

AD-A202 467

AFWAL-TR-88-3082

DTIC FILE COPY



AFTI/F-111 MISSION ADAPTIVE WING BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

Boeing Advanced Systems Co.  
Seattle WA



October 1988

Final Report for Period Nov 86 to Jul 88

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

FLIGHT DYNAMICS LABORATORY  
AIR FORCE WRIGHT AERONAUTICAL LABORATORIES  
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND  
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO 45433-6553

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

| REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |       |                                                    |                                                                                                                       | Form Approved<br>OMB No. 0704-0188                     |                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>UNCLASSIFIED                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |       |                                                    | 1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS<br>None                                                                                      |                                                        |                                  |
| 2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY<br>N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |       |                                                    | 3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT<br>Approved for public release;<br>distribution is unlimited.                |                                                        |                                  |
| 2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE<br>N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |       |                                                    |                                                                                                                       |                                                        |                                  |
| 4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |       |                                                    | 5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)<br><br>AFWAL-TR-88-3082                                                   |                                                        |                                  |
| 6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION<br>AFTI/F-111 Mission Adaptive<br>Wing Program Office                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |       | 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL<br>(If applicable)<br>AFWAL/FIMF | 7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION<br>Flight Dynamics Laboratory (AFWAL/FIMF)<br>AF Wright Aeronautical Laboratories |                                                        |                                  |
| 6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)<br>AFWAL/FIMF<br>WPAFB OH 45433-6553                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |       |                                                    | 7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)<br><br>Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-6553                                    |                                                        |                                  |
| 8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING<br>ORGANIZATION<br>Same as 6a                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |       | 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL<br>(If applicable)<br>Same as 6b | 9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER<br><br>F33615-78-C-3027                                               |                                                        |                                  |
| 5c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)<br><br>Same as 6c                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |       |                                                    | 10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS                                                                                         |                                                        |                                  |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |       |                                                    | PROGRAM<br>ELEMENT NO.<br>63245F                                                                                      | PROJECT<br>NO.<br>2568                                 | TASK<br>NO.<br>01                |
| 11. TITLE (Include Security Classification)<br><br>AFTI/F-111 Mission Adaptive Wing Briefing to Industry                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |       |                                                    |                                                                                                                       |                                                        |                                  |
| 12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)<br>N/A. This report is a compilation of overhead charts presented at a Briefing to Industry.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |       |                                                    |                                                                                                                       |                                                        |                                  |
| 13a. TYPE OF REPORT<br>Final                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |       | 13b. TIME COVERED<br>FROM 18NOV86 TO 22JUL88       |                                                                                                                       | 14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day)<br>1988, October |                                  |
| 15. PAGE COUNT<br>425                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |       |                                                    |                                                                                                                       |                                                        |                                  |
| 16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION<br>This report is a collection of charts presented at the 21-22 July 1988 AFTI/F-111 Briefing to Industry. A copy is to be mailed to each Briefing attendee. (cont'd) 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |       |                                                    |                                                                                                                       |                                                        |                                  |
| 17. COSATI CODES                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |       |                                                    | 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)                                     |                                                        |                                  |
| FIELD                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | GROUP | SUB-GROUP                                          | Smooth variable camber wing, Flight test results.<br>Automatic flight controls. (code) 2-                             |                                                        |                                  |
| 01                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 01    |                                                    |                                                                                                                       |                                                        |                                  |
| 01                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 04    |                                                    |                                                                                                                       |                                                        |                                  |
| 19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) The AFTI/F-111 (Advanced Fighter Technology Integration/F-111) Mission Adaptive Wing is a joint USAF and NASA program which is developing and flight demonstrating a smooth variable camber wing and flight control system capable of adjusting the wing's shape in response to flight condition and pilot input in order to maximize aerodynamic efficiency. The program objective is to produce flight substantiated design criteria for a practical wing system that maintains peak aerodynamic efficiency and versatility throughout the broad flight envelopes and diverse mission requirements of future military and civilian aircraft.<br><br>This document contains illustrations presented at the second AFTI/F-111 Mission Adaptive Wing Briefing to Industry on 21-22 July 1988 in Dayton OH. The presentations covered the analysis, design, ground test, and flight test phases of the development of the automatic flight control system for the AFTI/F-111. An earlier Briefing to Industry in November 1986 covered all phases of the AFTI/F-111 manual system development.<br><br>(continued on reverse side) |       |                                                    |                                                                                                                       |                                                        |                                  |
| 20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |       |                                                    | 21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>UNCLASSIFIED                                                                  |                                                        |                                  |
| 22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL<br>Kenneth L. Bonnera                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |       |                                                    | 22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)<br>(513) 255-6739                                                                  |                                                        | 22c. OFFICE SYMBOL<br>AFWAL/FIMF |

DD Form 1473, JUN 86

Previous editions are obsolete.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

UNCLASSIFIED

Block 19. ABSTRACT (Cont.)

Flight testing of the AFTI/F-111 Mission Adaptive Wing system was only partially complete at the time these illustrations were prepared for presentation. Data and findings herein should be considered preliminary.


*Large delta wing, Variable leading edges, Variable trailing edges,*

## FOREWORD

The AFTI/F-111 (Advanced Fighter Technology Integration/F-111) Program began as a joint USAF/NASA effort in 1975 with several exploratory studies to evaluate ability of state of the art technologies to be integrated into a wing system capable of maintaining peak aerodynamic efficiency for future fighters and bombers. As the concept matured, it was dubbed the Mission Adaptive Wing (MAW). A contract was awarded to the Boeing Company in 1979 to design and fabricate a flight research version of the MAW for flight testing on NF-111A aircraft number 13. The objective: to produce flight test substantiated design criteria for practical wing systems that maintain peak aerodynamic efficiency and versatility throughout diverse missions by changing wing contour in response to variable flight condition, aircraft configuration, and pilot commands. The overall program management, as well as Boeing's design and fabrication, were provided by USAF's Flight Dynamics Laboratory. The flight testing was performed by NASA's Ames Dryden Flight Research Facility with the assistance of the Air Force Flight Test Center (AFFTC). Other contributors to the development: NASA/ARC, U.S. Navy/ONR, NASA/LARC, USAF/AEDC, Grumman Corporation, and General Dynamics Corporation.


This document contains illustrations presented at the Second AFTI/F-111 Briefing to Industry on 21-22 July 1988 in Dayton, Ohio. The program was in the midst of its second flight test phase at the time of the Briefing to Industry. The second phase of flight testing focuses primarily on the evaluation of the AFTI/F-111 automatic flight control system. This emphasis was reflected at the Briefing to Industry, with the majority of the presentations addressing automatic flight control system topics.

Data and findings contained herein should be considered preliminary. Five months of flight testing remain, and final conclusions may be revised based on the outcome of the remaining tests. A Mission Adaptive Wing Symposium is planned for the spring of 1989, at which final results, conclusions, and design criteria will be presented.



| Accession |   |
|-----------|---|
| NHS       | ✓ |
| DTIC      |   |
| USAF      |   |
| J         |   |
| E         |   |
| U         |   |
| A-1       |   |





FLIGHT DYNAMICS LABORATORY  
**AFTI**  
ADVANCED FIGHTER TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION

AFTI/F-111 MISSION ADAPTIVE WING  
SECOND BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY, 21-22 JULY 1988  
STOUFFER'S CENTER PLAZA HOTEL, DAYTON OH

THURSDAY, 21 JULY 1988

0745-0830 Registration  
0830-0900 Welcome & Introduction - Col Thaddeus Sandford, FDL Director

SESSION I - AFTI/F-111 Program Summary and Review

0900-0915 Mission Adaptive Wing Background - Ron DeCamp (FDL)  
0915-0945 MAW System Development Review - Doug Gould (Boeing)  
0945-1000 MAW Flight Test Overview - Louis Steers (NASA)  
1000-1015 Break

SESSION II - Manual Flight Control System Flight Test Results

1015-1045 Performance & Stability & Control - Steve Smith (AFFTC)  
1045-1105 Wing Loads Summary - Steve Thornton (NASA)  
1105-1130 Wing Pressure Distributions - Dean Webb (NASA)  
1130-1200 Buffet Characteristics - Ed Friend (NASA)  
1200-1300 Lunch

SESSION III - Automatic Flight Control System Development

1300-1330 AFCS Objectives and Requirements - Aivars Smitchens (FDL)  
1330-1355 Cruise Camber Control Mode Development - Joe Hall (Boeing)  
1355-1415 Maneuver Camber Control Mode Development - George Lewis (Boeing)  
1415-1445 Maneuver Load Control Development - George Lewis (Boeing)  
1445-1500 Break  
1500-1530 Maneuver Enhancement/Gust Alleviation Mode Development - Dan Norman (Boeing)  
1530-1545 AFCS Mode Combination Capabilities - Joe Hall (Boeing)  
1545-1615 AFCS Simulation - Joe Hall (Boeing)  
1615-1645 Fabrication & Ground Testing of AFCS - Clate Boldrin (Boeing)  
1645-1705 Government Overview of Software Development - Ron Braet (FTI)

FRIDAY, 22 JULY 1988

SESSION IV - Automatic Flight Control System Flight Test Results

0800-0845 AFCS Functional & Performance Results - P. Bussing (Boeing), P. Phillips (AFFTC)  
0845-0900 Handling Qualities of MCC - Joe Conley (NASA)  
0900-0915 AFCS Handling Qualities - Gordon Fullerton (AFFTC)  
0915-0930 AFTI/F-111 Mission Performance - Glenn Harshberger (FDL)

SESSION V - MAW Technology Transition

0930-0950 Cruise Camber Control Mode Evaluation - Col Larry Brock (USAFR)  
0950-1010 Automodes Analysis - Joe Conley (NASA)  
1010-1025 Break  
1025-1045 Structures and Mechanization Lessons Learned - Frank Statkus (Boeing)  
1045-1100 Flight Control System Lessons Learned - Joe Hall (Boeing)  
1100-1120 Considerations for an Operational MAW System - Doug Gould (Boeing)

SESSION VI - Future Research

1120-1130 Overview of the Remaining Flight Test Program - Louis Steers (NASA)  
1130-1150 Summary Comments - Dr Keith Richey, AFWAL Technical Director  
1150-1200 Closing Remarks - Ron DeCamp (FDL)

AFTI/F-111 MISSION ADAPTIVE WING  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY



21-22 JULY 1988

DAYTON, OHIO

SESSION I

AFTI/F-111 PROGRAM SUMMARY AND REVIEW

# **MAW SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT REVIEW**

**Douglas K. Gould  
Boeing Advanced Systems**

# Mission Adaptive Wing Definition

---

The Mission Adaptive Wing combines:

Variable Wing Geometry


A flight control system for automatic wing geometry change according to various pre-determined operating modes

# Objectives


---

- Improved aerodynamic efficiency over a wide range of flight conditions
- Improved maneuver and dynamics capability
  - Response time
  - Load alleviation
- Provide basic data for application to future aircraft systems

# Mission Adaptive Wing Aerodynamic Characteristics



# Increased Aerodynamic Efficiency






## Mission Adaptive Wing Operating Modes

---


- Four modes
  - Maneuver camber control (MCC)
  - Cruise camber control (CCC)
  - Maneuver load control (MLC)
  - Maneuver enhancement and gust alleviation (ME/GA)
- Modes integrated as system
  - MCC and CCC
  - MCC, MLC, ME/GA
  - Verifiable and demonstrable as individual modes or as integrated system

# Maneuver Camber Control—Sustained Maneuver Comparison


---




## Cruise Camber Control




# Maneuver Load Control at Constant Bending Moment ( $8.5 \text{ in-lb} \times 10^6$ )



## Maneuver Load Control at Constant 5g




## Maneuver Enhancement and Gust Alleviation—Typical $N_z$ Response



# **Maneuver Enhancement and Gust Alleviation— Gust Response Summary**

---




## **• Reduction of aircraft open-loop response with ME/GA**

### **Conditions:**



- NZ at cockpit: 39%
- NZ at CG: 23%
- Height: 15,000 ft
- Mach: 0.8
- Weight: 73,000 lb

# **AFTI-F-111 GENERAL ARRANGEMENT MECHANICAL SYSTEM**






# AFTI/F-111 MAW Applicability to Thin and Thick Wings

| AFTI/F-111<br>research configuration<br>t/c max range, % |                                                                                      | Existing aircraft<br>t/c max range, % |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Thick Wing                                               |   | A-7 7                                 |
|                                                          | 9.9 to 5.4                                                                           | C-5 12 to 11                          |
| Thin Wing                                                |  | A-10 16 to 13                         |
|                                                          | 5.3 to 3.7                                                                           | C-130 18 to 12                        |
| Concorde 3 to 2.2                                        |                                                                                      |                                       |
| F-15 6.6 to 3                                            |                                                                                      |                                       |
| F-16 4                                                   |                                                                                      |                                       |


# VARIABLE CAMBER LEADING EDGE WING TIP



Control Blocks Sliding in A Channel

# TRAILING EDGE VARIABLE CAMBER

## FLAP END SEAL




**FULL SCALE LEADING AND TRAILING EDGE FLAP  
TEST**

- **VERIFIED FUNCTION**
- **VERIFIED STATIC LOAD CAPABILITY**
- **VERIFIED CYCLIC CAPABILITY**
- **VERIFIED REQUIRED RATE UNDER LOAD**
- **VERIFIED TRAILING EDGE UP STOP DESIGN**
- **IDENTIFIED PROBLEM AREAS EARLY**


## Variable Camber Benefits—Flight Test Data

### Conditions:

- Wing sweep: 26 deg
- Mach: 0.7



# Variable Camber at Supersonic Speeds— Flight Test Data



## Design Considerations

---

- Mission Adaptive Wing design solutions will vary depending upon overall airplane system requirements
  - Simple flap
  - Smooth variable camber
  - Combinations of smooth variable camber and slotted flap
- An Automatic Flight Control System for operating modes is desirable in all cases to avoid adding to pilot workload

# Conclusions


---

- Feasibility of MAW concept has been demonstrated on a full scale, tactical airplane
- Predicted variable camber performance levels have been matched or exceeded in flight test





## *FLIGHT TEST OVERVIEW*




**LOUIS L. STEERS**  
**NASA AMES-DRYDEN PROJECT MANAGER**

2000-11-12



# PARTICIPANTS




## ORGANIZATION

- MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT (AFFDL, AFFTC, NASA-AMES DRYDEN)

| AMES DRYDEN<br>FLIGHT RESEARCH FACILITY                                                                                                                                                                           | AIR FORCE<br>FLIGHT TEST CENTER                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• FLIGHT SAFETY</li><li>• FLIGHT EXPERIMENTS</li><li>• FLIGHT PLANNING</li><li>• DATA ACQUISITION</li><li>• VEHICLE MAINTENANCE</li><li>• PROVIDE RESEARCH PILOTS</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• FLUTTER</li><li>• PERFORMANCE</li><li>• ASSIST FLIGHT PLANNING<br/>STABILITY AND CONTROL</li><li>• HANDLING QUALITIES</li><li>• PROVIDE FLT TEST PILOTS</li></ul> |



## PROGRAM OBJECTIVES



- DETERMINE THE AERODYNAMIC PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENTS OF A SMOOTH VARIABLE--CAMBER AIRFOIL
- DEVELOP A DATA BASE FOR TRANSITION OF TECHNOLOGY TO FUTURE AIRPLANES

## RESEARCH OBJECTIVES (AFFTC AND NASA)

- OBTAIN AIRCRAFT LIFT AND DRAG DATA TO EVALUATE AIRCRAFT PERFORMANCE IN COMPARISON TO F-111A/TACT CONFIGURATION
- EVALUATE AIRFOIL CHARACTERISTICS USING WING PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS AND COMPUTATIONAL FLUID DYNAMICS
- OBTAIN AERODYNAMIC LOADS DATA ON SYSTEM LINKAGES, FLEXIBLE PANELS, WINGBOX, AND WING CARRY-THROUGH STRUCTURE
- OBTAIN STABILITY AND CONTROL DERIVATIVE DATA TO EVALUATE AERODYNAMIC EFFECTS OF MAW

C3026.058

# MAW DESIGN APPROACH

MAW FLIGHT CONTROL  
ELECTRONICS  
DUAL DIGITAL  
DUAL ANALOG

EXISTING TACT/F-111  
WING BOX

3 SEGMENT FLEXIBLE  
TRAILING EDGE

SINGLE SEGMENT  
FLEXIBLE LEADING  
EDGE

EXISTING F-111  
PITCH CONTROL  
SYSTEM

ADVANCED SUPERCRITICAL  
AIRFOIL

F-111 -- A VERSATILE  
TEST BED

## AFTI/F-111



## ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- 44 FLIGHTS FLOWN
- 105 FLIGHT HOURS ON MAW SYSTEM
- FLIGHT ENVELOPE CLEARED TO MACH 1.3
- AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROLS SYSTEM  
INTEGRATED



## **MANUAL FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM - FLIGHT STATUS**

- **PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION**
- **STABILITY AND CONTROL**
- **BUFFET**
- **PERFORMANCE FLIGHT TEST**
- **AERODYNAMIC LOADS**






## **AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM - FLIGHT STATUS**

- **CRUISE CAMBER CONTROL (CCC)**
- **MANEUVER CAMBER CONTROL (MCC)**
- **MANEUVER LOAD CONTROL (MLC)**
- **MANEUVER ENHANCEMENT / GUST ALLEVIATION**
- **MODE COMBINATIONS**

SESSION 11

MANUAL FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM FLIGHT TEST RESULTS

11817.001




# MISSION ADAPTIVE WING PERFORMANCE FLIGHT TEST

## TEST OBJECTIVES

- DETERMINE TRIMMED AIRCRAFT DRAG
- ASSESS ACCURACY OF WIND TUNNEL  
AND ANALYTICAL DRAG
- PROVIDE DATA FOR MISSION ANALYSIS



# PERFORMANCE FLIGHT TEST CONDITIONS



A1108.W11

# TEST APPROACH

$\Lambda$  26°

TEST CAMBERS

0/2  
5/2  
5/6  
5/10

$\bar{Q}$  300 - 600 PSF

$\Lambda$  58°

TEST CAMBERS

0/2  
5/6  
10/6  
0/-1  
10/-1  
10/2

$\bar{Q}$  300 - 700 PSF

25 FLIGHTS  
13 PERFORMANCE FLIGHTS

## THRUST COMPUTATION

### • PRATT & WHITNEY PRESSURE AREA METHOD

$$F_{i_{pri}} = \psi P_a A_j \quad \psi = \text{GROSS THRUST PARAMETER}$$

$$P_a = \text{ATMOSPHERIC PRESSURE}$$

$$C_{gp} = \text{GROSS THRUST COEFFICIENT}$$

$$\bullet F_{g_{pri}} = \psi P_a A_j C_{gp} \quad A_j = \text{NOZZLE AREA}$$

# DRAG COMPUTATION

$$F_{g_a} = F_g + \Delta F_{N_{AB}}$$

$$C_{L_t} = \frac{n_{z_w} W - F_{g_a} \sin(\alpha - i_F)}{\bar{q}S}$$

$$C_{D_t} = \frac{F_{g_a} \cos(\alpha - i_F) - F_e - n_{x_w} W}{\bar{q}S}$$

WHERE:

