



Guidance Methods for Accurate In-Flight Alignment of Navy Theatre Wide Missiles

15 May 2001

**Ernest J. Ohlmeyer
Craig Phillips
David Hanger
Mark Jones
Thomas R. Pepitone**

NDIA Missiles & Rockets Symposium and Exhibition

Report Documentation Page

Report Date 15052001	Report Type N/A	Dates Covered (from... to) -
Title and Subtitle Guidance Methods for Accurate InFlight Alignment of Navy Theatre Wide Missiles	Contract Number	
	Grant Number	
	Program Element Number	
Author(s) Ohlmeyer, Ernest J.; Phillips, Craig; Hanger, David; Jones, Mark; Pepitone, Thomas R.	Project Number	
	Task Number	
	Work Unit Number	
Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es) NAVSEA, Dahlgren	Performing Organization Report Number	
Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es) NDIA (National Defense Industrial Association 2111 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 400 Arlington, VA 22201-3061	Sponsor/Monitor's Acronym(s)	
	Sponsor/Monitor's Report Number(s)	
Distribution/Availability Statement Approved for public release, distribution unlimited		
Supplementary Notes Proceedings from Armaments for the 2nd Annual Missiles & Rockets Symposium & Exhibition, 14-16 May 2001 sponsored by NDIA., The original document contains color images.		
Abstract		
Subject Terms		
Report Classification unclassified	Classification of this page unclassified	
Classification of Abstract unclassified	Limitation of Abstract UU	
Number of Pages 29		



OUTLINE




- Background
- ADOP - In-Flight Alignment Metric
- Second Stage Guidance Methods
- In-Flight Alignment Analysis
- Summary



Background



NTW Concept of Operation






Successful Intercept Requirements




Pointing Requirement



- At kinetic warhead (KW) separation the target must be within the seeker field of regard (FOR)

Divert Requirement



- The zero effort miss (ZEM) must be within the kinetic warhead divert capability



In-flight Alignment Required to Achieve Pointing Error Allocations



- The missile IMU alignment with respect to the ship defined navigation (ECEF) coordinate frame may have a large unknown error at launch (up to 26 mrad)
 - This error dominates the error budget and degrades performance
 - The in-flight alignment (IFA) process calibrates the IMU alignment with respect to the navigation coordinate frame during flight
 - An integrated GPS/IMU missile navigation system was first used on Standard Missile to perform this in-flight alignment as part of the Terrier LEAP experiment

In order To Meet The Pointing Error Allocation The Missile Initial Attitude Error Must Be Reduced Inflight



How Does Inflight Alignment Work?



- Background Facts
 - The major alignment error component to be calibrated is the IMU alignment with respect to the navigation frame (≤ 26 mrad)
 - When accelerations are transformed with an IMU alignment error to the navigation frame an acceleration error develops
- The Aiding Process
 - Acceleration errors, when integrated, result in velocity errors which result, in turn, in position errors
 - Navigation errors are observable by comparing inertial navigation estimates of the position and velocity to measurements from outside sources:
 - Radar measurements (position)
 - GPS measurements (position & velocity)
 - Errors are corrected via an on-board Kalman Filter



In-Flight Alignment Metric “ ADOP ”



ADOP - The Alignment Metric



- Attitude Dilution Of Precision (ADOP) was developed as a trajectory induced observability metric of in-flight alignment
- There are two fundamental ingredients in the ADOP metric
 - The missile acceleration time profile
 - The GPS and radar measurement noise error time profiles
- An interpretation of the ADOP metric
 - Missile total (RSS) attitude alignment error with respect to the navigation coordinate frame ($3\text{-}\sigma$ value expressed in milli-radians)
 - A value less than 5 mrad is considered good performance and a value greater than 5 mrad is considered degraded performance





ADOP Attributes



- Trajectory induced observability metric for in-flight alignment
- A simplified error model that is economical to run
- Provides lower bound on attitude errors for benchmarking in-flight alignment performance
- Can be used to generate observability maps over the tactical battlespace
- Shows difficult regions of the battlespace for in-flight alignment

