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SIMULATION SOLUTIONS

## CGNS format: is portability really there?

- Many file setups using different CGNS node combinations are valid, e.g.
- One or many Elements_t nodes ( mixed, separated, NGON )
- PointList or PointRange
- Usage of Family_t node or not
- ZoneBC_t node must always be there.
- Each software develops one or more combinations.
- Not all CFD software is synchronized with the new CGNS features: some software is not following the new devs, some other is moving slow towards them and another is up-to-date.

CGNS format: Current state


## CGNS format: the problem

What happens when a file is shared among different software?


Scenario \#1

Node Tree
BBase
－RamilyBC
埌 inlet
－outlet
－ 管 FamilyBC
－ZoneType
（1－G GridCoordinates
GridShells
－Zonvere
－Pointlist － －FamilyName －－inlet＿1 －PointList －監 GridLocation －R FamilyName －－outlet＿1
－ －Point List
－管 GridLocation
－FamilyName

Family＿t
CGNSview ：box＿family．cgns

$\square$ Node Description


Node Data Line

Scenario \＃2


## CGNS format:

- Lets consider the cgns file written from scenario \#2. the concerns What happens in the vendors'/custom parsers' side? This valid cgns file fails to be read if :
* families are not supported yet
* one section per bc is required ( why? - Is it PointRange that facilitates this? Are the sample files that guide the users there? )

P Consider billion meshes cases where this will not be feasible at all due to memory issues

* Zones_BC node is skipped, due to section naming conventions.

CGNS format: the solution

- We need to consider syncing our software to a minimum compliance level and have a uniform way of communicating it.
- We need to provide tools that allow API users to transform their valid CGNS file representation to a different one.


## Thank you for your attention



Stay connected