$F_{g_a}$  = ADJUSTED GROSS THRUST

$\Delta F_{N_{AB}}$  = AFTER BODY EFFECTS


$F_e$  = RAM DRAG

$i_F$  = ENGINE INCIDENCE ANGLE






# **DRAG POLAR FLIGHT DATA**



A1108.W12




# FLIGHT TEST TO WIND TUNNEL COMPARISON - 26 DEG SWEEP



A1108.W03




# FLIGHT TEST TO WIND TUNNEL COMPARISON - 58 DEG SWEEP



A1108.W07




# FLIGHT TEST TO WIND TUNNEL COMPARISON - TRIMMED HORIZONTAL TAIL




A1108.W05



# **FLIGHT TEST TO WIND TUNNEL COMPARISON - TRIMMED LIFT**




# VARIABLE CAMBER ENVELOPE GENERATION



C3026.024




# DRAG POLAR COMPARISON 26 DEG SWEEP



A1108.W01



# **DRAG POLAR COMPARISON** **58 DEG SWEEP**




A1108.W04





# AFTI TO TACT FLIGHT TEST COMPARISON - DRAG POLAR



A1108.W06


## CONCLUSIONS

- DATA QUALITY  $\pm 30$  COUNTS
- GOOD AGREEMENT WITH WIND TUNNEL
- BENEFITS OVER TACT
- SUITABLE FOR MISSION ANALYSIS

C3026.054

6510TW/TER

LFB



**AFTI/F-111**  
**MISSION ADAPTIVE WING**  
**STABILITY AND CONTROL**  
**TESTING**

C3026.054

## OBJECTIVES

- ENVELOPE CLEARANCE


- CAMBER
- WING SWEEP
- ANGLE OF ATTACK

- AERODYNAMIC INVESTIGATION

- CAMBER EFFECTS
- FLEXIBILITY

# TEST APPROACH

## TEST ENVELOPE



# TEST CONFIGURATION

## LEADING EDGE / TRAILING EDGE CAMBER


| $\Lambda = 26^\circ$ |
|----------------------|
| 0/2    20/18         |
| 0/10   15/10         |
| 5/2    20/15         |
| 5/10                 |

| $\Lambda = 45^\circ$ |
|----------------------|
| 0/2                  |
| 0/4                  |
| 0/6                  |

| $\Lambda = 58^\circ$ |
|----------------------|
| 0/-1   10/6          |
| 0/2                  |
| 5/6                  |
| 10/2                 |

## TYPICAL LATERAL DIRECTIONAL DOUBLET


### STABILITY AUGMENTATION ON



# Stability and Control Parameter Identification

## 26 Degree Wing Sweep Longitudinal Body Axis

CG = 28 PCT MAC  
Q = 125 - 325 PSF



NOTE: Fairings represent  
contractor wind tunnel  
analysis results


Shaded symbols  
denote Mach  
number > 0.70



# Stability and Control Parameter Identification

## 26 Degree Wing Sweep Longitudinal Body Axis

CG = 28 PCT MAC  
Q = 125 - 325 PSF




NOTE: Fairings represent  
contractor wind tunnel  
analysis results

Shaded symbols  
denote Mach  
number > 0.70

# Stability and Control Parameter Identification

26 Degree Wing Sweep  
Longitudinal Body Axis

CG = 28 PCT MAC  
Q = 125 - 325 PSF




NOTE: Fairings represent  
contractor wind tunnel  
analysis results

Shaded symbols  
denote Mach  
number > 0.70

# Stability and Control Parameter Identification

26 Degree Wing Sweep  
Longitudinal Body Axis

CG = 28 PCT MAC  
Q = 125 - 325 PSF



NOTE: Fairings represent  
contractor wind tunnel  
analysis results

Shaded symbols  
denote Mach  
number > 0.70


# Stability and Control Parameter Identification

## 26 Degree Wing Sweep

CG = 28 PCT MAC


Mach = 0.75 - 0.8

Q = 330 - 380 PSF



# FLIGHT TEST RESULTS LATERAL - DIRECTIONAL

WING SWEEP: 26 DEG  
 MACH :  $\leq .96$   
 CAMBER : 0/2



C3026 050

## CONCLUSIONS

- WIND TUNNEL VALIDITY
  - FAIR AGREEMENT WITH FLIGHT TEST
  - SOME DISPARITIES NOTED
- ELEVATED ANGLE OF ATTACK
  - UNCAMBERED: SIMILAR TO TACT
  - CAMBERED: LESS STABLE THAN TACT

# **AFTI/F-111 -Structural Loads- Flight Test Results**


**Steve Thornton  
Ames Dryden Flight Research Facility**

## **NASA FLIGHT LOADS PROGRAM OBJECTIVES**


- **Safety of Flight**
- **Loads Envelope Expansion**
- **Loads Measurements for  
NASA Flight Loads Research**
- **Wing Deflection Measurements  
supporting NASA and Air Force  
Aerodynamic Research**



# Loads Envelope Expansion Matrix




# STRAIN GAGE INSTRUMENTATION




C3026.071

# CRITICAL LOADS PARAMETERS



C3028.010


## Wing Pivot Plate Stress



11-2-87  
ST


# AFTI/F-111 FLIGHT LOADS ENVELOPE

$\Lambda = 26^\circ$  CAMBER = 0/2,10/2




# AFTI/F-111 FLIGHT LOADS ENVELOPE

$\Lambda = 26^\circ$  CAMBER = 5/10 DEG




# AFTI/F-111 FLIGHT LOADS ENVELOPE

$\Lambda = 26^\circ$       CAMBER = 5/15




# AFTI/F-111 FLIGHT LOADS ENVELOPE

$\Lambda = 26^\circ$       CAMBER = 10/18





## MANEUVER LOAD CONTROL (MLC)



## MLC TEST APPROACH

Fly MLC configurations using manually positioned flaps to:

- Quantify bending moment reduction
- Determine trim load increase
- Determine effect of dynamic pressure
- Determine effect of Mach number
- Determine effect of flap position

## **SIMULATED MLC VARIABLES INVESTIGATED**


### Independent Variables

Mach Number  
Dynamic Pressure  
Flap Position  
Gross Weight

### Dependent Variables

Wing Bending Moments  
Horizontal Tail Trim Loads  
Load Factor  
Angle of Attack


# FLIGHT LOADS RESEARCH TEST POINTS



# FLIGHT 207

QBAR = 300. MACH = .60


- O - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/10
- Δ - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/4
- + - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/-1



# FLIGHT 207

QBPR = 300. MACH = .60


- O - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/10
- Δ - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/4
- + - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/-1



# FLIGHT 207

QBAR = 300. MACH = .60


- O - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/10
- Δ - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/4
- + - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/-1



# FLIGHT 207

QBAR = 300. MACH = .60

- O - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/10
- Δ - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/4
- + - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/-1






# FLIGHT 207

QBAR = 300. MACH = .60


- O - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/10
- Δ - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/4
- + - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/-1



# FLIGHT 207

QBAR = 300. MACH = .60


- O - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/10
- Δ - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/4
- + - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/-1



# FLIGHT 207

QBAR = 300. MACH = .60

- - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/10
- △ - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/4
- + - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/-1




# FLIGHT 207

QBAR = 300. MACH = .60

- MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/10
- MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/4
- MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/-1


○ Δ +



# FLIGHT 207

QBAR = 300. MACH = .60


- - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/10
- △ - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/4
- + - MANEUVER 17 CAMBER 5/10/-1



# FLIGHT 210

QBAR = 450. MACH = .90


- O -- MANEUVER 14 CAMBER 5/10/10
- Δ -- MANEUVER 14 CAMBER 5/10/4
- + -- MANEUVER 14 CAMBER 5/10/-1



# FLIGHT 211


QBAR = 800. MACH = .80

- O - MANEUVER 8F CAMBER 5/10/10
- Δ - MANEUVER 8K CAMBER 5/10/4
- + - MANEUVER 80 CAMBER 5/10/-1



# POTENTIAL LOADS ENVELOPE W/MLC

$\Lambda = 26^\circ$  CAMBER = 5/10 DEG







AFTI/F-111

# MLC HORIZONTAL TAIL TRIM LOADS

Mach = .60      Qbar = 300 psf



# AFTI/F-111 FLIGHT DEFLECTION MEASUREMENT SYSTEM



C3020.016

## MLC PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

- 10 - 20% Reduction in Wing Root Bending Moment
- 5-15% Reductions in Other Wing Load Parameters
- Potential for Significant Expansion of Basic Loads Envelope

# **Measured and Predicted Pressure Distributions on the AFTI/F-111 Mission Adaptive Wing**

**Lannie D. Webb**  
NASA Ames Dryden Flight Research Facility  
Edwards, California

**William E. McCain and Lucinda A. Rose**  
PRC Systems Services  
Edwards, California


# Objectives

**NASA**  
AD83-861


- Establish wing surface pressure database
  - Span effects
  - Mach number effects
  - Angle-of-attack effects
  - Camber effects
- Compare flight and wind-tunnel data
- Compare MAW and TACT data for design changes
- Compare flight and predicted data

# Smooth Variable Camber of the MAW

NASA  
AD86-874



# Static Pressure Instrumentation



## Flight Data Acquisition Techniques and Data Selection

- Trim for one minute
- Slow wind-up turns to short stabilized conditions (sustained angle-of-attack/Mach number turns) or push-over pull-ups for low angles of attack
- Wind-tunnel conditions matched
  - $4^\circ \leq \alpha \leq 12^\circ$
  - $0.6 \leq M_\infty \leq 0.90$
  - $\delta_{LE/TE} = 0/2 \text{ --- } 20/18$

- 
- Limits for selection of data

$$M_\infty = M_{\infty AIM} \pm 0.01$$

$$\alpha = \alpha_{AIM} \pm 0.25^\circ$$


$$\beta = 0^\circ \pm 0.25^\circ$$

$$H = \text{Quasi-Steady-State}$$



# Time History for a Typical Maneuver

NASA  
AD88-8763




## Flight Data Base Collected

- $M_\infty$  = 0.6, 0.8, 0.85\*, and 0.90
  - $\alpha$  =  $4^\circ$ ,  $8^\circ$ ,  $10^\circ$ , and  $12^\circ$
  - $\delta_{LE/TE}$  =  $0/2^*$ ,  $5/2$ ,  $5/6$ ,  $5/10$ ,  
 $10/2$ ,  $0/10$ ,  $10/10$
  - $q_\infty$  = 300/600 lb/ft<sup>2</sup>
  - $R_n$  =  $2.3 \times 10^6$ /ft (  $26 \times 10^6$  based on mean  
aerodynamic chord )
  - Miscellaneous data---from other disciplines ( loads, buffet,  
automatic modes, etc. )
- 
- \* Wing cruise design conditions (  $0.45 C_L$  )
  - Conditions underlined were tested at  $q_\infty = 600$  lb/ft<sup>2</sup>  
in addition to  $q_\infty = 300$  lb/ft<sup>2</sup> for all the points

# Steady Chordwise Pressure Distributions

## $M_\infty = 0.60$ and $\delta_{LE/TE} = 0/2$


NASA  
AD89-964



# Steady Chordwise Pressure Distributions

$M_\infty = 0.85$  and  $\sigma_{LE/TE} = 0/2$


NASA  
AD634045



# Effect of Small Mach Number Changes

$\eta = 0.76$ ,  $\delta_{LE/TE} = 0/2$ , and  $\alpha = 8^\circ$


NASA  
AD99-873



# Effects of Angle of Attack


$\eta = 0.76$  and  $M_\infty = 0.85$

NASA  
AD88-832



# Effects of Three Leading-Edge Surface Deflections



$\eta = 0.76$  and  $M_{\infty} = 0.85$



# Effects of Three Trailing-Edge Surface Deflections

$\eta = 0.76$  and  $M_\infty = 0.85$


NASA  
AD 682 866






# Section $c_n$ Versus $\alpha$

$M_\infty = 0.85$  and  $\delta_{LE/TE} = 0.12$



# Camber Combinations for Optimum $c_n$ Versus $\alpha$ $\eta = 0.76$ and $M_\infty = 0.85$

NASA  
AD88-868



## **Transonic Airfoil Analysis**

### **The TAA Code**

- Two-dimensional, nonconservative, full-potential flow equation with boundary layer approximation
- Mach number adjusted by simple sweep theory for three-dimensional comparison ---  $M_{\infty} \cos \Lambda_{LE}$
- Subsonic production code
- Used for TACT and MAW design analysis


### **3-D CFD Calculations in Progress**

- Boppe ( transonic small disturbance theory )
- FLO 22.NM ( modified full potential theory )

# COMPARISON OF MEASURED AND CALCULATED UPPER-SURFACE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS

$\eta=0.76$ ,  $M_\infty=0.60$ ,  $\delta_{LE/TE}=0/2$


|     |              | $\alpha$ | $C_n$ |
|-----|--------------|----------|-------|
| ○   | FLIGHT       | 7.6      | 0.473 |
| ●   | WIND TUNNEL  | 7.8      | 0.470 |
| --- | TRR (2D)     | 8.0      | 0.553 |
| --- | FLO22NM (3D) | 8.0      | 0.407 |
| --- | BOPPE (3D)   | 8.0      | 0.412 |



# COMPARISON OF MEASURED AND CALCULATED SURFACE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS


$\eta=0.76$ ,  $M_\infty=0.60$ ,  $\delta_{LE/TE}=0/2$

|           | $\alpha$ | $C_n$ |
|-----------|----------|-------|
| O FLIGHT  | 7.5      | 0.473 |
| — FLO22NM | 8.0      | 0.407 |
| --- BOPPE | 8.0      | 0.412 |



# COMPARISON OF MEASURED AND CALCULATED UPPER-SURFACE PRESSURE DISTRIBUTIONS

$\eta=0.76$ ,  $M_\infty = 0.85$ ,  $\delta_{LE/TE} = 0/2$



# Comparison of TACT and MAW Steady Chord-wise Pressure Distributions



$\eta = 0.76$  and  $M_\infty = 0.70$

NASA  
AD88-871

MAW flight data    TACT flight data


○    ●     $C_{p_{U.S.}}$

□    ■     $C_{p_{L.S.}}$



# Comparison of TACT and MAW Steady Chord- wise Pressure Distributions $\eta = 0.76$ and $M_\infty = 0.86$

NASA  
AD9-372





## Wing Pressure Research Remaining

- Complete some supersonic priority 2 points and repeat some priority 1 points
- Analysis data:  
effects of ---  $\alpha$ ,  $M_\infty$ ,  $\delta_{LE/TE}$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $R_n$ ,  $q_\infty$ ,  $x/c$ , etc.
- Compare with wind-tunnel and predicted data
- Compare wing twist data from the Flight Deflection Measurement System, to wing pressure measurements
- Final report ( including a data base )

## Concluding Remarks

- **MAW** flight data compared with wind-tunnel data
  - In general, wing pressures agreed well
- **MAW** flight data compared with **TACT** data
  - Design changes evaluated
- **MAW** chordwise pressures were integrated
  - Illustrated advantages of variable camber



# AIRCRAFT BUFFET CHARACTERISTICS

EDWARD FRIEND  
NASA AMES DRYDEN

WILLIAM TOTTON  
WOODSIDE SUMMIT

# Maneuver Camber Control



- AUTOMATICALLY SETS THE WING CAMBER TO OBTAIN MAXIMUM LIFT/DRAG USING TABLE LOOKUP

## Conditions:

- Altitude: 25,000
- Mach: 0.7
- Sustained maneuver (33% improved)

## Legend:

- With MAW
- - - Without MAW



- SUSTAINED MANEUVER COMPARISON



# **MAW BUFFET STUDY**

- OBJECTIVES
  - DETERMINE BUFFET INTENSITY RISE (BIR) BOUNDARIES AND INTENSITY CHARACTERISTICS FOR A MATRIX OF WING-FLAP SETTINGS
  - COMPARE RESULTS WITH F-111A AND TACT FLIGHT DATA
  - COMPARE RESULTS WITH WIND TUNNEL STUDIES



# PLANVIEW OF AFTI-F111 AIRPLANE

- ACCELEROMETER LOCATIONS DISCUSSED
- OTHER ACCELEROMETER LOCATIONS






# DATA PROCESSING

- INSTRUMENTATION
  - HIGH FREQUENCY NORMAL ACCELEROMETERS
    - WING TIP
    - HORIZONTAL TAIL TIP
    - COCKPIT
  - 160 SAMPLES PER SECOND
- DATA REDUCTION
  - EXISTING COMPUTER PROGRAM
    - DIGITAL FILTERING/RMS DATA
  - STABILITY AND CONTROL DATA LISTINGS
  - TIME HISTORIES
- GROUND TESTS
  - NATURAL FREQUENCIES OF STRUCTURE

# TIME HISTORY OF WINDUP - TURN MANEUVER



$M \approx 0.83$   
 ALTITUDE  $\approx 30,000$  FT  
 $\delta F = 0.2$








# TIME HISTORY OF WINDUP - TURN MANEUVER

$M \approx 0.83$


ALTITUDE  $\approx 30,000$  FT

$\delta_F = 5/15$






# VARIATION OF $C_{NA}$ WITH ANGLE OF ATTACK AT SELECTED WING-FLAP POSITIONS $M \approx 0.70, 300 \bar{q}$






# VARIATION OF CNA WITH ANGLE OF ATTACK AT SELECTED WING-FLAP POSITIONS $M \approx 0.80, 300 \bar{q}$







# VARIATION OF $C_{NA}$ WITH ANGLE OF ATTACK AT SELECTED WING-FLAP POSITIONS $M \approx 0.88, 300 \bar{\eta}$






# BUFFET BOUNDARIES






# EFFECTS OF LEADING AND TRAILING EDGE DEFLECTIONS ON THE BUFFET BOUNDARY AT $M \approx 0.80$






# EFFECTS OF LEADING AND TRAILING EDGE DEFLECTIONS ON THE BUFFET BOUNDARY AT $M \approx 0.88$






# **BUFFET BOUNDARY SUMMARY FOR THE F-111 SERIES AIRPLANES**







# COMPARISON OF FLIGHT AND WIND TUNNEL BUFFET BOUNDARIES






## CONCLUDING REMARKS

- BUFFET LEVELS EXPERIENCED WOULD BE REGARDED AS MODERATE FOR THE ENVELOPE FLOWN FOR THE BUFFET MANEUVERS ( $300 \bar{q}$  FLIGHT CONDITIONS).
- THE WING-FLAP CONFIGURATIONS EVALUATED OFFER SIGNIFICANT GAINS IN THE BUFFET BOUNDARIES, BUFFET INTENSITY CHARACTERISTICS AND AIRPLANE NORMAL FORCE CURVE CHARACTERISTICS, WHEN COMPARED WITH THE CLEAN WING.
- THE BUFFET BOUNDARIES FOR THE WING-FLAP SETTINGS WHICH SHOWED THE MOST IMPROVEMENT WERE CONSIDERABLY BETTER THAN THE TACT FLIGHT DATA.
- FLIGHT BUFFET BOUNDARIES WERE GENERALLY LOWER THAN THE WIND TUNNEL DATA FOR SIMILAR WING-FLAP CONFIGURATIONS.