ADOP Observability Contour Map
Spanning the Battlespace






Second Stage Guidance Methods



IFA Performance Examined for 3 Second Stage Guidance Laws



- Cross Product Guidance (CPG)
 - Guides to a specified injection velocity vector
 - Approximates an optimal kinematic trajectory
- Delayed Cross Product Guidance (DCPG)
 - Similar to CPG, guides to a specified injection velocity vector
 - Guidance initiation is delayed to improve IFA
- Modified Cross Product Guidance (MCPG)
 - Similar to CPG, guides to a specified injection velocity vector
 - Guidance initiation is delayed
 - Adds a shaping term to improve IFA





Guidance Law Definitions




$$\vec{A}_C = \underbrace{-K_1 V \sin d \hat{u}}_{\text{Cross Product Term}} + \underbrace{K_2(t) \hat{u}}_{\text{Shaping Term}}$$

• Cross Product Term:

- CPG, DCPG, & MCPG
- Nulls heading error and forces convergence to injection velocity vector
- K_1 gain is scheduled with γ_{INJ} to minimize angle-of-attack

• Shaping Term:

- MCPG only
- Applies short-lived acceleration in direction opposite to cross product term to induce observability
- K_2 gain is scheduled with γ_{INJ} to maximize effect in regions of poor IFA



$$\bar{\mathbf{u}} = \hat{\mathbf{v}} \times (\hat{\mathbf{v}} \times \hat{\mathbf{v}}_{INJ})$$

$$|\bar{\mathbf{u}}| = \sin d$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{u}}}{|\bar{\mathbf{u}}|}$$

$\bar{\mathbf{A}}_C$ = commanded acceleration vector

V = velocity magnitude

$\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ = current velocity unit vector

$\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{INJ}$ = commanded injection velocity unit vector

$\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ = cross product unit vector

d = angle between $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_{INJ}$

K_1 = cross product term gain

K_2 = shaping term gain




2ND Stage Guidance Attributes



- Second stage guidance is closed-loop
- At lower injection angles, accelerations are limited early in second stage to meet the aero-thermal constraint
- Used to generate a fan of trajectories for varying injection angles and flight times to span the kinematic battlespace
- ADOP measured at various flight times along each trajectory to create observability maps

Fan of Trajectories for Varying Injection Angles and Flight Times





IFA Analysis



IFA Analysis for 3 Guidance Laws




- IFA performance measured by ADOP observability maps covering the battlespace
- ADOP maps generated for each guidance law:
 - CPG
 - DCPG
 - MCPG
- ADOP maps examined for two types of aiding:
 - Radar only
 - Radar & GPS
- ADOP maps examined at two trajectory events:
 - 2ND/3RD stage separation
 - 3RD/4TH stage separation



Example ADOP Histories




ADOP Histories for Radar Only Aiding
for the 3 Guidance Methods



- ADOP time histories show improvement in IFA performance at 3rd/4th stage separation over 2nd/3rd stage separation
- IFA performance improvement at the later flight time results from
 - Additional time for aiding from outside sensors
 - Additional accelerations from the 3rd stage




CPG ADOP Maps



- IFA improves from 2nd/3rd stage separation to 3rd/4th stage separation for both aiding methods
- IFA improves for radar & GPS aiding over radar only aiding
- IFA requirement satisfied over majority of the battlespace for the radar & GPS aiding case at the 3rd/4th stage separation point




DCPG ADOP Maps



- IFA improves from 2nd/3rd stage separation to 3rd/4th stage separation for both aiding methods
- IFA improves for radar & GPS aiding over radar only aiding
- IFA requirement satisfied over majority of the battlespace for the radar & GPS aiding case at the 3rd/4th stage separation point



MCPG ADOP Maps







- IFA improves from 2nd/3rd stage separation to 3rd/4th stage separation for both aiding methods
- IFA improves for radar & GPS aiding over radar only aiding
- For radar & GPS aiding, IFA requirement satisfied over most of the battlespace at 2nd/3rd stage separation and satisfied over the entire battlespace at 3rd/4th stage separation



DCPG and MCPG Kinematic Penalties



Maps of Burnout Velocity



- Battlespace is slightly reduced in ground range with DCPG and further reduced in altitude with MCPG
- Burnout velocities are slightly decreased for DCPG and further reduced for MCPG in the regions of largest trajectory shaping



