kenneth Bryden  
Robert Bush  
Terrence Conlisk  
Sami Habchi  
Ali Hadid  
Robert Harris  
Charles Hirsch  
Mark Jurkovich  
Hyung Lee  
Edward Lynch  
Mory Mani  
Unmeel Mehta  
William Oberkampf  
Francisco Palacios  
Dominique Pelletier  
Joseph Powers  
Christopher Roy  
Christopher Rumsey  
Tom Shih  
John Schaefer  
Christopher Steffen

The above-listed members all voted on this Recommended Practice. The balloters may have voted for approval, disapproval, or abstention. The above consensus body approved this document in January 2021.

The AIAA Committee on Standards for CFD intends to publish a “Standard for Code Verification in CFD” as a sequel to this “Recommended Practice for Code Verification in CFD.” When published, the Standard will supersede and replace this Recommended Practice.

## Executive Summary

This Recommended Practice outlines a procedure for Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) code verification and identifies the minimum criteria that should be satisfied to assert that code verification has been successfully carried out.

This Recommended Practice defines code verification and explains its role and importance within the overall scheme of code and solution verification, validation, and uncertainty quantification (VVUQ) in CFD. The document emphasizes the need for code verification as a necessary first step in the VVUQ process. It also identifies who should carry out code verification and who should assume responsibility for ensuring that appropriate code verification has been carried out before relying on computational results.

This Recommended Practice provides and explains the main definitions relating to: (1) discretization of the mathematical model equations used in CFD codes; (2) discrete solutions and discrete solution methods; (3) errors in discrete solutions; (4) systematic mesh and time-step refinement; (5) formal order of accuracy; and (6) observed order of accuracy. The code verification process is then explained in terms of comparing the observed order of accuracy with the formal order of accuracy. This document also outlines how round-off errors and iterative convergence errors can be accounted for in code verification and how they can be quantified and controlled.

This Recommended Practice also explains how a code verification program should be matched to a target application, in that the code verification program should be designed to cover all the terms of the mathematical model equations that are exercised in the target application, as well as the methods, inputs, and parameters that are used for the application. The criteria to be used for assessing the outcome of the code verification process should also be chosen *a priori*. Establishing the observed order of accuracy requires determination of the error in the computational solution and this in turn requires the corresponding exact solution or a highly accurate numerical solution to be known. The following three types of reference solution may be used for code verification: (1) traditional exact analytical solutions; (2) manufactured exact solutions; and (3) benchmark computational solutions. The use of each of these types is explained and demonstrated with an example. Sufficient detail is given for each of these examples to enable the process to be repeated for different test cases with different code. This Recommended Practice also briefly discusses the main weaknesses and limitations of code verification, especially its lack of applicability to models with a built-in dependence on the mesh spacing, such as wall-modeled LES, and the difficulty of applying it to coupled or staged computations.

The overall conclusion and recommendation of this Recommended Practice is that any claim of correctness of a code or a computational solution should rest on adequate code verification, whether done by developers, software vendors, analysts, or other end users, and that without code verification, reliance on computational results in making decisions incurs unquantifiable risks.

The body of this Recommended Practice is kept intentionally brief. Additional details are provided in appendices, and references to external literature are also given for additional coverage and details.