SESSION III

AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT



**AFTI / F-111 MISSION  
ADAPTIVE WING**

## **AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM**

## **OBJECTIVES AND REQUIREMENTS**

**A. SMITCHENS  
AFWAL/FIGX  
21 JULY 1988**



## AGENDA

---

- BACKGROUND
- AFCS PROGRAM GOALS
- DOMINANT AFCS CONCERNS
- CONTROL MODE REQUIREMENTS



## BACKGROUND

---

- AFTI/F-111 AND AFTI/F-16 PROGRAMS
  - TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION
  - MISSION LEVEL BENEFIT DEMONSTRATION
- SMOOTH VARIABLE CAMBER WING
  - AERODYNAMICS, LOW OBSERVABLES PAYOFFS
  - POSSIBLY, SINGLE LEADING AND TRAILING EDGE SURFACES
- CANDIDATE MISSIONS
  - BOMBERS
  - FIGHTERS
  - TRANSPORTS
- ISSUE: MAW IMPACT ON FLIGHT CONTROLS



## AFCS PROGRAM GOALS

- DEMONSTRATE MAW AND FLIGHT CONTROLS COMPATIBILITY
  - VEHICLE STABILITY AND CONTROL
  - HANDLING QUALITIES
- EXPLORE MAW AND MISSION NEED COMPATIBILITY

- HIGH-G MANEUVERING
- CONFIGURATION VARIATIONS
- WEAPON DELIVERY
- LOW ALTITUDE PENETRATION
- FUEL EFFICIENCY

| FIGHTERS | BOMBERS | TRANSPORTS |
|----------|---------|------------|
| X        |         |            |
| X        | X       | X          |
| X        | X       |            |
| X        | X       |            |
| X        | X       | X          |

- ADVANCE CONTROLS TECHNOLOGY
  - NEW CAPABILITIES



## DOMINANT AFCS CONCERNS

---

- SURFACE POSITIONING PRECISION AND REPEATABILITY
- CONTROL SYSTEM BANDWIDTH
- CONTROL POWER
- STRUCTURAL LOAD CONTROL
- RESPONSE TO SEVERAL SIMULTANEOUS CONTROL DEMANDS
- UNCERTAINTY MANAGEMENT
- NO INCREASE IN PILOTING WORKLOAD
- FLIGHT SAFETY





## CONTROL MODES

---

- ROLL CONTROL
- CRUISE CAMBER CONTROL
- MANEUVER LOAD CONTROL
- MANEUVER ENHANCEMENT
- GUST ALLEVIATION

SELECTABLE INDIVIDUALLY OR COLLECTIVELY



## CONTROL MODE REQUIREMENTS

### ROLL CONTROL

#### PROBLEM:

- MAW/AFCS COMBINATION MAY DEGRADE A) VEHICLE STABILITY AND CONTROL OR B) FLYING QUALITIES DUE TO:
  - SURFACE POSITIONING ERRORS, HYSTERESIS
  - BANDWIDTH LIMITATIONS
  - CONTROL POWER LIMITATIONS

#### REQUIREMENT

- PROVIDE MIL-F-8785B FLYING QUALITIES
- PRIORITY MODE-ALWAYS AVAILABLE
- SMOOTH AND EFFICIENT



## CONTROL MODE REQUIREMENTS CRUISE CAMBER CONTROL

### PROBLEM:

- FUEL EFFICIENCY REQUIRES WING OPTIMALITY
- LARGE DATA BASE REQUIRED TO COVER FLIGHT ENVELOPE
- WIND TUNNEL DATA UNCERTAINTIES MAY LIMIT WING EFFICIENCY
- STORES VARIATIONS MAY COMPROMISE OPTIMALITY
- WING MANAGEMENT COULD INCREASE PILOTING WORKLOAD

### REQUIREMENT

- AUTOMATICALLY SELECT OPTIMUM LEADING AND TRAILING EDGE POSITIONS  
CONSISTENT WITH THE FLIGHT CONDITION
  - RAPIDLY
  - BETTER PERFORMANCE THAN TABLE LOOK-UP
  - EXTERNAL DISTURBANCE ROBUST



## CONTROL MODE REQUIREMENTS MANEUVER LOAD CONTROL

---

### PROBLEM:

- HIGH-G MANUEVERING STRUCTURAL LOADS COULD LIMIT AVAILABLE LIFT
  - WING BENDING STRESS ALLEVIATION
  - CONTROL POWER ADEQUACY

### REQUIREMENT

- SHIFT CENTER OF PRESSURE INBOARD AS A FUNCTION OF WING BENDING STRESS
- MAINTAIN MAXIMUM LIFT-TO-DRAG RATIO FOR BOTH STEADY STATE AND MANUEVERING FLIGHT




## CONTROL MODE REQUIREMENTS MANEUVER ENHANCEMENT

### PROBLEM:

- WEAPON DELIVERY AND OTHER FLIGHT MODES REQUIRE PRECISION ATTITUDE CONTROL
  - ACCURATE PITCH POINTING
  - CONTROL SYSTEM BANDWIDTH
  - SURFACE POSITIONING PRECISION

### REQUIREMENT

- PROVIDE QUICKENED PITCH RESPONSE
- ELIMINATE INITIAL REDUCED-G RESPONSE





# CONTROL MODE REQUIREMENTS GUST ALLEVIATION

## PROBLEM:

- LOW ALTITUDE PENETRATION RIDE QUALITIES MAY BE LESS THAN DESIRABLE
  - SURFACE POSITIONING PRECISION
  - CONTROL POWER
  - DYNAMIC RESPONSE

## REQUIREMENT

- PROVIDE DECREASED RESPONSE TO TURBULENCE REPRESENTATIVE OF THAT ENCOUNTERED IN LOW ALTITUDE PENETRATION

# **CRUISE CAMBER CONTROL (CCC) MODE DEVELOPMENT**

**Joseph M. Hall  
Boeing Advanced Systems**

# Mission-Adaptive Wing

## Cruise Camber Control

Objective: Maximize vehicle velocity during straight and level flight at constant power setting  
Optimization strategy:

Perturb flap

Measure velocity




Use velocity measure to realize first order predictor model

Perturb flap


Measurements: longitudinal acceleration

Applicable mission regions:

Compare measured velocity with predicted  
If predicted is less, beneficial flap change  
Reinforce beneficial flap change; otherwise reverse flap direction



Performance improvement:



Future applications:


- Mission: tactical, strategic, refuel, airlift
- Aircraft: fighter, bomber, long-range bomber, reconnaissance, reconnaissance-strike, tanker, cargo




# CCC MODE DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY

- I INITIAL ANALYSIS AND MODE DESIGN ACCOMPLISHED  
WITH LINEARIZED DRAG EQUATION
- II SYSTEM PERFORMANCE VERIFIED ON 6 DOF FLIGHT  
SIMULATION WITH HARDWARE (FLIGHT CONTROL  
COMPUTERS) IN THE LOOP
- III INITIAL FLIGHT TESTING LOOKED PROMISING
- IV SUBSEQUENT FLIGHT TESTING REVEALED MAJOR  
PROBLEMS
- V REVISION OF MODE CURRENTLY IN PROGRESS

M








DIETZEN CORPORATION  
MADE IN U.S.A.

NO 340R-MP DIETZEN GRAPH PAPER  
MILLIMETER




## **CCC MODE FUTURE PLANS**

- I EVALUATE THE USE OF AIRSPEED INSTEAD OF LONGITUDINAL ACCELERATION ON THE FLIGHT SIMULATOR**
- II REVISE THE CCC SOFTWARE TO IMPLEMENT THIS CHANGE**
- III FLIGHT TEST THE REVISED SYSTEM**


# **MANEUVER CAMBER CONTROL (MCC) MODE DEVELOPMENT**

**George E. Lewis  
Boeing Advanced Systems**

# MAW: An Efficient Shape for All Flight Conditions



Mission Adaptive Wing,  
One Wing for All Conditions



Conventional Wings




Subsonic



Transonic





Supersonic






# Increased Aerodynamic Efficiency (AFTI/Tact)







MCCIN IS TRUE IF THE FAILURE DETECTION SYSTEM HAS NOT DECLARED A FAILURE IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING INPUT SIGNALS: TFUEL, ZGALC, QBAR, MACH, STOW AND WSPOS.

## MANEUVER CAMBER CONTROL SYSTEM





LEADING EDGE COMMANDS FOR 26 DEGREE WING SWEEP

| CLMCC | $M = 0$ |        | $M = 0.30$ |        | $M = 0.6$ |        | $M = 0.70$ |        | $M = 0.8$ |        | $M = 0.85$ |        | $M = .875$ |        | $M = 0.9$ |        | $M = 0.95$ |        |
|-------|---------|--------|------------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|--------|------------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|--------|
|       | LEMCCI  | LEMCCI | LEMCCI     | LEMCCI | LEMCCI    | LEMCCI | LEMCCI     | LEMCCI | LEMCCI    | LEMCCI | LEMCCI     | LEMCCI | LEMCCI     | LEMCCI | LEMCCI    | LEMCCI | LEMCCI     | LEMCCI |
| -.4   | -2.5    | -2.5   | -2.4       | -2.4   | -2.4      | -2.3   | -2.3       | -2.3   | -2.3      | -2.3   | -2.2       | -2.2   | -2.2       | -2.2   | -2.2      | -2.2   | -2.2       | -2.2   |
| -.3   | -2.0    | -2.0   | -2.0       | -2.0   | -2.0      | -2.0   | -2.0       | -2.0   | -2.0      | -2.0   | -2.0       | -2.0   | -2.0       | -2.0   | -2.0      | -2.0   | -2.0       | -2.0   |
| -.2   | -1.4    | -1.4   | -1.5       | -1.5   | -1.6      | -1.6   | -1.6       | -1.6   | -1.6      | -1.6   | -1.7       | -1.7   | -1.7       | -1.8   | -1.8      | -1.8   | -1.8       | -1.8   |
| -.1   | -0.8    | -0.8   | -1.0       | -1.0   | -1.1      | -1.3   | -1.3       | -1.3   | -1.3      | -1.3   | -1.4       | -1.4   | -1.4       | -1.5   | -1.5      | -1.5   | -1.5       | -1.5   |
| 0.0   | -0.2    | -0.2   | -0.4       | -0.4   | -0.5      | -0.7   | -0.7       | -0.7   | -0.7      | -0.7   | -1.0       | -1.0   | -1.0       | -1.3   | -1.3      | -1.3   | -1.3       | -1.3   |
| .1    | 0.4     | 0.4    | 0.2        | 0.2    | 0.1       | -0.4   | -0.4       | -0.4   | -0.4      | -0.8   | -1.0       | -1.0   | -1.0       | -1.1   | -1.1      | -1.1   | -1.1       | -1.1   |
| .2    | 1.2     | 1.2    | 0.9        | 0.9    | 0.7       | 0.0    | 0.0        | 0.0    | 0.0       | -0.4   | -0.7       | -0.7   | -0.7       | -0.8   | -0.8      | -0.8   | -0.8       | -0.8   |
| .3    | 1.9     | 1.9    | 1.1        | 1.1    | 1.1       | 0.4    | 0.4        | 0.4    | 0.4       | 0.0    | 0.0        | 0.0    | 0.0        | -0.6   | -0.6      | -0.6   | -0.6       | -0.6   |
| .4    | 2.7     | 2.7    | 2.0        | 2.0    | 1.6       | 0.9    | 0.9        | 0.9    | 0.9       | 0.4    | 0.4        | 0.4    | 0.4        | -0.4   | -0.4      | -0.4   | -0.4       | -0.4   |
| .5    | 3.5     | 3.5    | 2.7        | 2.7    | 2.3       | 1.4    | 1.4        | 1.4    | 1.4       | 0.8    | 0.3        | 0.3    | 0.3        | -0.1   | -0.1      | -0.1   | -0.1       | -0.1   |
| .6    | 4.5     | 4.5    | 3.4        | 3.4    | 2.9       | 2.0    | 2.0        | 2.0    | 2.0       | 1.3    | 0.7        | 0.7    | 0.7        | 0.2    | 0.2       | 0.2    | 0.2        | 0.2    |
| .7    | 5.5     | 5.5    | 4.2        | 4.2    | 3.6       | 2.6    | 2.6        | 2.6    | 2.6       | 1.7    | 1.2        | 1.2    | 1.2        | 0.5    | 0.5       | 0.5    | 0.5        | 0.5    |
| .8    | 6.7     | 6.7    | 5.0        | 5.0    | 4.3       | 3.2    | 3.2        | 3.2    | 3.2       | 2.3    | 1.6        | 1.6    | 1.6        | 0.8    | 0.8       | 0.8    | 0.8        | 0.8    |
| .9    | 8.2     | 8.2    | 5.8        | 5.8    | 5.1       | 3.8    | 3.8        | 3.8    | 3.8       | 2.9    | 2.2        | 2.2    | 2.2        | 1.2    | 1.2       | 1.2    | 1.2        | 1.2    |
| 1.0   | 9.7     | 9.7    | 6.7        | 6.7    | 5.8       | 4.6    | 4.6        | 4.6    | 4.6       | 3.6    | 2.7        | 2.7    | 2.7        | 1.6    | 1.6       | 1.6    | 1.6        | 1.6    |
| 1.1   | 12.2    | 12.2   | 7.7        | 7.7    | 6.7       | 5.5    | 5.5        | 5.5    | 5.5       | 4.4    | 3.4        | 3.4    | 3.4        | 2.2    | 2.2       | 2.2    | 2.2        | 2.2    |
| 1.2   | 16.0    | 16.0   | 9.0        | 9.0    | 7.7       | 6.5    | 6.5        | 6.5    | 6.5       | 5.4    | 4.4        | 4.4    | 4.4        | 2.9    | 2.9       | 2.9    | 2.9        | 2.9    |
| 1.3   | 22.0    | 22.0   | 10.4       | 10.4   | 6.7       | 7.7    | 7.7        | 7.7    | 7.7       | 7.0    | 6.3        | 6.3    | 6.3        | 4.2    | 4.2       | 4.2    | 4.2        | 4.2    |
| 1.4   | 22.0    | 22.0   | 12.4       | 12.4   | 10.9      | 10.2   | 10.2       | 10.2   | 10.2      | 10.0   | 10.0       | 10.0   | 10.0       | 10.0   | 10.0      | 10.0   | 10.0       | 10.0   |
| 1.5   | 22.0    | 22.0   | 16.2       | 16.2   | 15.3      | 14.7   | 14.7       | 14.7   | 15.0      | 18.0   | 22.0       | 22.0   | 22.0       | 22.0   | 22.0      | 22.0   | 22.0       | 22.0   |
| 1.6   | 22.0    | 22.0   | 22.0       | 22.0   | 22.0      | 22.0   | 22.0       | 22.0   | 22.0      | 22.0   | 22.0       | 22.0   | 22.0       | 22.0   | 22.0      | 22.0   | 22.0       | 22.0   |


$M = 0.94$   
 $M = 1.0$   
 $M = 1.5$   
 $M = 2.0$   
 $M = 2.5$

157

$$M = 0.94$$

$$M = 1.0 - 2.5$$
158





EFFECT OF MCC MODE ON MAXIMUM SUSTAINABLE LEVEL FLIGHT TURN 25,000 FT.

# **MANEUVER LOAD CONTROL (MLC) MODE DEVELOPMENT**

**George E. Lewis  
Boeing Advanced Systems**

# Maneuver Load Control System (MLC) Objectives

---

- AUTOMATICALLY COMMAND TRAILING EDGE FLAP POSITION TO SHIFT THE WING CENTER OF PRESSURE INBOARD, MAINTAINING WING ROOT BENDING MOMENT AT A LIMIT LEVEL WHILE CONTINUING TO INCREASE AIRPLANE "G" LEVEL
- AIRCRAFT SURFACES NOT USED FOR MLC WILL CONTINUE TO RESPOND TO PILOT INPUTS WHEN MLC IS IN OPERATION
- AIRCRAFT WILL RESPOND IN NORMAL MANNER TO OTHER ENABLED MODES AT OPERATING CONDITIONS BELOW 95% OF WING ROOT BENDING LIMIT

# Maneuver Load Control Approach


---

- COMPUTE WING CRITICAL BENDING MOMENT VALUE FOR EACH WING BASED ON ACCELERATIONS, WEIGHT, DYNAMIC PRESSURE, MACH NUMBER, AND LEADING AND TRAILING EDGE POSITIONS.
- COMPARE AGAINST MLC THRESHOLD BENDING MOMENT EQUAL TO 95% OF ALLOWABLE BENDING MOMENT.
- IF COMPUTED BENDING MOMENT EXCEEDS THRESHOLD, MLC SYSTEM COMMANDS OUTBOARD FLAP UP TO REDISTRIBUTE AIRLOAD.
- AIRCRAFT CONTINUES TO RESPOND NORMALLY TO PILOT COMMANDS, BOTH BEFORE AND DURING MLC OPERATION.


## Maneuver Load Control


### Reduce wing root bending moment

Compare computed bending moment against MLC threshold bending moment, if threshold exceeded MLC commands the outboard flap up to redistribute the airload



# Effect of MLC on Wing/Body Pressure Distribution






MANEUVER LOAD CONTROL SYSTEM


# AFTI/F-111 New Control System Block Diagram

CONTROL SYSTEM DIAGRAM







# MLC COMMAND SYSTEM




## MLC BENDING MOMENT CALCULATION





# MLC COMMAND GENERATION




• THIS LIMIT IS A FUNCTION OF AVERAGE IMPACT PRESSURE (QCAVE) PER PARA. 3.3.8.3 LIMITING OF D365-10062-1.