Summary



Summary



- IFA is necessary to meet the KW seeker pointing requirement
- ADOP is the trajectory induced IFA observability metric
- IFA performance has been analyzed for three different second stage guidance laws
- The addition of GPS aiding significantly improves IFA
- The longer aiding period for 3rd/4th stage separation improves IFA over 2nd/3rd stage separation
- Both DCPG and MCPG provide improved IFA performance over CPG
- Using MCPG and with radar & GPS aiding, the IFA requirement is satisfied over the majority of the battlespace at 2nd/3rd stage separation and over the entire battlespace at 3rd/4th stage separation
- Both burnout velocity and the overall battlespace are slightly reduced for DCPG and MCPG



Backup Slides



Example Pointing Error Allocation



Assumptions:

- Pr target within radius = **0.9974**
- $V_C = 4068$ m/s
- $T_{GO} = 24$ s
- $R_{SHIP/TARGET} = 261.3$ km
- Angle Error = Range Error / ($V_C \times T_{GO}$)

KW Field of Regard Radius

11.0 mr [15.6 mr]

X 3.45 / 3


Boresight Error Requirement

9.6 mr 3σ [13.6 mr]

RSS

Notes:

- Bold numbers are allocated values
- Shaded boxes indicate where GPS measurements are used to achieve allocations
- Brackets are target/missile track on different radar faces






GPS And Radar Measurement Aiding For Missile Navigation




$\{r_i, i = 1,2,3,4\}$ = GPS Pseudo Range Measurements $\{Dr_i, i = 1,2,3,4\}$ = GPS Delta Pseudo Range Measurements



$\underline{P}_{M/S}$ = Position Of The Missile Relative To The Ship From AEGIS WCS Radar Track Processing

Note:
 \underline{L}_1 and \underline{L}_2 are taken from the AEGIS Ship Navigation System

\underline{L}_2 = Linear Position Change From The Initial SBEF Reference



AEGIS Derived Missile Position In The ECEF Frame Requires Both Radar Measurements And Ship Navigation System Data



GAINS Kalman Filter States



- 3 Position Errors
- 3 Velocity Errors
- 3 Missile Attitude Errors
- 3 Gyro Drifts
- 3 Accelerometer Biases
- 2 GPS Receiver Clock Errors (Bias & Drift)
- 3 SPY Radar Face Misalignments
- 3 Ship Initial Position Biases



Error Budget for ADOP Analyses



Navigation System Error	1 σ Value		
	X	Y	Z
Initial Position Error (m)	115.5	115.5	115.5
Initial Velocity Error (m/sec)	5	5	5
Initial Attitude Error (mrad)	8.72	8.72	8.72
Radar Face Misalignment (mrad)	0.8	0.8	0.8
Ship Initial Position Error (m)	1852	1852	100
Position Process Noise (m/rt-sec)	0.1	0.1	0.1
Accelerometer Random Walk (μ g/rt-hz)	85	85	85
Gyro Random Walk (deg/rt-hr)	0.125	0.125	0.125
Radar Face Noise (μ rad/rt-sec)	0.1	0.1	0.1
Ship Position Drift (m/rt-hr)	61.1	61.1	61.1
Radar Position Measurement Error (m)	f (range)	f (range)	f (range)
GPS Position Measurement Error (m)	10	10	10
GPS Velocity Measurement Error (m/sec)	0.3	0.3	0.3

Ship Motion Parameters	Nominal Value
Ship Speed (kts)	7
Roll Sinusoidal Amplitude (deg)	15
Pitch sinusoidal Amplitude (deg)	5
Yaw Sinusoidal Amplitude (deg)	3
Roll Sinusoidal Period (sec)	15
Pitch Sinusoidal Period (sec)	7
Yaw Sinusoidal Period (sec)	21

Note: The radar track of the missile is assumed to be constrained to SPY face 0.



ADOP Calibrated Against Detailed Navigation Simulation



- ADOP Alignment Error Comparisons with Detailed 6-DOF Navigation Simulation:

	ADOP Alignment Error @ KW Ejection (mrad)			
Trajectory Case	Radar Only		Radar & GPS	
	ADOP	NAVSIM	ADOP	NAVSIM
2	12.9	15.7	2.7	4.2
3	21.4	22.5	3.2	3.8
6	19.2	21.8	3.7	5.8
11	16.3	18.2	3.0	4.2