## 170



MLC/NON MLC COMMAND SWITCHING



MANEUVER LOAD CONTROL (MLC) PERFORMANCE ON AFTI/F-111 FLIGHT SIMULATOR  
WITH MANUAL 14,000 FT MACH 0.9 SWEEP 26



AIRPLANE RESPONSES - WING LOAD RELIEF  
(NO CROSSFEED TO STABILON)

# **MANEUVER ENHANCEMENT/GUST ALLEVIATION (ME/GA) MODE DEVELOPMENT**


**Daniel C. Norman  
Boeing Advanced Systems**



## PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

- MANEUVER ENHANCEMENT
  - $n_z$  RESPONSE TIME REDUCED BY 50%
  - ACCEPTABLE ACTUATOR RATES
  - STEADY-STATE WING CAMBER TO MAXIMIZE LIFT/DRAG
  - SMOOTH RESPONSE WITH MINIMAL OVERSHOOT
  - NO DEGRADATION OF GUST RESPONSE
- GUST ALLEVIATION
  - GUST INDUCED RMS G'S REDUCED BY 50%
  - ACCEPTABLE ACTUATOR RATES
  - GOOD STABILITY MARGINS
  - NO DEGRADATION OF COMMAND RESPONSE
- PERFORMANCE EVALUATED BY COMPARING RESPONSE OF ME/GA MODE TO EXISTING COMMAND AUGMENTATION SYSTEM (CAS)

# ME/GA FLIGHT DEMONSTRATION ENVELOPE




## DESIGN APPROACH


- LINEAR REGULATOR
- EXPLICIT MODEL FOLLOWING
- FREQUENCY SHAPED CRITERIA
- ROBUST KALMAN FILTER
- CONTROLLER REDUCTION VIA MODEL RESIDUALIZATION

## **DESIGN PROBLEMS**

- Existing Control Loop With Fixed Adaptive Gain
- No Direct Access To Horizontal Tail Actuator
- Strong Adverse Coupling Between Tail and Trailing Edge
- Extremely Nonlinear Wing Characteristics



EXISTING LONGITUDINAL COMMAND AUGMENTATION SYSTEM (CAS)



ROOT LOCUS OF EXISTING CAS  
AS A FUNCTION OF ADAPTIVE GAIN


# COUPLING BETWEEN STABILON AND TRAILING EDGE FLAP

- STABILON GENERATES SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE LIFT  
RELATIVE TO TRAILING EDGE

$$\frac{\partial \dot{w} / \partial \delta TE}{\partial \dot{w} / \partial \delta STAB} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{VARIES FROM 1.3 TO 2.1} \\ \text{AT 1g TRIM CONDITIONS} \\ \text{IN ME/GA DESIGN ENVELOPE} \end{array}$$


- TRAILING EDGE GENERATES SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE PITCHING  
MOMENT RELATIVE TO STABILON

$$\frac{\partial \dot{q} / \partial \delta TE}{\partial \dot{q} / \partial \delta STAB} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{VARIES FROM .47 TO .55} \\ \text{AT 1g TRIM CONDITIONS} \\ \text{IN ME/GA DESIGN ENVELOPE} \end{array}$$




TRAILING EDGE EFFECTIVENESS (VERTICAL ACCELERATION)  
 AS A FUNCTION OF WING CAMBER, MACH .8, 15000 ft,  
 1.0g LOAD FACTOR





TRAILING EDGE EFFECTIVENESS (PITCH ACCELERATION)  
AS A FUNCTION OF WING CAMBER, MACH .8, 15000 ft.,  
1.0g LOAD FACTOR

# CLOSED LOOP CONFIGURATION OF ME/GA MODE




## **PERFORMANCE SUMMARY**

- **STABILITY CHARACTERISTICS**
- **GUST RESPONSE**
- **COMMAND RESPONSE**
- **HANDLING QUALITIES**


| MODE                               | $K_{AD}$      | SHORT PERIOD<br>DAMPING        | ADAPTIVE MODE<br>DAMPING       |
|------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| EXISTING<br>AUGMENTATION<br>SYSTEM | NORMAL        | $.42 \leq \zeta_{SP} \leq .60$ | $\zeta_{AM} = .3$              |
|                                    | FIXED<br>GAIN | $.26 \leq \zeta_{SP} \leq .45$ | $.20 \leq \zeta_{AM} \leq .59$ |
| ME/GA                              | FIXED<br>GAIN | $.41 \leq \zeta_{SP} \leq 1.0$ | $.40 \leq \zeta_{AM} \leq .66$ |

EFFECT OF FIXING ADAPTIVE GAIN.  $K_{AD}$ , ON DAMPING RATIO OF SHORT PERIOD AND ADAPTIVE MODES IN ME/GA DEMONSTRATION ENVELOPE

# HORIZONTAL TAIL CONTROL LOOP FREQUENCY RESPONSE COMPARISON OF ME/GA MODE AND EXISTING CAS 15 000 ft, MACH .8, 1.0g LOAD FACTOR




# **AFTI/F-111 COMMAND RESPONSE** **Mach .8 15,000 FT 26 DEG SWEEP RESPONSE TO 1G STEP COMMAND**



BOEING ADVANCED SYSTEMS

# AFTI/F-111 COMMAND RESPONSE

Mach .8 15,000 FT 26 DEG SWEEP RESPONSE TO 1G STEP COMMAND



|                                                        | 1.0 g | 4.0 g |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| $\frac{\partial \dot{Q}}{\partial \delta \text{STAB}}$ | -11.4 | -11.4 |
| $\frac{\partial \dot{Q}}{\partial \delta \text{TE}}$   | -6.29 | +0.11 |

|                                                        |       |       |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| $\frac{\partial \dot{W}}{\partial \delta \text{STAB}}$ | -2.06 | -2.06 |
| $\frac{\partial \dot{W}}{\partial \delta \text{TE}}$   | -4.21 | -2.06 |

EFFECT OF FLOW SEPARATION ON TRAILING EDGE EFFECTIVENESS  
AT MACH .6 200 FT








FIGURE 7.3-21 COMMAND RESPONSE COMPARING TRIM CONDITIONS OF  
1.0 g and 4.0 g AT MACH .6, 200 ft.

# **RMS VERTICAL TURBULENCE RESPONSE AT COCKPIT (INTENSITY: 5 FT/SEC)**



BOEING ADVANCED SYSTEMS

# AFTI/F-111 EQUIVALENT SHORT-PERIOD PARAMETERS AND REQUIREMENTS



# **AFCS SIMULATION**


**Joseph M. Hall  
Boeing Advanced Systems**

# AFTI/F-111 Flight Simulator

## Major Features

---

- I FIXED BASE, VISUAL FLIGHT SIMULATOR
- II TV PROJECTION ON 14 X 20 FT SCREEN
  - LANDING RUNWAY
  - COMPANION AIRPLANE FOR FORMATION/REFUEL
  - HORIZON AND TARGET AIRPLANE FOR LARGE SCALE MANEUVERS  
(NO LIMITATIONS ON MANEUVERS)
- III HIGH FIDELITY REPRESENTATION OF NONLINEAR AERODYNAMIC EFFECTS AND STICK FORCES
- IV ALL MAW CONTROL MODES PROVIDED, AS WELL AS SELECTED F-111 CONTROL SWITCH FUNCTIONS



# **Flight Simulator Evaluation of Flying Qualities of AFCS Modes**

| MODE(S)    | DATE(S) OF EVALUATION |                  | PILOT(S)                  |
|------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
|            | FULL SIMULATION       | HARDWARE-IN LOOP |                           |
| MCC        | 1-28-83; 6-10-83      | 4-23-86          | ENEVOLDSON, BIRK          |
| MEGA       | 7-21-83; 9-15-83      | 4-23-86          | ENEVOLDSON, BIRK, RUFVOLD |
| MLC        | 4-15-83; 6-10-83      | 4-23-86          | ENEVOLDSON, BIRK, SMITH   |
| CCC        |                       | 4-30-86          | (NONE)                    |
| MCC + MEGA | 9-15-83               | 4-23-86          | ENEVOLDSON, BIRK          |
| MCC + MLC  | 4-15-83; 6-10-83      | 4-23-86          | ENEVOLDSON, BIRK, SMITH   |
| MEGA + MLC |                       | 4-23-86          | ENEVOLDSON                |

RESULTS: ACCEPTABLE, WITH NO CONTROLLABILITY PROBLEMS

REFERENCES: 1) BOEING DOCUMENT D365-10041-1, REV. F (5-28-85)

2) BOEING LETTER L-8940-0086-021 (4-25-86)

TABLE 5-42  
PILOT EVALUATION OF FLYING QUALITIES  
IN LARGE PITCH AND ROLL MANEUVERS  
(Effects of MLC)

| DATE    | MACH.<br>NO. | ALT.<br>(FT) | LE/TE<br>(DEG) | FCS<br>MODE(S) | PILOT | PILOT COMMENTS                                               |
|---------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6-10-83 | .75          | 5000         | 10/17          | MAN            | C     |                                                              |
|         |              |              |                | MAN +<br>MLC   |       | No noticeable difference in flying qualities with<br>MLC on. |
|         |              |              |                | MCC            |       |                                                              |
|         |              |              |                | MCC +<br>MLC   |       | No noticeable difference in flying qualities with<br>MLC on. |
| 6-10-83 | .9           | 14000        | 10/17          | MAN            | C     |                                                              |
|         |              |              |                | MAN +<br>MLC   |       | Again, no noticeable difference with MLC on.                 |
|         |              |              |                | MCC            |       |                                                              |
|         |              |              |                | MCC +<br>MLC   |       | Seems slightly move stiff in pitch with MLC on.              |



TABLE 5-43  
PILOT EVALUATION OF FLYING QUALITIES IN MEGA MODE  
FORMATION/REFUEL TASK  
WING SWEEP = 26 DEG  
15,000 FT.

| DATE    | MACH<br>NO. | FCS<br>MODES  | COOPER-HARPER<br>RATINGS |       | PILOT | PILOT COMMENTS                                                                                                                                |
|---------|-------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|         |             |               | LAT.                     | LONG. |       |                                                                                                                                               |
| 9-15-83 | .6          | MCC           | 3.5                      | 4     | C     | (None)                                                                                                                                        |
|         | ↓           | MCC +<br>MEGA | 3                        | 4     |       | With MEGA on, there is a little tendency to overcontrol in pitch.                                                                             |
|         | .8          | MCC           | 2                        | 3     |       | Laterally pretty good. Longitudinally it's a 3.                                                                                               |
|         | ↓           | MCC +<br>MEGA | 2                        | 3     |       | Laterally good. In pitch, the initial response is a little quicker. For rapid inputs, a slight tendency to overcontrol.                       |
|         | .9          | MCC           | 3                        | 3     |       | Laterally, good response. Longitudinally, good, with very little tendency to overcontrol.                                                     |
|         | ↓           | MCC +<br>MEGA | 2.5                      | 4     |       | Laterally, good. In pitch, response is good for small inputs. For moderate inputs and tight tracking, there is a slight overcontrol tendency. |

D365-10041-1  
E

# Summary of Results of AFCS Mode Evaluations

---

## I COOPER-HARPER RATINGS

- LATERAL RATINGS  
BETWEEN 2 (NEGLECTIBLE DEFICIENCIES)  
AND 4 (MINOR BUT ANNOYING DEFICIENCIES)
- LONGITUDINAL RATINGS  
BETWEEN 3 (MILDLY UNPLEASANT DEFICIENCIES)  
AND 4 (MINOR BUT ANNOYING DEFICIENCIES)

## II PIO RATINGS

- NO TENDENCIES TOWARDS PILOT INDUCED OSCILLATIONS WERE NOTED DURING ANY AFCS EVALUATION

## III CONTROLLABILITY

- SLIGHT TENDENCY TO OVERCONTROL IN TIGHT TRACKING TASKS NOTED FOR MEGA MODE

# Evaluation of Failures Affecting AFCs

---


## CATEGORY I - FAILURES WHICH CAUSE DISENGAGEMENT OF MODE

- FUNCTIONAL VERIFICATION PERFORMED IN SOFTWARE VERIFICATION TESTS (D365-10088-2)
- VERIFICATION OF SWITCHING TRANSIENTS PERFORMED ON FLIGHT SIMULATOR (5-9-86, NEXT SLIDE)

## CATEGORY II - FAILURES WHICH DO NOT CAUSE DISENGAGEMENT OF MODE

- FAILURES ARE ADS FAILURES GIVING ±HARDOVER SIGNALS TO:
  - MACH NUMBER
  - DYNAMIC PRESSURE
  - TRUE AIRSPEED
- VERIFICATION OF SWITCHING TRANSIENTS PERFORMED ON FLIGHT SIMULATOR (10-13-83)

# AFCS MODE COMBINATIONS



NUMBER  
REV LTR

→ PATHS DUE TO  
FAILURES




FIGURE 3.3.3-3 MODE SWITCHING TRANSITIONS

SHEET

01 0000 0000 00 0 071

## Failures of Air Data System

| Mode      | Failure                                     | Pilot Comments                                                                     |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| MCC       | Q = 0 at 1G<br>M = 0 at 4G<br>Q&M = 0 at 4G | Minor Pitch Change<br>"                                                            |
| MAN + MLC | Q & M = 10,000 at 4G<br>Q & M = 0 at 4G     | No noticeable motion<br>dropped about 0.5G at<br>failure, but damps out<br>quickly |
| MEGA      | TAS = 0<br>TAS = 0                          | No problem<br>No significant change                                                |

Limiter on Q: 100 - 1200  
 Mach: .25 - .95 (Sweep 26)  
 1.05 - 2.2 (Sweep 58)  
 TAS: >200

# AFCs Flight Simulator Results Relative to MIL-F-8785B

| PARA.     | SUBJECT                                       | RESULTS                                                               |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3.2.1.1   | LONGITUDINAL STATIC STABILITY                 | STABLE AT ALL TRIM CONDITIONS                                         |
| 3.2.1.1.2 | PITCH FORCE VARIATIONS IN RAPID SPEED CHANGES | NOT SPECIFICALLY ADDRESSED                                            |
| 3.2.1.2   | PHUGOID STABILITY                             | NO PROBLEMS NOTED ON SIMULATOR                                        |
| 3.2.2.1.3 | RESIDUAL OSCILLATIONS                         | NO RESIDUAL OSCILLATIONS DETECTED                                     |
| 3.2.2.2.1 | CONTROL FORCES IN MANEUVERING FLIGHT          | STICK FORCE PER G IN MCC AND MCC + MEGA NOTED AS LIGHT BUT ACCEPTABLE |
| 3.2.2.2.2 | CONTROL MOTIONS IN MANEUVERING FLIGHT         | NO ADVERSE COMMENTS                                                   |
| 3.2.2.3   | LONGITUDINAL PILOT INDUCED OSCILLATIONS       | NO PIO TENDENCIES NOTED                                               |
| 3.2.2.3.1 | TRANSIENT CONTROL FORCES                      | NO ADVERSE COMMENTS OTHER THAN NOTED FOR 3.2.2.2.1                    |
| 3.2.3.1   | LONGITUDINAL CONTROL IN UNACCELERATED FLIGHT  | NO PROBLEMS NOTED ON SIMULATOR (COMPLIANCE SHOWN BY 1G TRIM DATA)     |

# **FABRICATION & GROUND TESTING OF AFCS**

**Clete M. Boldrin  
Boeing Advanced Systems**



# MANUAL MAW ELECTRONICS CONVERSION TO AFCS OVERVIEW

---

- THE MANUAL FLIGHT CONTROL ELECTRONICS UNITS (FCEUs) WERE DESIGNED FOR UPGRADE TO AFCS CONFIGURATION THROUGH HARDWARE ADDITIONS.
  - MINIMIZED CIRCUIT REPLACEMENT
  - RETAINED THE MANUAL MAW CAPABILITY
- AFCS MODIFICATIONS REQUIRED TWO OF THE THREE AVAILABLE SPARE FCEU CARD SLOTS PLUS SOME MINOR SCALING CHANGES ON SEVERAL MANUAL CARDS.

## FCEU PACKAGING FEATURES:

- CUSTOM-DESIGNED RUGGED "FULL ATR LONG" CHASSIS
- CHASSIS BACKPLANE WAS MACHINE WIRE WRAPPED FOR EASY MODIFICATION
- TWO PINS WERE PROVIDED BETWEEN CIRCUIT CARDS AND BACKPLANE FOR CRITICAL SIGNALS
- CIRCUIT CARDS:
  - VIBRATION STIFFENED 8X9 INCH BOARDS
  - WIRE WRAPPED FOR EASY MODIFICATION
  - CAPTAN/TEFLON WIRE WRAP INSULATION REDUCED CUT THROUGHGS
  - ALL ELECTRICAL COMPONENTS EXCEPT MEMORY WERE SOLDERED AND CONFORMAL COATED
  - REMOVEABLE MEMORY COMPONENTS WERE HELD IN SOCKETS BY RETENTION PLATES

## AFCS REDUNDANCY MANAGEMENT PHILOSOPHY:

- DUAL REDUNDANT FAIL PASSIVE AFCS, MANUAL AND ANALOG BACKUP MODES
- AFCS FAILS TO MANUAL DIGITAL MODE, NOT DIRECTLY TO ANALOG BACKUP


## HARDWARE CONFIGURATION CONTROL:

- USED THE BOEING IRSO SYSTEM WHICH ASSIGNED NEW PART NUMBERS FOR EVERY HARDWARE, SOFTWARE OR HARDWARE ACCEPTANCE TEST CHANGE

# SUMMARY OF MAW AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROL HARDWARE CHANGES TO F-111


- ADDITIONS TO FCEU:
- AUTOMATIC PROCESSOR COMPUTER CARD
  - PHYSICALLY IDENTICAL (EXCEPT FOR EPROM MEMORY CONTENT) TO MANUAL COMMAND PROCESSOR COMPUTER CARD
  - CONTAINS PROGRAM MEMORY FOR MCC, MLC AND ME/GA AUTOMATIC MODES
- AUTOMATIC STABILON INTERFACE / COMPUTER MEMORY EXPANSION CARD
  - TRANSMITS STABILON COMMAND SIGNALS TO PITCH DAMPER SERVO
  - PITCH RATE AND NORMAL ACCELERATION BENDING MOMENT ANALOG NOTCH FILTERS
  - SAMPLE AND HOLD ANALOG CIRCUITS FOR LONGITUDINAL ACCELERATION SIGNALS
  - ADDITIONAL 20K EPROM MEMORY FOR BOTH MANUAL AND AUTOMATIC PROCESSOR COMPUTER CARDS
- ADDITIONAL SENSORS FOR AUTOMATIC MODES / LOCATION ON AIRPLANE / MODES SUPPORTED:
  - MACH / TACH / CAD / MCC, MLC
  - AIRSPEED / TACT CAD / MLC, ME/GA
  - FUEL QUANTITY / TACT INT-DEV TOT / MCC, MLC
  - PITCH STICK / COCKPIT / CCC, ME/GA
  - PITCH RATE / TACT PITCH RATE GYRO / ME/GA
  - NORMAL ACCELERATION / F.S. 460 / MCC, MLC
  - NORMAL ACCELERATION / TACT ACCELEROMETER / ME/GA
  - ROLL ATTITUDE / TACT SPU, MD3-3 / CCC, ME/GA
  - LONGITUDINAL ACCEL / F.S. 460 / CCC
  - ROLL ACCELERATION / F.S. 460 / MLC
  - ROLL RATE / TACT ROLL RATE GYRO / MLC
  - STABILON POSITION / TACT STABILONS / MLC
- ADDITION TO MAW CONTROL AND DISPLAY PANEL
  - MAW STABILON DISABLE SWITCH
- ADDITIONS TO AIRCRAFT WIRING
  - WIRING BETWEEN FCEU AND C&D PANEL MAW STAB DISABLE SWITCH
  - WIRING BETWEEN FCEU AND AUTOMATIC SENSORS
  - WIRING BETWEEN FCEU AND TACT PITCH FCS
- CHANGES TO THE DDIU
  - REVISED DOWNLINK SERIAL FORMAT
  - ADDED DDIU ALIVENESS MONITOR LIGHT
  - INCREASED CROSS CHANNEL SERIAL DATA RATE FROM 150K TO 400K BITS/SEC

# AFCS DESIGN SAFETY FEATURES




# TRIPLEX STABILON INTERFACE

**BOEING**



# AIRCRAFT HARDWARE CHECKOUT AND TEST



# FCEU HARDWARE ACCEPTANCE TEST DESCRIPTION

## (D365-10061-10)

---

**PURPOSE:** FCEU HARDWARE PERFORMANCE VERIFICATION PRODUCTION SCREEN

**DESCRIPTION:** AN EXTERNAL HOST COMPUTER CONTROLLED THE FCEU'S OWN I/O TO STIMULATE A SECTION OF CIRCUITRY AND THEN VERIFIED THE RESPONSE AGAINST SPECIFIC PASS / FAIL CRITERIA.

**SCOPE:** PROVIDED A COMPLETE HARDWARE VERIFICATION TEST FOR MANUAL, BACKUP AND AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROL ELECTRONICS WITHIN A SINGLE FCEU.

- CONSISTED OF 60 SEMI-AUTOMATIC TESTS

THE FOLLOWING AFCS CIRCUITS WERE TESTED:

- AUTOMATIC PROCESSOR
  - MEMORY & I/O
  - MANUAL & AUTO PROCESSOR SERIAL I/O INTERFACE
- AUTOMATIC INTERFACE ELECTRONICS
  - STABILON & DISENGAGE CIRCUIT
  - ANALOG PITCH RATE & NORMAL ACCELERATION BODY BENDING NOTCH FILTERS
- SAMPLE & HOLD ANALOG CIRCUITS FOR LONGITUDINAL ACCELERATION SIGNALS

## **HARDWARE ACCEPTANCE TEST SUMMARY**

---

- 60 TOTAL TESTS PER FCEU
- 20 PRIMARY SYSTEM TESTS
- 35 BACKUP SYSTEM TESTS
- 5 AUTOMATIC SYSTEM TESTS
- TESTS WERE RUN WITH FLIGHT EPROMs INSTALLED
- TESTING DEFINED IN D365-10061-10
- TEST RESULTS PRINTED OUT WITH PASS / FAIL AND TOLERANCE EXCEEDANCE DATA IF APPLICABLE
- TEST REPORT EASY TO FOLLOW SINCE RESULTS IMMEDIATELY FOLLOW SET UP PROCEDURES
- TESTS WERE DESIGNED TO BE EFFICIENT FAULT ISOLATION TOOL

# FCEU FLIGHT WORTHINESS TEST DESCRIPTION

## (D365-10061-4)

### SUMMARY:

SINUSOIDAL / RANDOM VIBRATION AND THERMAL CYCLING TESTS (-65 DEG F TO + 160 DEG F, 10 CYCLES MINIMUM) WERE CONDUCTED. 

### PURPOSE:

THE FLIGHT WORTHINESS TESTS SERVED A PRODUCTION SCREENING FUNCTION AND ALSO VERIFIED ELECTRICAL HARDWARE OPERATION AFTER EXPOSURE TO ENVIRONMENTAL EXTREMES. THE TESTS WERE SIMILAR TO THOSE WHICH WERE CONDUCTED ON THE MANUAL FCEU's.

### TEST FACILITIES:

AN AUTO-CONTROL LABORATORIES ENVIRONMENTAL CHAMBER WAS USED TO CONDUCT THE VIBRATION AND THERMAL CYCLING TESTING.



ALTITUDE TESTS WERE NOT CONDUCTED ON THE FCEU's BECAUSE THE PRIMARY PROBLEMS UNCOVERED DURING ALTITUDE TESTING ARE RELATED TO THE INCREASED TEMPERATURE OF THE ELECTRONICS CAUSED BY DECREASED EFFECTIVENESS OF COOLING AIR AT HIGHER ALTITUDES. TESTS OF THE MAW FCEUs HAVE VERIFIED THAT THEY OPERATE WITHOUT DEGRADATION FOR AT LEAST ONE-HALF HOUR WITHOUT COOLING AIR.

THE MAW SYSTEM DOES NOT EMPLOY HIGH VOLTAGE SUBJECT TO BREAKDOWN AT ALTITUDE.



10

# FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM INTEGRATION TEST DESCRIPTION FOR THE AUTOMATIC SYSTEM (D365-10060-14)

---

## PURPOSE:

- VERIFIED MECHANICAL, ELECTRICAL AND HYDRAULIC OPERATION OF THE ENTIRE FCS AFTER INSTALLATION ON THE AIRPLANE
- VERIFIED AFCS SENSOR AND STABILON INTERFACE OPERATION
- VERIFIED OPERATION OF THE AUTOMATIC MODES


## DESCRIPTION:

THE TESTS WERE RUN FROM MANUAL TEST PROCEDURES USING A NASA FURNISHED AIRCRAFT INTERROGATION DISPLAY SYSTEM TO MONITOR SYSTEM PERFORMANCE.

THE FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM INTEGRATION TEST FOR THE MANUAL SYSTEM WAS RERUN WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL TESTS FOR THE AUTOMATIC SYSTEM:

- AUTO MODE TESTS WITH 26, 40° AND 58 DEGREE WING SWEEP (MCC, MEGA, MLC AND CCC MODES)
- AUTO MODE SELECTION LOGIC TESTS
- DDIU TRANSMISSION TESTS OF AUTOMATIC SIGNALS
- 40 DEGREE WING SWEEP AUTO MODE TESTS WERE INSERTED IN D365-10060-14 TO VERIFY THAT THE AUTO MODES DO NOT ENGAGE AT 40 DEGREE WING SWEEP

# SYSTEM INTEGRATION TEST EQUIPMENT SETUP



# SYSTEM INTEGRATION TEST SUMMARY


---

- 253 TOTAL TESTS
- 87 PRIMARY TESTS
  - SYMETRIC AND ROLL COMMANDS, FAILURE DETECTION, ANNUNCIATORS, PREFLIGHT TEST, WING SWEEP AND FLAP RATE.
- 87 BACKUP SYSTEM TESTS
  - SYMETRIC AND ROLL COMMANDS, WING SWEEP AND FLAP RATES.
- 8 PRIMARY / BACKUP TRANSITION
- 40 SURFACE BRAKE TESTS
  - SURFACE PAIRS, INDIVIDUAL BRAKES AND ELECTRICAL COMMANDS
- 5 DDIU TESTS
- 26 FLAP SWITCH EFFECTS ON F-111 SYSTEMS

## **AFCS FABRICATION AND GROUND TESTING LESSONS LEARNED**

---

- FLIGHT CRITICAL DESIGNS WITH A REMOTE POSSIBILITY OF SINGLE POINT FAILURE ARE UNACCEPTABLE
- TOLERANCE PROBLEMS MAKE ANALOG CIRCUITS FAR MORE COSTLY THAN DIGITAL CIRCUITS TO DESIGN AND TEST
- GROWTH CAPABILITIES FOR CHANGING REQUIREMENTS ARE ESSENTIAL IN R&D DESIGN
- STABILITY OF THE SOFTWARE ENVIRONMENT FOR ENGR TOOLS AND MFGR AIDS IS CRITICAL TO SUCCESS OF LONG LIVED PROJECTS
- PRODUCTION RULES ARE EXPENSIVE TO IMPLEMENT ON AN R&D PROJECT
- CAPTAN COATED TEFLON WIRE INSULATION GREATLY REDUCES CUT THROUGH SHORTS
- SPECIFYING HARDWARE ACCEPTANCE TEST REQUIREMENTS AS A SEQUENCE OF 'OPERATOR DO THIS', 'PROGRAM DO THAT' INSTRUCTIONS WORKED WELL
- XYBASIC PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE WORKED WELL FOR HARDWARE ACCEPTANCE TESTS



# AFTI/F-111 MISSION ADAPTIVE WING


GOVERNMENT OVERVIEW  
OF  
SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT

RON BRAET

## TOPICS

- 0 SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGY
- 0 SOFTWARE DOCUMENTATION
- 0 SOFTWARE TEST OVERVIEW
- 0 SOFTWARE CONFIGURATION CONTROL
- 0 INDEPENDENT SOFTWARE REVIEW ACTIVITIES
- 0 LESSONS LEARNED

# SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGY: OVERVIEW



SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGY: CONSIDERATIONS

- 0 PROJECT ORGANIZATION
  - 0 STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR SYSTEM/SOFTWARE REQUIREMENTS AND FOR SOFTWARE VERIFICATION/SYSTEM TEST
  - 0 PROJECT RESPONSIBLE FOR SOFTWARE DESIGN AND CODING
  - 0 QA ORGANIZATION SEPARATE FROM PROGRAM
- 0 DOCUMENTATION
  - 0 TYPES OF DOCUMENTATION
  - 0 ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES
  - 0 LIFE CYCLE USE
- 0 PROGRAM LANGUAGE
  - 0 HIGHER ORDER LANGUAGE
  - 0 COMPILER MATURITY
  - 0 ASSEMBLY CODE
  - 0 DEVELOPMENT METHODS & TOOLS



SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT METHODOLOGY: CONSIDERATIONS (CONTINUED)

0 CONFIGURATION CONTROL

- 0 REQUIREMENTS ESTABLISHED AND STABILIZED
- 0 MARGINAL CHANGES/NECESSARY CHANGES
- 0 AF/NASA INVOLVEMENT
- 0 TRANSITION COMPATIBILITY

0 SAFETY OF FLIGHT

- 0 REVIEW OF CONTRACTOR STUDIES
- 0 INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION
- 0 MONITORING ACTIVITIES
- 0 INDEPENDENT REVIEW BOARDS

## SOFTWARE DOCUMENTATION

- o CP REQUIREMENTS SPECIFICATION
- o CP DESIGN SPECIFICATION
- o CP TEST PLAN
- o CP TEST PROCEDURES
- o CP VERSION DESCRIPTION

### SOFTWARE DEVELOPED PER FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS:

- |                |                                                       |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| o D365-10021   | AFTI/F-111 MAW FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT PLAN |
| o D365-10076-1 | AFTI/F-111 SOFTWARE QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN            |
| o D365-23310-1 | AFTI/F-111 MAW COMPUTER PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT PLAN      |


## SOFTWARE TESTING OVERVIEW

- 0 MODULE TESTS
- 0 INTERMODULE COMPATIBILITY TESTS
- 0 VERIFICATION TESTS (DRY RUN) D365-10088-2
- 0 HARDWARE-IN-THE-LOOP TESTS
- 0 VERIFICATION TESTS (FORMAL) D365-10088-2
- 0 AIRCRAFT TESTS D365-10060-14
- 0 FLIGHT TESTS

## MODULE TEST SEQUENCE

- 0 PREPARE PROGRAM FLOWCHART FROM MODULE LISTING
- 0 VERIFY THAT THE FLOWCHART SATISFIED THE SOFTWARE REQUIREMENTS
- 0 DIVIDE THE PROGRAM FLOWCHART INTO TESTABLE SEGMENTS
- 0 PREPARE A SEPARATE TEST PROCEDURE FOR EACH PROGRAM SEGMENT
- 0 TEST THE FIRST PROGRAM SEGMENT USING THE "WINDOW" PROGRAM
- 0 ADD SECOND SEGMENT AND TEST, THEN THIRD, ETC.
- 0 TESTS DOCUMENTED IN SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT FOLDERS

# SAMPLE MODULE TEST




0 VERIFY THAT THE OUTPUT SIGNALS ARE CORRECT  
FOR THE GIVEN INPUT SIGNALS

## INTERMODULE COMPATIBILITY TEST SEQUENCE

- 0 INTEGRATE ALL OF THE MODULES INTO ONE PROGRAM
- 0 EXECUTE THEM IN THE SEQUENCE THEY ARE TO BE EXECUTED IN FLIGHT
- 0 VERIFY THAT THE MODULES INTERACT TO PROVIDE THE EXPECTED OUTPUTS
- 0 IMCT RESULTS DOCUMENTED IN SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT FOLDERS

# SAMPLE INTERMODULE COMPATIBILITY TEST



- 0 VERIFY THAT INTERFACING SIGNALS ARE PASSED BETWEEN THE MODULES.
- 0 VERIFY THAT THE OUTPUT SIGNALS ARE CORRECT FOR THE GIVEN INPUT SIGNALS.
- 0 THE TEST IS CONDUCTED WITH SIMULATORS OF THE TWO PROCESSORS.
- 0 THE SHOWN MODULES AND ALL OTHER MODULES ARE BEING EXECUTED BY THE EXECUTIVES IN THE TWO PROCESSORS.

## SOFTWARE VERIFICATION TESTS

- O CONCENTRATE ON:
  - O TECHNICAL CORRECTNESS
  - O EFFICIENCY
  - O TECHNICAL ADEQUACY
- O HARDWARE TEST EQUIPMENT SETUP USED TO DRIVE OPEN-LOOP TESTS
- O D365-10088-2 WAS PREPARED TO VERIFY THE SOFTWARE REQUIREMENTS SPECIFIED IN D365-10062-1 AND D365-10086-1.



## VERIFICATION TEST PROCEDURES DOCUMENT

- 0 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF A TYPICAL TEST FOR BACKGROUND PURPOSES
- 0 DOCUMENTATION REFERENCES
- 0 DESIGN REFERENCES
- 0 TEST SETUP DESCRIPTION FOR EACH TEST
- 0 PROCEDURE FOR CONDUCTING EACH TEST
- 0 A DATA SHEET FOR EACH TEST WITH EXPECTED RESULTS  
AND TOLERANCES

## HARDWARE-IN-THE-LOOP SOFTWARE TESTS

0 PILOTED SIMULATION WITH MAW SYSTEM IN HARDWARE OR IN THE  
SIMULATION EQUATIONS.

0 VERIFIED ACTUAL SOFTWARE WITH ALL FOUR AUTOMATIC MODES:

0 MCC  
0 MLC  
0 MEGA  
0 CCC

0 MCC, MLC, AND MEGA MODE RESPONSE WAS ESSENTIALLY IDENTICAL  
WITH THE HARDWARE.

0 CCC MODE REVEALED A NOISE PROBLEM WHICH WAS RESOLVED BY  
RECONFIGURING THE INPUT HARDWARE.

0 MEGA AERO DATA PROCESS TIME PROBLEM REQUIRED ARRAY PROCESSOR.

## SOFTWARE CONFIGURATION CONTROL

- 0 INITIATED AFTER "DRY RUN" SOFTWARE VALIDATION TESTS AND PRIOR TO "DRY RUN" FUNCTIONAL TESTS
- 0 FORMAL SOFTWARE CONTROL OF "CHIP BURNED" SOFTWARE MAINTAINED BY BY BOEING QUALITY ASSURANCE
- 0 FORMAL CONFIGURATION CONTROL PASSED TO GOVERNMENT UPON SUCCESSFUL FORMAL ACCEPTANCE TEST OF AIRCRAFT
- 0 CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT BOARD (AIR FORCE/NASA) REVIEW/EVALUATE CHANGE AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO AIR FORCE PROGRAM MANAGER
- 0 ENGINEERS USE DR PROCESS FOR PREPARING SOFTWARE CHANGES

## INDEPENDENT SOFTWARE REVIEW ACTIVITIES

- 0 SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT MONITORING
  - 0 ATTEND/SUPPORT PROGRAM REVIEWS
  - 0 WEEKLY SOFTWARE STATUS CONTACT
  - 0 CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES
  - 0 ON-SITE VISITS
    - SOFTWARE DESIGN WALKTHROUGH (DESIGN FOLDERS)
    - TEST DEMONSTRATION
    - LIMITED SOFTWARE AUDIT
    - CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT INSPECTION
- 0 REVIEW OF SOFTWARE RELATED DOCUMENTATION
  - 0 DEVELOPMENT PLAN
  - 0 REQUIREMENTS SPECIFICATION
  - 0 DESIGN DOCUMENT
  - 0 TEST DOCUMENT
  - 0 VERSION DESCRIPTION
  - 0 QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN
- 0 SYSTEM LEVEL DOCUMENTATION REVIEW
- 0 NASA/ADFRF
  - 0 SIMULATION DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT/INTERFACE
  - 0 GROUND TEST PLANNING REVIEW

## LESSONS LEARNED

- 0 CONTRACTOR CAN DELIVER GOOD/WORKABLE/MAINTAINABLE SOFTWARE WITHOUT ADHERING TO FULL MIL-STDs
- 0 NO FORMAL DOCUMENTATION OF MODULE/INTERMODULE TESTING
- 0 FUNCTIONAL/ENGINEERING SIMULATION AS DONE BY NASA AIDED IN ASSURING CORRECT FUNCTIONAL DESIGN AND INTERFACE
- 0 SIMULATION TESTING IS ONLY AS GOOD AS THE MODELING ACCURACY


SESSION IV

AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM FLIGHT TEST RESULTS

## **Flight Test Performance**

- Automatic Mode Performance
- Quantify Performance Gains/Losses of MAW Automatic Modes
  - MCC
  - MLC
  - CCC
- Performance Maneuvers Included:
  - Roller Coasters (POPU'S)
  - Wind-up Turns
  - Steady Turns


# Roller Coaster Drag Repeatability (Manual Mode Phase vs Automode Phase)






# Roller Coaster Drag Repeatability

## (Manual Mode Phase vs Automode Phase)




# Dynamic Maneuver/Onset - Rate Effects


## MCC Mode



# Roller Coaster Maneuver



# Wind-up Turns Aero Elastic Effects




## Performance Summary

- At Mach = 0.70,  $\bar{Q} = 300\text{psf}$  the MCC Mode Showed Performance Gains of:
  - 16% Reduction in Drag at 2g's
  - 6.7% Increase in Nz at 2g's
- Dynamic Response
  - Maneuver Rates (load factor onset) Varied from 0.19 to 0.42 g/sec
    - No Detectable Effect on Drag
    - The Noted Differences are Attributed to the Table Look-up Values
    - Additional Data Required

# **AFCFS FUNCTIONAL AND PERFORMANCE RESULTS**

**Paul R. Bussing  
Boeing Advanced Systems**

**Paul W. Phillips  
Air Force Flight Test Center**



## **OBJECTIVE**

**VALIDATE DESIGN CONCEPT FOR A VERY LIMITED SET OF TEST  
CONDITIONS FOR MODES/COMBINATIONS**

- **MANEUVER CAMBER CONTROL (MCC)**
- **CRUISE CAMBER CONTROL (CCC)**
- **MANEUVER LOAD CONTROL (MLC)**
  - **MCC/MLC**
- **MANEUVER ENHANCEMENT/GUST ALLEVIATION  
(MEGA)**
  - **MEGA/MCC**
  - **MEGA/MLC**
  - **MEGA/MCC/MLC**



## **MCC TESTS**

**OBJECTIVE: ACCOMPLISH FOLLOWING TESTS**

- **MANUAL MODE TESTS TO VALIDATE FLAP COMMANDS**
- **SUBSONIC ENGAGEMENTS AT 26° WING SWEEP**
  - **ASE (M=0.75, HP=15,000)**
  - **HANDLING QUALITIES**
  - **PERFORMANCE TESTS**
  - **TRACKING TESTS**
- **SUPERSONIC ENGAGEMENTS**
  - **ASE (M=1.2, HP=30,000)**
  - **HANDLING QUALITIES**

## **MCC PRE-ENGAGEMENT FLIGHT TESTS**

- MCC LEADING AND TRAILING EDGE COMMANDS ARE CALCULATED WHENEVER MAW SYSTEM IS ACTIVE
- LIFT COEFFICIENTS AND MCC COMMANDS ARE ON THE PCM DATA STREAM

DIEZEL CORPORATION  
MADE IN U.S.A.

NO. 340R-MP DIEZEL GRAPH PUMP  
MILLIMETER

# AFTI/AFCS MCC FLAP POSITIONS


A 36°

LE FLAP POSITION DEGREES

20  
19  
18  
17  
16  
15  
14  
13  
12  
11  
10  
9  
8  
7  
6  
5  
4  
3  
2  
1  
0  
-1

10 25 30  
0.75, 150000  
70000  
X 1.1 1.2

M 0.7  
M 0.8



## CLEARANCE MANEUVERS MCC

### 1. 1G RAP SET

- TRIMMED LEVEL FLIGHT, ON CONDITION.
- SHARP LATERAL STICK RAP
- SHARP RUDDER KICK
- SHARP NOSEDOWN PITCH RAP

### 2. HANDLING QUAL EVAL

- BANK, G & ALTITUDE CAPTURES AT DISCRETION OF PILOT.
- LOAD FACTOR WITHIN  $\pm .5$  TO 1.5G.
- LONGITUDINAL FREQUENCY SWEEP
- PITCH DOURNET

MACH NO 0.75, ALTITUDE 15000 FT

MACH NO 1.20, ALTITUDE 30000 FT

## MCC SUBSONIC ENGAGEMENTS/RESULTS

### SWEEP 26°


- ASE-ROLL, YAW & PITCH RAPS SATISFACTORY
- PITCH & ROLL ANGLE CAPTURES-PITCH RESPONSE GOOD
- 2 G & 3 G WIND UP TURNS - SATISFACTORY - PILOT COMMENTS
- MANUAL  $P_s = 0$  TURN ENGAGE MCC
- ENGAGE FROM CCC - SATISFACTORY - GAINED .015 MACH NO.
- MCC TRACKING TESTS - COMMENTS

## **MCC SUBSONIC PILOT COMMENTS**

- "MCC ENGAGEMENT WAS SMOOTH AT 1 G - NO TRANSIENTS NOTED"
- "IN WIND UP TURNS -" A NOTICEABLE IMPROVEMENT IN NOSE TRACKING PERFORMANCE"
- "BUFFET ENCOUNTERED IN MANUAL WAS AVOIDED WITH MCC ENGAGED"
- "TRIM CHANGES WERE MINOR"
- "THE CAMBER CHANGES COULD BE FELT AS SMALL, DISCRETE G CHANGES - THIS WAS NOT OBJECTIONABLE"







|       |         |        |         |      |
|-------|---------|--------|---------|------|
| CALC  | J. HALL | 2-1-83 | REVISED | DATE |
| CHECK |         |        |         |      |
| APR   |         |        |         |      |
| APR   |         |        |         |      |

EFFECT OF MCC MODE  
ON MAXIMUM SUSTAINABLE LEVEL FLIGHT TURN  
15,000 FT

THE SCIEING COMPANY

FIG 1

PAGE

## **MCC SUBSONIC TRACKING TESTS**

- HANDLING QUALITIES AS GOOD AS OR BETTER  
THAN MANUAL MODE**
- BUFFET IN MANUAL MODE ELIMINATED OR  
REDUCED IN MCC**

## **MCC SUBSONIC CONCLUSIONS**

- ASE/FLUTTER CLEARED
- PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENTS ACHIEVED
  - NEED TO QUANTIFY TURN PERFORMANCE BETTER
- LIGHT BUFFET IN TURNS (0/2) ELIMINATED
- TRIM CHANGES MINOR
- TRACKING AS GOOD OR BETTER THAN MANUAL

# **SUPERSONIC ENGAGEMENTS**

- MACH 1.2
- FROM C&D PANEL
- FROM CCC MODE

## **PROBLEM:**

**FIRST ENGAGEMENT FOR ASE OK, BUT NEXT  
ENGAGEMENT FAILED BECAUSE REASONABLENESS  
TEST FALSE - DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CADC & FCEU  
QBAR EXCEEDED TOLERANCE FOR SHORT TIME**

**SOLUTION: SUBSEQUENT ENGAGEMENTS SATISFACTORY  
WITH ORIGINAL TOLERANCE**

**OPEN TOLERANCE-INCORPORATED**

## **MCC SUPERSONIC CONCLUSIONS**

- **ENGAGEMENT MARGINAL WITH ORIGINAL QBAR  
REASONABLENESS TOLERANCE**
- **ASE/FLUTTER SATISFACTORY AT M= 1.2, 30000 FT**
- **HANDLINGS QUALITIES SATISFACTORY AT M= 1.2, 30000 FT**
- **COMPARABLE PERFORMANCE DATA NOT OBTAINED**

## CCC TESTS

### OBJECTIVE:

- (1) TO HAVE CCC DETERMINE OPTIMUM T.E. CAMBER WITH INITIAL FLAP POSITIONS ABOVE AND BELOW EXPECTED OPTIMUM
- (2) DEMONSTRATE CCC TRANSFER TO MCC WITH BANK ANGLE  $>30^{\circ}$ 
  - SUBSONIC ENGAGEMENTS  $26^{\circ}$  SWEEP
  - SUBSONIC ENGAGEMENTS  $58^{\circ}$  SWEEP
  - SUPERSONIC ENGAGEMENTS  $58^{\circ}$

# SUMMARY OF THE CCC MODE RESULTS

| INITIAL |       |            | MAXIMUM MACH |            |      | FINAL CONDITIONS |            |      | REMARKS                                                            |                                                |
|---------|-------|------------|--------------|------------|------|------------------|------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| MACH    | ALT.  | $\delta F$ | MACH         | $\delta F$ | TIME | MACH             | $\delta F$ | TIME |                                                                    |                                                |
| 0.742   | 15130 | 6.0        | .787         | 1.3        | 4:04 | 0.783            | 0.3        | 4:09 | { FLAPS BRIEFLY<br>MOVED TO .3<br>THEN RETURNED<br>TO -.7 & STAYED |                                                |
| 0.751   | 15160 | -0.7       | .764         | 0.1        | 3:09 | 0.763            | -0.7       | 3:31 |                                                                    |                                                |
| 0.851   | 30380 | -0.7       | FINAL        |            |      | 0.882            | -0.7       | 5:07 |                                                                    |                                                |
| 0.886   | 30110 | -0.7       | FINAL        |            |      | 0.911            | 0.2        | 2:19 | 58                                                                 | STILL SEARCHING                                |
| 1.202   | 30430 | 2.0        | INITIAL      |            |      | 1.182            | 5.0        | 1:50 | 58                                                                 | FLAPS ALWAYS<br>WENT WRONG<br>DIRECTION        |
| 0.830   | 30280 | 6.0        | .902         | 2.0        | 5:34 | 0.900            | 1.8        | 6:15 | 26                                                                 | MADE SOME MIS-<br>TAKES BUT<br>SPEED INCREASED |
| 0.835   | 30280 | 1.0        | INITIAL      |            |      | 0.771            | -0.7       | 4:15 | 26                                                                 | FLAPS WENT TO<br>-0.7 & STAYED                 |
| 0.810   | 27610 | 4.0        | .818         | 1.0        | 2:00 | 0.776            | -0.7       | 5:24 | 26                                                                 | FLAPS ALWAYS<br>WENT HIGHER<br>STAYED FULL UP  |
| 0.798   | 27550 | 6.0        | .870         | 0.1        | 4:42 | 0.861            | -0.7       | 6:17 | 26                                                                 | SAME AS ABOVE                                  |

FLAPS BRIEFLY  
MOVED TO .3  
THEN RETURNED  
TO -.7 & STAYED

STILL SEARCHING

FLAPS ALWAYS  
WENT WRONG  
DIRECTION


MADE SOME MIS-  
TAKES BUT  
SPEED INCREASED

FLAPS WENT TO  
-0.7 & STAYED

FLAPS ALWAYS  
WENT HIGHER  
STAYED FULL UP

SAME AS ABOVE


# FLT205 30.3E SPEED POWER WITH CCC





# FLT206 3I SPEED POWER WITH CCC

COMMAND?



## CONCLUSIONS

2:00 PM - 2:30 PM



## CCC MODE CONCLUSIONS

- CCC MODE DOES NOT OPERATE CONSISTENTLY OR RELIABLY AS CURRENTLY MECHANIZED
- ALGORITHM APPEARS TO OPERATE PER DESIGN
- BODY MOUNTED LONGITUDINAL, ACCELEROMETERS ARE NOT SATISFACTORY AS SENSOR SOURCE
- SOLUTION-CHANGE SENSOR SOURCE AND CHANGE COMMAND LIMITS TO FLAP ELECTRICAL LIMITS
- CCC "DOWNMODED" TO MCC SUCCESSFULLY IN SUBSONIC
- CCC ATTEMPT TO DOWNMODE TO MCC AT MACH 1.2 UNSUCCESSFUL ON ONLY TRY (QBARRE) - WILL TRY AGAIN

## MLC TESTS

OBJECTIVE: (1) DEMONSTRATE MLC OPERATION AT REDUCED  
THRESHOLD FLAPS 5/10.  
(2) DEMONSTRATE MLC/MCL COMBINATION AT  
REDUCED THRESHOLD.

- MANUAL MODE PRE-ENGAGEMENT FLIGHT TESTS
- CLEARANCE MANEUVERS
- PROBLEM ENCOUNTERED / SOLUTION
- MLC RESULTS WITH REVISED SYSTEM
- MCC/MLC
- COMPARISONS
  - FLIGHT DATA WITH DESIGN
  - FCEU / INSTRUMENTATION BENDING  
MOMENTS

| BENDING MOMENT THRESHOLDS          |                                       |  |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| BM Threshold<br>Switch<br>Position | Bending Moment<br>Threshold<br>in-lbs |  |
| 0 BMTH0                            | 14.0E5                                |  |
| 1 BMTH1                            | 12.0E6                                |  |
| 2 BMTH2                            | 10.0E5                                |  |
| 3 BMTH3                            | 9.5E5                                 |  |
| 4 BMTH4                            | 9.0E6                                 |  |
| 5 BMTH5                            | 8.5E6                                 |  |
| 6 BMTH6                            | 8.0E6                                 |  |
| 7 BMTH7                            | 7.5E6                                 |  |
| 8 BMTH8                            | 7.0E6                                 |  |
| 9 BMTH9                            | 6.0E6                                 |  |
| 10 BMTH10                          | 5.0E6                                 |  |
| 11 BMTH11                          | 4.0E6                                 |  |

## **PRE-ENGAGEMENT FLIGHT TESTS**


- MLC BENDING MOMENTS CALCULATED  
WHENEVER MAW SYSTEM IS ACTIVE
- BENDING MOMENTS AND LIFT COEFFICIENTS  
ARE ON THE PCM DATA STREAM
- MLC DESIGN CHARTS / CONTROL ROOM  
DISPLAYS AND TOLERANCES


13:56:14.171

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
84

[illegible]

|        |       |
|--------|-------|
| CEAR   | 0.01  |
| EMIL   | 4.5   |
| CMSC   | 0.48  |
| ECGHL1 | -1.98 |








13:56:14.171

13:59:27.166->

|         |        |
|---------|--------|
| CLUE    | 1.41   |
| ORLE    | 1.41   |
| CLUT    | 4.42   |
| CLUTD   | 4.42   |
| CLIN    | 4.28   |
| ORIN    | 4.28   |
| ORID    | 4.14   |
| OROUT   | 4.1    |
| PLLE    | 1.33   |
| PRLE    | 1.46   |
| PLOUT   | 4.27   |
| PLUID   | 4.41   |
| PLIN    | 4.27   |
| PRIN    | 4.39   |
| PRUID   | 4.11   |
| PROUT   | 4.23   |
| MINF    | .81    |
| KORG    | 359.   |
| HP      | 22596. |
| FGF     | 10551. |
| FGF     | 2482.  |
| DELTA   | 8148.  |
| QBR     | 487.   |
| BPCL    | 4.5    |
| CLWCC   | .48    |
| ZOGACLI | -1.58  |

\* MLC/MCC MACH 0.8 23500 FT SMTH MILLION IN. LB.

POINT



19:57:57.638

04:48:23.74:59:51

3770 28-2

2000

1000

2000

333

[illegible]

1000

02-9 0143

五、

၁၁၁၁

100

1007

Office  
S. B. 1

88.9  
NIR

25-9

6.19.1944

11-10-64

18. 18. 18.

SECRET

1992

FOI 300 19561

THE

1940

100

100

100

**7-1**

33

2012


72

—

1

100

田子口



## CLEARANCE MANEUVERS MLC

### 1. 1G RAP SET

- TRIMMED LEVEL FLIGHT, ON CONDITION.
- SHARP LATERAL STICK RAP
- SHARP RUDDER KICK
- SHARP NOSL DOWN PITCH RAP

### 2. HANDLING QUAL EVAL

- BANK, G & ALTITUDE CAPTURES AT DISCRETION OF PILOT.
- LOAD FACTOR WITHIN +.5 TO 1.5G.
- LONGITUDINAL FREQUENCY SWEEP
- PITCH DOUBLET

### 3. XG MLC SWEEP + RAP

- MLC THRESHOLD SET FOR MLC TRIGGER AT X -.5G
- ESTABLISH SLOWLY INCREASING WUT UNTIL MLC TRIGGERS
- SHARP NOSE UP PITCH RAP
- LOAD FACTOR TO REMAIN <X (X=2,3)

MACH NO 0.80, ALTITUDE 23500 FT      δF 5/10

MACH NO 0.30 ALTITUDE 23500 FT      δF MCC

13:20:22.136

12:57:45-1

311-333

31-33

10.33

10.33

1171 10.00

19.01

9.66

# PLAY FOR

WILLIAM H. BENTLEY & CO.

1971 10 13

10.20  
10.30

॥ ॥

1995

9-70

5.55

18-3111

51-18338

65022

11029.

3148.

1267

303  
2.1.

3.5

47.


170x10-25.1-

100


100

MLC. NACII 0.8 2350 FT BMTII 6 MILLION IN. LB.

FLT 208 POINT 4 B2



287




## MLC PROBLEM / SOLUTION

### PROBLEM:

- ROLL PIO DURING MLC FLAP EXCURSION
  - ASYMMETRIC MOTION OF OUTBOARD FLAPS
  - OUTBOARD FLAPS ARE ALSO AILERONS

### SOLUTION:

- PIO CEASES WHEN O/B FLAPS FULL UP
- REMOVE ROLL ACCELERATION AND RATE INPUTS FROM ALGORITHM



|                                                                                |                                                              |                                                                                          |                                                                                     |                                                                       |                                                                       |                                                                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5<br>DEC X 10 <sup>1</sup><br>1-1-51-5<br>A 0 A<br>DM001 | -1.00.0 1.0 2.0 3.0 4.0<br>C<br>1-1-51-5<br>NZ CG<br>ACCG00P | -2.5-1.5-0.50.5 1.5 2.5<br>DEC/SEC X 10 <sup>1</sup><br>1-1-51-5<br>PITCH RATE<br>RAC001 | -2.5-1.5-0.50.5 1.5 2.5<br>DEC X 10 <sup>1</sup><br>1-1-51-5<br>ROLL RATE<br>RAC002 | 2.0 1.5 1.0 0.5 0.0 -0.5<br>DEC X 10 <sup>1</sup><br>MLCL CMO<br>MLCL | 2.0 1.5 1.0 0.5 0.0 -0.5<br>DEC X 10 <sup>1</sup><br>MLCL CMO<br>MLCL | 0.0 0.5 1.0 1.5 2.0 2.5<br>DEC X 10 <sup>1</sup><br>MLCL CMO<br>MLCL |
| 0 N/A DAC TAEUC                                                                | 0 N/A DAC TAEUC                                              | 0 N/A DAC TAEUC                                                                          | 0 N/A DAC TAEUC                                                                     | 0 N/A DAC TAEUC                                                       | 0 N/A DAC TAEUC                                                       | 0 N/A DAC TAEUC                                                      |
| 1                                                                              | 2                                                            | 3                                                                                        | 4                                                                                   | 5                                                                     | 6                                                                     | 7                                                                    |

STRIPCHART NUMBER 2

8:59:45.621

9:00:18.220

CLLE 5.00

ORLE 5.00

CLOUT 10.77

CLMID 10.75

CLIN 10.00

CRIN 10.00

CRMID 9.25

OVERLAY FOR

FLY POINT

PRLE 4.73

PRLE 4.74

PLOUT 10.51

PLMID 10.81

PLIN 9.90

PRIN 9.94

PRMID 9.23

PROUT 9.46

MINF .81

KCRS 346.

HP 24549.

FOF 12183.

FOA 3876.

DELTA 8364.


QBAR 368.

BMCL 5.8

CLMCC .50

ZCGACL1 -1.46

MLC MACH 0.8 23500 FT BMTH 0.0 MILLION IN. LB.  
FLT 209 POINT 4N



BMCL FCEU CALCULATED BENDING MOMENT MILLIONS IN. LB.






9:06:26.253


9:06:58.352\*\*\*

|        |        |
|--------|--------|
| CLLE   | .83    |
| ORLE   | .83    |
| CLOUT  | 3.63   |
| CLMID  | 3.63   |
| CLIN   | 3.63   |
| CRIN   | 3.63   |
| CRMID  | 3.66   |
| OROUT  | 3.7    |
| PLLE   | .70    |
| PRLE   | .75    |
| PLOUT  | 3.36   |
| PLMID  | 3.58   |
| PLIN   | 3.55   |
| PRIN   | 3.68   |
| PRMID  | 3.55   |
| PROUT  | 3.59   |
| MINF   | .82    |
| KCAS   | 358.   |
| HP     | 23164. |
| FGF    | 11547. |
| FGA    | 3557.  |
| DELTA  | 7973.  |
| QBAR   | 396.   |
| BMCL   | 3.4    |
| CLMCC  | .37    |
| ZCGAQL | -1.17  |


MLC/MCC MACH 0.8 23500 FT BMTH 7 MILLION IN. LB.  
FLT 209 POINT 6C




# COMPARISON OF INSTR & FEEL BEND. MOMENTS




## AFT/F111 MLC BENDING MOMENT VS CN



# AFTI/F111 MLC BENDING MOMENT VS CN



## COMPARISON OF INSTR & FCEU BEND. MOMENTS



## MLC CONCLUSIONS

- ASYMMETRIC OUTBOARD FLAP DEFLECTIONS DURING MLC CAN LEAD TO A ROLL PIO
- REMOVING ROLL RATE AND ROLL ACCELERATION INPUTS STOPPED THE ROLL PIO
- MLC MODE OPERATES PER DESIGN PARAMETERS
- MLC/MCC ACTUAL BENDING MOMENTS AT "LOW" TE DEFLECTIONS HIGHER THAN MODE CALCULATIONS DUE TO HIGHER FLAP EFFECTIVENESS AT LOW T.E. DEFLECTIONS

# **MEGA TESTS**

## **OBJECTIVES**

### **(1) MANEUVER ENHANCEMENT**

- . CLEARANCE MANEUVERS**
- . TRACKING TESTS**


### **(2) MEGA/MCC**

- . CLEARANCE MANEUVERS**
- . TRACKING TESTS**

### **(3) GUST ALLEVIATION**


- . RIDE QUALITY - MEGA ON VS MEGA OFF**

# MAW CONTROL AND DISPLAY PANEL



KMEGA ACTIVE SWITCH

KMEGA SELECTOR SWITCH



CLEARANCE MANEUVERS MEGA

1. 1G RAP SET

- TRIMMED LEVEL FLIGHT, ON CONDITION.
- SHARP LATERAL STICK RAP
- SHARP RUDDER KICK
- SHARP NOSEDOWN PITCH RAP

2. HANDLING QUAL EVAL

- BANK, G & ALTITUDE CAPTURES AT DISCRETION OF PILOT.
- LOAD FACTOR WITHIN +.5 TO 1.5G.
- LONGITUDINAL FREQUENCY SWEEP
- PITCH DOUBLET

3. XG MEGA STEP + RAP

- ESTABLISH STABILIZED TURN AT X - 5G, HOLD FOR ~ 5 SEC.
- MAKE MODERATELY SHARP INPUT, CAPTURE XG LOAD FACTOR
- HOLD XG
- SHARP NOSE DOWN PITCH RAP


MACH NO 0.80, ALTITUDE 23500 FT  $\delta F$  5/6



## MEGA TEST RESULTS

### MEGA FLAPS 5/6

- FIRST ENGAGEMENT - FIRST PROBLEM/SOLUTION
- CLEARANCE MANEUVERS
  - 80% GAIN - ALL TESTS ACCOMPLISHED
  - 90% AND 100% GAIN
  - IN ASE - PITCH COUPLES WITH FIRST FUSELAGE BENDING MODE AT NATURAL FREQUENCY OF 4.5 HZ. PILOT AWARE OF COUPLING
- PILOT COMMENTS
  - "WELL DAMPED WITH A NICE CRISP INITIAL RESPONSE THAT WAS EASILY CONTROLLED"
  - "HANDLING QUALITIES WERE NORMAL WITH NO UNCOMMANDED RESPONSES NOTED. LOAD FACTOR RESPONSE WITH BACK STICK INPUT WAS FELT TO BE QUICKER AS MEGA GAIN WAS INCREASED."



AFTI/F-111; FLT 037 (ME/GA)

TIME SEG. 9:31:20 → 9:31:35

$M = 0.8$

$\omega_p = 23.5 \text{ K}$

$\Lambda = 26^\circ$

$K_{ME/GA} = 0.7$ ;  $K_{AD} = 1.5$

A/C RESPONSE FOLLOWING

A  $1/2''$  PSTICK STEP

INPUT  $\sim \Delta N_z(\text{c.g.}) = 0.5 \text{ g's}$

FLAPS 5/6

CLEARANCE MANEUVERS      MEGA /MCC

1. 1G RAP SET

- TRIMMED LEVEL FLIGHT, ON CONDITION.
- SHARP LATERAL STICK RAP
- SHARP RUDDER KICK
- SHARP NOSE DOWN PITCH RAP

2. HANDLING QUAL EVAL

- BANK, G & ATTITUDE CAPTURES AT DISCRETION OF PILOT.
- LOAD FACTOR WITHIN +.5 TO 1.5G.
- LONGITUDINAL FREQUENCY SWEEP
- PITCH DOUBLET


3. XG MEGA STEP + RAP

- ESTABLISH STABILIZED TURN AT X - .5 G, HOLD FOR - 5 SEC.
- MAKE MODERATELY SHARP INPUT, CAPTURE X G LOAD FACTOR
- HOLD X G
- SHARP NOSE DOWN PITCH RAP

MACH NO 0.80,    ALTITUDE 23500 FT    **δ**F    MCC

## **MEGA / MCC RESULTS**

- ASE AND HANDLING QUALITIES SATISFACTORY TO KMEGA = 50%
- AT KMEGA = 70% A PITCH INSTABILITY WAS ENCOUNTERED (FLAPS APPROXIMATELY 1/4)
- FLAP SETTINGS INVESTIGATED



MEGA LAB L/H STAB POSN. DEG.  
 C-119  
 MEGA N2 9  
 LONG STICK POSN. INCHES  
 PITCH DAMPER DEG.  
 SERIES TRIM DEG.  
 PITCH RATE DEG/SEC  
 AFTI/F111 MEGA MODE  
 MARCH 0.8  
 HP 23500  
 FLAPS 1/4

# MEGA/FLAP INVESTIGATIONS

KMEGA = 70%

| FLAP SETTINGS | RESULTS  |
|---------------|----------|
| 5/6           | STABLE   |
| 5/4           | MARGINAL |
| 5/2           | UNSTABLE |
| 3/6           | UNSTABLE |
| 1/6           | UNSTABLE |
| 3/4           | UNSTABLE |
| 1/4           | UNSTABLE |
| 3/2           | UNSTABLE |

## **MEGA/MCC CONCLUSIONS**

- AT KMEGA 70% A BOUNDED OSCILLATION EXISTS FOR CERTAIN FLAP SETTINGS
- PROBLEM APPEARS TO BE CAUSED BY GREATER FLAP EFFECTIVENESS AT LOW ( $< 6^\circ$ ) TE FLAP DEFLECTIONS

## **LESSONS LEARNED**

- **GET AIRCRAFT DERIVATIVES IN FLIGHT BEFORE FINALIZING AUTO MODE DESIGN**
- **MAKE END-TO-END CHECKS OF ALL SENSOR INPUTS BEFORE FLIGHT**
- **AVOID SENSORS WHICH RELY ON SMALL CHANGES IN SMALL VALUES FOR COMMANDS**
- **AVOID ASYMMETRIC SURFACE MOTIONS IN ROLL AXIS IN MLC MODE**
- **AN "IRON BIRD" SIMULATOR IS NOT A LUXURY**
- **CONTROL SYSTEM VARIABLE GAIN USEFUL IN EARLY FLIGHT TESTING**
- **DO NO SET UNREALISTIC HW/SW FAILURE TOLERANCES EG. QBARRE**
- **ABILITY TO MONITOR CALCULATIONS AND COMMANDS WITHOUT ENGAGING MODE IS VERY HELPFUL**



AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

21 - 22 July 1988

SESSION IV -

AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM  
FLIGHT TEST RESULTS

Handling Quality Analysis of MCC Mode

Joseph L. Conley

NASA Ames Research Center  
Dryden Flight Research Facility

## HANDLING QUALITIES OBJECTIVES

- Evaluate control system changes that primarily enhance performance
- Evaluate analysis procedures to accomplish first objective

AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

## HANDLING QUALITIES MANEUVERS

- Flown in Manual Mode followed by MCC Mode
- Tracking tasks:
  - 3 g WUT's
  - "S" turns
  - Simulated terrain following

AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

## PILOT COMMENTS AND RATINGS

| MODE | MANEUVER      | RATINGS | COMMENTS                       |
|------|---------------|---------|--------------------------------|
| MAN  | 3 G TURN HQDT | 3       | PITCH NO PROBLEM               |
| MCC  | 3 G TURN HQDT | 3       | NOT MUCH CHANGE                |
| MAN  | 3 G TURN HQDT | 3       | HARD TO STABILIZE<br>ON CANOPY |
| MCC  | 3 G TURN HQDT | 2       | PITCH TRACKING<br>EASY         |
| MAN  | 2 G TURN HQDT | 3       | PITCH NO PROBLEM               |
| MCC  | 2 G TURN HQDT | 2       | NO CHANGE IN<br>PITCH          |

AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

## PILOT COMMENTS AND RATINGS


| MODE | MANEUVER | RATINGS | COMMENTS                                                                                                            |
|------|----------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| MAN  | HQDT WUT | 2       | NONE                                                                                                                |
| MCC  | HQDT WUT | 2       | NONE                                                                                                                |
| MAN  | S TURN   | 3       | NO PROBLEM IN PITCH                                                                                                 |
| MCC  | S TURN   | 3       | INITIAL RESPONSE TO CORRECTIONS A LITTLE FASTER NOW. LITTLE BURB-LING. OVERSHOOT IN PITCH, BUT EASILY CONTROLLABLE. |

AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

## HANDLING QUALITIES ANALYSIS

- Tracking maneuver flight data reduced and processed by a fast Fourier transform
- Pitch rate to longitudinal stick transfer functions ( $q / \delta_{ep}$ ) obtained

# PITCH RATE / LONGITUDINAL STICK FREQUENCY RESPONSE



## LOWER ORDER EQUIVALENT SYSTEMS

- $q / \delta_{ep}$  transfer functions approximated by lower order equivalent systems
- Results compared to MIL SPEC 8785C criteria:
  - equivalent time delay
  - damping ratio
  - short period natural frequency vs. load factor per alpha



# Q / $\delta_{ep}$ LOES FREQUENCY RESPONSE






Figure 1 is a graph showing Time Delay (sec) versus MCC Mode. The Y-axis represents Time Delay in seconds, ranging from 0.00 to 0.30. The X-axis represents the MCC Mode, with Manual Mode and MCC Mode indicated. The graph is divided into three horizontal levels, each represented by a hatched band:

- LEVEL 1:** This level is located between approximately 0.04 and 0.06 seconds. It contains several data points (small squares) clustered around 0.05 seconds.
- LEVEL 2:** This level is located between approximately 0.10 and 0.11 seconds. It contains one data point (small square) at approximately 0.11 seconds.
- LEVEL 3:** This level is located between approximately 0.21 and 0.26 seconds. It contains several data points (small squares) clustered around 0.25 seconds.




# MIL SPEC 8785C Short Period Damping Ratio



# MIL SPEC 8785C Short Period Natural Frequency




# NEAL-SMITH CRITERION




Neal-Smith pilot strategy (closed-loop pilot/vehicle frequency response).

# NEAL-SMITH CRITERION FOR FIGHTER MANEUVERING DYNAMICS



# NEAL-SMITH CRITERION FOR FIGHTER MANEUVERING DYNAMICS



AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

## HANDLING QUALITIES RESULTS

- MIL - F - 8785C longitudinal mode criteria
- Neal / Smith criterion
- Current criteria adequate to predict H. Q. characteristics  
due to auto modes

RMK



# PILOT OBSERVATIONS

- FLIGHT TEST TECHNIQUES
- HANDLING QUALITIES - MANUAL MODE
- HANDLING QUALITIES - CCC, MCC AND MLC
- MEGA MODE OBSERVATIONS
- FINAL THOUGHTS

COL. C.G. FULLERTON

JULY 22, 1988

# FLIGHT TEST TECHNIQUES

- INFLIGHT REFUELING - PLANNED MISSION 3 HOURS
- STICK TRIGGER DISCONNECTS AUTO MODE, RETRACTS FLAPS
- SIMULATOR EXTREMELY VALUABLE TOOL
  - FLIGHT PLAN DEVELOPMENT, INCREASED EFFICIENCY
  - SAFETY ENHANCED-ELIMINATE POINTS THAT EXCEED OR APPROACH LIMITS
  - EASY PARAMETER CHANGE, RESET IMPORTANT
  - USED TO FIND CAUSE OF DESIGN DEFECTS

## MAWSO DUTIES

- SETUP MAW CONFIGURATION
- MONITOR POSITION, FUEL, REFUEL PLANNING
- RELIEF ON LONG FLIGHTS
- MONITOR LIMITING PARAMETERS

## UPLINK GUIDANCE (RAV)

- DESIRED/ACTUAL PARAMETER DELTA DISPLAYED ON ADI POINTERS
- ENHANCES ACCURACY AND EFFICIENCY

## TYPICAL MANEUVERS

- WIND-UP TURNS      - CONSTANT NZ TURNS      - PUSHOVER MANEUVERS
- SPEED/POWER      -  $\alpha$ , NZ,  $\theta$  CAPTURES      - STICK RAPS
- FORMATION      - AIR-TO-AIR TRACKING

## HANDLING QUALITIES - MANUAL MODE

- GENERAL RESPONSE, ANY FLAP SETTING - MUCH LIKE STANDARD F-111 (GOOD)
- INFLIGHT REFUELING - NO DIFFERENCE, A/B REQUIRED ABOVE 24000 FT
- INDUCED DRAG WITH LOAD FACTOR DRAMATIC
- FLAP DRAG DRAMATIC (USED AT HIGHER SPEEDS THAN NORMAL F-111)
- INCREASED GROUND ROLL DISTANCE (EMPTY WEIGHT + 9000#, NO GROUND ROLL SPOILERS)
- FAILURE MODES (PRIMARY FCS FAIL)
  - PROCEDURE: USE BACK UP SYSTEM TO LOWER FLAPS, BRAKE MAW, LAND WITH ROLLING STABILON CONTROL
  - DAMPERS ON - REASONABLE ROLL RESPONSE, USE STRAIGHT IN APPROACH TO RUNWAY
  - ROLL DAMPER FAILED - VERY SLUGGISH ROLL RESPONSE, USE LAKEBED
  - ROLL AND YAW DAMPER FAILED - SLUGGISH ROLL, POORLY DAMPED DUTCH ROLL, RUDDER VERY EFFECTIVE - PREFER SINGLE STRING BACKUP SYSTEM FOR LANDING

# HANDLING QUALITIES - AUTO MODE

## CCC, MCC AND MLC

- CRUISE CAMBER CONTROL (CCC)

- LOWER FREQUENCY SYSTEM - NO EFFECT ON SHORT PERIOD HANDLING

- MANEUVER CAMBER CONTROL (MCC)

- WING RECAMBERS PER NZ, M TABLE LOOKUP
- NO APPARENT HANDLING DIFFERENCE FROM MANUALLY SET FLAPS
- NO APPARENT TRIM CHANGE OR PITCHING EFFECTS AS FLAPS ACTUATE
- TRACKING OF TARGET AIRCRAFT IMPROVED

- MANEUVER LOAD CONTROL (MLC)

- NO APPARENT PITCH EFFECT WHEN SYSTEM "TRIGGERS"
- FIRST USES SHOWED ROLL PIO TENDENCY DUE TO DIFFERENCE IN LEFT VS RIGHT WING TRIGGER POINT
- ELIMINATION OF ROLL AND ROLL RATE FEEDBACK FIXED PROBLEM
- NOW MODE IS TRANSPARENT TO ROLL AND PITCH HANDLING

- COMBINATION MODE MCC/MLC

- NO INTERACTIVE EFFECTS
- NO DETECTABLE HANDLING CHANGES

## MEGA MODE OBSERVATIONS

- GROUND RESONANCE PROBLEM - LED TO VARIABLE GAIN IMPLEMENTATION
- VERY CONSERVATIVE APPROACH INFLIGHT - SLOWLY INCREASED GAIN STEPS
- FIRST INFLIGHT USE CLEARLY UNSTABLE IN PITCH
  - NZ SIGNAL TO MAW REVERSED POLARITY
  - POLARITY CORRECTED, TESTS RESUMED
- AT FLAPS 5/6, MEGA GAIN UP TO .8, MODE PROVIDES DESIREABLE QUICKENING OF NZ RESPONSE TO STICK COMMAND
- "LURCHINESS" NOTED AT MEGA GAIN  $> .5$  AT LOW CAMBER
  - INITIAL RESPONSE TO PITCH INPUT AS EXPECTED
  - FOLLOWED BY FLAP OSCILLATIONS AND UNDESIRED PITCH MOTIONS
  - PRECISE PITCH CONTROL REQUIRES EXCESSIVE PILOT ATTENTION
  - EFFECT LESS WITH INCREASED WING CAMBER
- SIMULATOR RESPONSE SIMILAR IF PITCHING MOMENT DUE TO TRAILING EDGE FLAP DEFLECTION COEFFICIENT IS DOUBLED
- GUST ALLEVIATION NOT EVALUATED YET


## **FINAL THOUGHTS**

- EXHAUSTIVE GROUND TEST AND SIMULATIONS PAY OFF
- SURPRISES STILL OCCUR IN FLIGHT
- CONSERVATIVE INCREMENTAL APPROACH ADVISED IF ANY DOUBT EXISTS

**AFTI/F-111**  
**MISSION PERFORMANCE**

**GLENN W. HARSHBERGER**  
**CHIEF AERODYNAMICIST**  
**AFTI/F-111 ADPO**


# Mission Adaptive Wing Aerodynamic Characteristics






# VARIABLE CAMBER ENVELOPE

MACH=0.70 SWEEP=16 DEG Q=300 PSF




# VARIABLE CAMBER ENVELOPE

MACH=0.85 SWEEP=26 DEG Q=340 PSF




# DRAG POLAR COMPARISON

MACH=0.70 SWEEP=26 DEG Q=300 PSF




# DRAG POLAR COMPARISON

MACH=0.85 SWEEP=16 DEG Q=300 PSF




# CRUISE EFFICIENCY

SWEEP-26 DEG H=35,000 FT CL=0.4




# DRAG POLAR COMPARISON

MACH=1.30 SWEEP=18 DEG H=32,000 FT



# NSEG OVERVIEW



- EXAMINE MANEUVERABILITY OF AIRCRAFT
- DEVELOP VARIED FLIGHT ENVELOPES
- COMPARE FLIGHT ENVELOPES OF TWO DIFFERENT AIRCRAFT

- INVESTIGATE RANGE/PAYLOAD PERFORMANCE OF AIRCRAFT
- COMPARE AIRCRAFT CONFIGURATIONS AND FLIGHT PROFILES
- DEVELOP REALISTIC FLIGHT PROFILES FOR OTHER APPLICATIONS

## BASIC INPUT DATA

- AERODYNAMIC DATA
  - CLEAN AIRCRAFT DRAG POLARS
  - EXTERNAL STORE DRAG
  - MACH, DYNAMIC PRESSURE, LIFT COEFFICIENT LIMITS
  - REYNOLDS NUMBER CORRECTIONS
- PROPULSION DATA
  - MAX DRY (MILITARY) THRUST AND FUEL FLOW (OR SFC)
    - $FF=f(H,M, \text{POWER SETTING})$
  - PARTIAL AFTERBURNER (WET)
    - NOT REQUIRED
  - FULL AFTERBURNER THRUST AND FUEL FLOW (OR SFC)
    - $FF=f(H,M)$
- WEIGHTS AND CONFIGURATION DATA
  - AIRCRAFT EMPTY AND TAKE-OFF GROSS WEIGHT
  - FUEL AND EXPENDABLE STORES WEIGHT
  - EXPENDABLE STORES CONFIGURATION
  - AERO REFERENCE AREA



## AERODYNAMIC MODELS

### ● TAC I

- "TACT FLIGHT DERIVED LIFT AND DRAG CHARACTERISTICS,"  
AFFTC-TR-77-12. JULY 1977, (VOLUME I)

- CD = F(C<sub>L</sub>, M, Q, SWEEP)
- MACH = .5 TO 2.0
- Q = 200 TO 1100 PSF
- SWEEP = 26 & 58

### ● AFTI/F-111

- CD = F(C<sub>L</sub>, M, Q, SWEEP, L<sub>E</sub>, T<sub>E</sub>)
- MACH = .65 TO 1.3
- SWEEP = 26 & 58
- 58° SWEEP FLOWN AT H=30,000 FT.
- 26° SWEEP PRIMARILY FLOWN AT Q = 300 PSF

## THRUST MODEL

### • TF30-P-9 ENGINES

- "PROPULSION DATA SUBSTANTIATION STANDARD AIRCRAFT CHARACTERISTICS CHARTS AND REGULAR FLIGHT MANUAL F-111D AIRCRAFT," GENERAL DYNAMICS REPORT FZA-12-8002, OCT 1970.

- MACH = 0 TO 2.5

- ALTITUDE = 0 TO 65,000 FT.


-  $F_n, W_F = F(M, H)$

PRODUCTION AIRCRAFT WEIGHT SUMMARY (LBS.)

|                  | TACT  | MAW   | $\Delta$ |
|------------------|-------|-------|----------|
| OPERATING WEIGHT | 49287 | 49965 | 678      |
| FUEL             | 26746 | 26746 | 0        |
| TAKEOFF WEIGHT   | 76033 | 76711 | 678      |


# SUBSONIC MANEUVERABILITY COMPARISON

SWEEP=26 DEG H=30,000 FT MAX A/B P-9 ENGINES




# SUPERSONIC MANEUVERABILITY COMPARISON


SWEEP=56 DEG H=32,000 FT MAX A/B P-9 ENGINES



# MISSION PROFILE



# MISSION RANGE COMPARISON



SESSION V

LOW TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION



# CRUISE CAMBER CONTROL

for the AFTI/F-111 Missions Adaptive Wing

Larry D. Brock  
Col USAFR

Briefing to Industry  
Dayton, Ohio  
21-22 July 1988

Flight Dynamics Laboratory  
Air Force Wright Aeronautical Laboratories  
Aeronautical Systems Division  
Air Force Systems Command  
Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433

AFTI/F-111  
**MAW**

# CRUISE CAMBER CONTROL (CCC)

## Purpose

Adjust the camber of the Mission Adaptive Wing during cruise operation to provide the optimum shape for the current conditions. The optimum shape is the one that maximizes speed by minimizing the total effective drag.

## Requirements

The CCC mode must operate automatically and autonomously in a self-optimizing process without the need for extensive *a priori* aircraft performance data.

AFTI/F-111  
MAW

7/18/88 2

## ADVANTAGES OF CCC

- Optimizes Cruise Performance
  - Increases speed or
  - Increases range
- Self Adaptive
  - To variations in a particular aircraft over time.
  - To variations from aircraft-to-aircraft in the fleet.
- Self Contained
  - Not dependent on acquiring extensive and expensive wind tunnel and flight test data.

AFTI/F-111  
**MAW**

7/18/88 3

## CCC STUDIES

- A simulation program was developed to study automatic camber control issues.
- Cruise camber optimization strategies were studied.
  - Techniques using test camber perturbations were determined to be the most promising.
- The effects of turbulence were studied.
  - Sensor data filtering was needed.
  - CCC mode was predicted to be functional with turbulence levels that are experience 98% of the time at the expected cruise altitudes.
- The potential for climb optimization was investigated.
  - Performance of automatic camber optimization during climb is expected to be marginal due to the difficulty of accurately predicting performance in a changing dynamic environment.

AFTI/F-111

MAW

7/18/88 4

## BASIC OPTIMIZATION STRATEGY

- Inject a step perturbation in the camber angle.
- Measure the dynamic response of the aircraft using available sensor data.
- Assess the effects of the camber change using the dynamic response of the aircraft.
- Make additional changes based of the assessment of the previous camber change.


## CCC DESIGN CHALLENGES

- No available sensor measurement gives an immediate and direct indication of the desired effect of a camber change.
  - Velocity is slow to respond to camber change.
  - Acceleration measurements are difficult to interpret because of corruption from other effects.
- Primary difficulty is the complex dynamic response of the aircraft to a camber change.
  - Immediate response of the aircraft to a camber change is a disruption of the pitch balance.
  - There are then changes in the vertical plane which must be corrected by the altitude hold autopilot.
  - Finally there is the change in horizontal speed which is the effect desired.


AFTI/F-111  
**MAW**

7/18/88 6

# DYNAMIC RESPONSE TO CAMBER CHANGE



# CURRENT IMPLEMENTATION OF CCC



AFTI/F-111  
MAW

7/18/88 8






## FLIGHT TEST OF CCC

- There have been nine tests of the CCC mode during three flights with multiple search sequences during several of these tests.
- The performance of the CCC mode has not been as good as expected.
  - The search technique was able to identify the correct direction to begin the search sequences.
  - In most of the search sequences, the search either stopped prematurely or continued to change the camber beyond the region of the known optimum value.

AFTI/F-111  
**MAW**

7/20/88 9




# RESULTS OF SELECTED FLIGHT TESTS



AFTI/F-111  
MAW

7/18/88 10




# RESULTS OF SELECTED FLIGHT TESTS (cont)



AFTI/F-111  
MAW

7/18/88 11

# RESULTS OF SELECTED FLIGHT TESTS (cont)



AFTI/F-111  
MAW

7/18/88 12

# PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF THE FLIGHT TEST RESULTS

- The primary difficulty in the performance of the CCC mode appears to be corruption and noise in the acceleration measurements.
  - The accelerometers used are body mounted. A technique of zeroing acceleration at the beginning of each five second period was used to remove undesired bias effects such as those due to pitch angle.
  - The effects of pitch due to the transients introduced by the camber change and other noise appears to be a major cause of the poor performance.

AFTI/F-111  
**MAW**

7/18/88 13

# FUTURE PLANS FOR THE CCC MODE

- A modification of the CCC mode is being planned to improve performance.
  - This modification will use velocity instead of acceleration.
  - An estimate of the effect of a camber change is made by measuring the change in velocity.
- Velocity has the advantage of:
  - being a more direct measure of the desired aircraft performance characteristic, and
  - not being as influenced by undesired aircraft dynamic characteristics.

AFTI/F-111  
**MAW**

7/18/88 14

## CONCLUSIONS

- The availability of a CCC mode will be a valuable asset for an aircraft that has a variable camber wing.
- Even though the flight test of the current implementation of the CCC mode has not been successful, the flight test data shows that information is available to implement a successful CCC mode.

AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

21 - 22 July 1988

SESSION V - MAW TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

Post Flight Analysis of Automatic Flight Control Modes

Joseph L. Conley

NASA Ames Research Center  
Dryden Flight Research Facility



## MODELS OF THE AUTO MODES

- Independent verification of mode implementation
- Provided the capability for access to internal variables
- Facilitated analysis for proposed mode modifications

## **MODELING APPROACH**


- All modes computer modeled for non-real time analysis
- Included capability of accepting flight measured sensor and command inputs
- Results included comparison of simulated auto mode commands with flight results

AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

## AUTO MODE ANALYSIS



- CCC Mode - functional evaluation and recommendation for modification
- MCC Mode
- ME/GA Mode

## CCC MODE ANALYSIS




- Verified mode was functioning as designed
- Determined poor mode performance was caused by sensor input and not the mode logic
- Facilitated modification of mode using airspeed as sensor input

# CCC ESTIMATION PROCESS (IDEAL)




AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

## CCC ESTIMATION PROCESS (ACTUAL)



AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

## PROPOSED CCC MODE MODIFICATION




AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

## MANEUVER CAMBER CONTROL


- Provides  $(L/D)_{\max}$  at steady state or maneuvering flight
- Continuously position L.E. and T.E. surfaces



## MCC LEADING EDGE COMMAND COMPARISON



## MCC TRAILING EDGE COMMAND COMPARISON




**AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY**

## **MANEUVER ENHANCEMENT/GUST ALLEVIATION**


- Enhances pitch maneuvering capability
- Alleviates effects of turbulence on flight crew
- Continuously positions L.E. , T.E. surfaces and Stab.

## MEGA TRAILING EDGE COMMAND COMPARISON



AFTI/F-111 MAW  
BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY

## MEGA STABILON COMMAND COMPARISON



## AUTO MODES MODELING RESULTS

- Automatic Modes independently verified
- Provided convenient method for mode analysis
  - internal variables
- Facilitated proposed mode modifications

# **STRUCTURES & MECHANIZATION LESSONS LEARNED**

**Frank D. Statkus  
Boeing Advanced Systems**


## Structures

# Lessons Learned

- \* Wing box
  - \* Design in parallel with flaps
    - \* Direct load paths
    - \* Eliminate auxiliary spar
    - \* Bending and torsion strength consistent with flaps
    - \* Wing thickness correct
- \* Continuous skins leading edge to trailing edge possible for upper surface




# Variable Camber Wing System



## **Structures**

### **Lessons Learned (Continued)**

- \* Continuous leading edge flaps
- \* Fiberglass skins give structural compliance during wing bending with flap deflection




## Structures


# Lessons Learned (Continued)

- \* Variable camber linkage
  - \* Single load path possible for decreased weight
  - \* Linkage is common for varying wing thickness
  - \* Linkage ratio is variable at the expense of flap rate
  - \* Common linkage is possible for both leading and trailing edge flaps


# Outboard L.E. Linkage Undelected



# Inboard L.E. Linkage Undeflected



# Inboard L.E. Fully Deflected




## Structures


# Lessons Learned (Continued)

- \* Fixed wing design
  - \* Eliminates flexible wing pivot seals
  - \* No inboard flap lockout requirements
  - \* No flap contour limitations for side-of-body glove matching
  - \* No flexible wing tip requirements
  - \* No flap end seals



# Variable Camber Leading Edge Wing Tip





## Structures

### Lessons Learned (Continued)

- \* Structural flap stops
- \* No extruded hard stops required
- \* PDU blocking mode combined with electrical brakes are sufficient to contain flap

## Mechanical Lessons Learned


- \* Rotary actuators
  - \* Suitable solution for Maw drive system
  - \* Can be used to "clock" linkage along flap span to "dial in" the design wing twist
  - \* Wing twist can be varied by changing the actuator "clocking"
  - \* Flap rerigging is not required following actuator removal and replacement

## Mechanical


### Lessons Learned (Continued)

- \* Power drive units
- \* Could be simplified while maintaining hydraulic drive duality by using a differential (combining) gear box
- \* Eliminate input gear box by changing rpm from PDUs


# AFTI/F-III General Arrangement Mechanical System



# L.E. Outboard Power Drive Unit




# T.E. Outboard Power Drive Unit





## Structural Problems During Design

- \* Rotary actuators
- \* Because of long lead time:
  - Early source selection
  - Nonoptimum "off the shelf" hardware
- \* Increased trailing edge flap rates (control requirements)
  - Significantly shortened actuator life
  - Ultimate strength integrity not affected
- \* Wing box
- \* Higher than expected stress levels required
  - unplanned strengthening of wing box
- \* Trailing edge envelope:
- \* Thin outboard trailing edge and increased flap rates reduced mechanical advantage of linkage mechanism forcing major redesign



## Flight Test Results

- \* Flex panels and mechanism
- \* Good correlation of flight test stress data with predicted stress levels; no problems
- \* Pivot fitting
  - \* Higher than predicted stress levels
  - \* Probable cause: Manner in which torsion is reacted
  - \* Possible restrictions of flight envelope
- \* Power drive unit quill shaft
  - \* Early fatigue failure
  - \* Cause
    - Consistent overload due to too severe preflight and quality testing
    - Tool marks
- \* Remedial action
  - Software change reduced dynamic factor during preflight test
  - Improved surface finish ~ 32 ✓

# **FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEMS LESSONS LEARNED**

**Joseph M. Hall  
Boeing Advanced Systems**

# **FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM LESSONS LEARNED**

---

- I IN SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT / TESTING**
- II ON THE FLIGHT SIMULATOR**
- III IN FLIGHT TEST**

## **LESSONS LEARNED IN SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT / TESTING**

---

**I IN INITIAL SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT, CONSIDERATION  
NEEDS TO BE GIVEN TO EASE OF TESTING**

- **WRITE DETAILED LOGIC EQUATIONS**
- **NAME ALL IMPORTANT VARIABLES**
- **SPECIFY FORMS OF FILTERS**

**II TEST SOFTWARE MUST ALSO BE TESTED**

- **ONLY SOFTWARE ERROR FOUND  
WAS IN TEST SOFTWARE**

## **LESSONS LEARNED ON THE FLIGHT SIMULATOR**

---

- I REALISTIC AND DEMANDING PILOT TASKS, USING A VISUAL SYSTEM, ARE NECESSARY FOR EVALUATION OF FLYING QUALITIES**
- II EARLY EVALUATION OF SIMULATOR COMPUTATIONAL DELAYS IS NECESSARY TO ASSURE VALIDITY OF RESULTS**
- III ARRAY PROCESSORS ARE NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE ACCEPTABLE DELAYS WHEN THE AERODYNAMIC DATA BASE IS LARGE**

## LESSONS LEARNED IN FLIGHT TEST

---

- 1 BUILT-IN PILOT SELECTABLE FEATURES SAVE TIME
  - VARIABLE GAIN ON MEGA MODE
  - SELECTABLE FEEDBACK OF ROLL RATE  
IN AYC SYSTEM



# **CONSIDERATIONS FOR AN OPERATIONAL SYSTEM**

**Douglas K. Gould  
Boeing Advanced Systems**


## Early Applications of Mission Adaptive Wing

---




243. Handley Page R/200 landplane, N.29.


# Current Use of Flexible Skin Technology—747 Variable Camber Leading-Edge Krueger Flap




# Mission Adaptive Wing Aerodynamic Characteristics




# Bomber




# Typical Bomber Mission



# Application of Mission Adaptive Wing Technology to Bomber




# Fighter





## Typical Fighter Mission



# Application of Mission Adaptive Wing Technology to Fighter


---

- **Maneuver Camber Control** to maximize lift/drag and buffet-free lift over entire flight envelope
  - 50% increase in  $L/D$  @  $M = 0.9$ , 5 g's compared to fixed camber wing
  - 20% increase in useable lift @  $M = 0.9$
- **Maneuver Load Control**
  - $\Delta$ wing weight = -100 lbs. due to reduction in wing design bending moment
- **Maneuver Enhancement/Gust Allevation**
  - Blended wing and tail commands for quicker maneuver
  - Gust response reduced 30%
- **Cruise Camber Control**
  - Optimum cruise camber for external configuration changes
    - Weapons
    - Fuel tanks
    - Control surface misalignments
    - Damage


# Missileer



## Application of Mission Adaptive Wing to Missileer



## Typical Short-Haul Transport Flight



## Mission Adaptive Wing Benefits

---

- An increase in performance and operating capability at any off design point for a fixed geometry design
- Reduction in Design Gross Weight required to meet the performance requirements for a new aircraft
- An increase in performance for requirements not critical from a sizing standpoint

## Mission Adaptive Wing Applicability

---

- Examine performance requirements
- Determine primary emphasis for variable camber system
- Select variable camber concept and extent
  - Simple hinge, smooth flexible skin, slotted
  - Leading edge and/or trailing edge
- Define operating requirements
  - Reflection magnitude and rate
  - Actuation power and concept
- Select materials and structural concept
- Evaluate design implications and performance
  - Drag
  - Weight
  - Mission Capability


# Design Considerations

---

- Wing Geometry
  - Thickness Distribution
  - Chord of Moving Surface
  - Wing Close Out
  - End Seals
- Redundancy
- Duty Cycle
- Producibility
- Maintainability




# Simple Hinge Versus Smooth Variable Camber




# Smooth Variable Camber vs. Simple Hinge Flap

## F-8



# Smooth Variable Camber Leading Edge with Auxiliary Krueger Flap



## **Weight Considerations (Fighter-Type Aircraft)**

---

| <b><u>Average Weight, lb/ft<sup>2</sup></u></b> |                                            |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 4.5                                             | • Fixed-wing leading edge structure        |
| 10.0                                            | • Simple-drooped leading edge flap         |
| 12.0                                            | • Double-drooped leading edge flap         |
| 16.0                                            | • Smooth variable-camber (AFTI production) |

## Conclusions

---


- The advantages of Mission Adaptive Wing capability have been recognized since the early days of aviation
- Advances in State-Of-Art technology in materials, Power Sources and Control Concepts now allow practical Mission Adaptive Wing systems to be built
- Aircraft having Performance Requirements in more than one flight regime can benefit greatly from Mission Adaptive Wing capability

SESSION VI

FUTURE RESEARCH

OVERVIEW  
REMAINING FLIGHT TESTS







## REMAINING TASKS

- A/C MAINTENANCE
  - ENGINE (TCTO)
  - AIRFRAME (TCTO)
  - PYRO (TCTO)
- MAW SYSTEM
  - 125 HOUR INSPECTION
  - CCC MODE UPDATE
  - MEGA MODE EVALUATION
- FLIGHT TEST
  - JULY - AUG
  - OCT - DEC





# FLIGHT TEST ENVELOPE






## MANUAL FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM - FLIGHT STATUS

- PRESSURE DISTRIBUTION
- STABILITY AND CONTROL
- BUFFET
- PERFORMANCE FLIGHT TEST
- AERODYNAMIC LOADS



## **AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROL SYSTEM - FLIGHT STATUS**

- **CRUISE CAMBER CONTROL (CCC)**
- **MANEUVER CAMBER CONTROL (MCC)**
- **MANEUVER LOAD CONTROL (MLC)**
- **MANEUVER ENHANCEMENT / GUST ALLEVIATION**
- **MODE COMBINATIONS**



# SCHEDULE

| AUTHENTICATED PROGRAM MANAGER |  | LOUIS L. STEERS |  | PROGRAM/PROJECT       |  | DATE          |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|-----------------------|--|---------------|
|                               |  |                 |  | MISSION ADAPTIVE WING |  | JULY 21, 1988 |
| ACTIVITY/TASK                 |  | FY87            |  | FY88                  |  | FY89          |
| MANUAL MAW SYSTEM             |  |                 |  |                       |  |               |
| FLIGHT ACTIVITY               |  |                 |  |                       |  |               |
| PHASE I - MANUAL ONLY         |  |                 |  |                       |  |               |
| PHASE II - MANUAL/AUTO        |  |                 |  |                       |  |               |
| BRIEFING TO INDUSTRY          |  |                 |  |                       |  |               |
| AUTOMATIC MAW SYSTEM          |  |                 |  |                       |  |               |
| INTEGRATED SYSTEM TEST        |  |                 |  |                       |  |               |
| FLIGHT ACTIVITY               |  |                 |  |                       |  |               |
| ANALYSIS AND REPORTING        |  |                 |  |                       |  |               |