

AFRL-VA-WP-TP-2005-304

**CONTROL OF AN UNSTABLE,
NONMINIMUM PHASE
HYPERSONIC VEHICLE**

**Dr. Michael W. Oppenheimer
David B. Doman**



OCTOBER 2005

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

STINFO Final Report

This material is declared a work of the U.S. Government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States.

**AIR VEHICLES DIRECTORATE
AIR FORCE RESEARCH LABORATORY
AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OH 45433-7542**

NOTICE

Using Government drawings, specifications, or other data included in this document for any purpose other than Government procurement does not in any way obligate the U.S. Government. The fact that the Government formulated or supplied the drawings, specifications, or other data does not license the holder or any other person or corporation; or convey any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may relate to them.

This report was cleared for public release by the Air Force Research Laboratory Wright Site (AFRL/WS) Public Affairs Office (PAO) and is releasable to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). It will be available to the general public, including foreign nationals.

PAO Case Number: AFRL/WS-05-2540 2 Nov 2005.

THIS TECHNICAL REPORT IS APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION.

/s/

Michael W. Oppenheimer
Electronics Engineer
Control Design and Analysis Branch
Air Force Research Laboratory
Air Vehicles Directorate

/s/

Deborah Grismer
Chief
Control Design and Analysis Branch
Air Force Research Laboratory
Air Vehicles Directorate

/s/

Brian W. Van Vliet
Chief
Control Sciences Division
Air Force Research Laboratory
Air Vehicles Directorate

This report is published in the interest of scientific and technical information exchange and its publication does not constitute the Government's approval or disapproval of its ideas or findings.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE					Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.						
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YY) October 2005		2. REPORT TYPE Conference Paper Preprint		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) 10/01/2004 – 10/01/2005		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE CONTROL OF AN UNSTABLE, NONMINIMUM PHASE HYPERSONIC VEHICLE				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER In-house		
				5b. GRANT NUMBER		
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER N/A		
6. AUTHOR(S) Dr. Michael W. Oppenheimer David B. Doman				5d. PROJECT NUMBER N/A		
				5e. TASK NUMBER N/A		
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER N/A		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Control Design and Analysis Branch (AFRL/VACA) Control Sciences Division Air Vehicles Directorate Air Force Research Laboratory, Air Force Materiel Command Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433-7542				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER AFRL-VA-WP-TP-2005-304		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Vehicles Directorate Air Force Research Laboratory Air Force Materiel Command Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH 45433-7542				10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY ACRONYM(S) AFRL/VACA		
				11. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER(S) AFRL-VA-WP-TP-2005-304		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.						
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Conference paper preprint submitted for the 2006 IEEE Aerospace Conference, March 4, 2006 in Big Sky, Montana. This material is declared a work of the U.S. Government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States.						
14. ABSTRACT In this work, a control law for an unstable, nonminimum phase model of a hypersonic vehicle is developed. The control problem is difficult due to the locations of the plant poles and zeros. For an unstable system, feedback is required to stabilize the plant. However, one cannot make the loop gains arbitrarily large without driving one or more of the closed-loop poles into the right-half of the s-plane, since the system is nonminimum phase. Thus, there is a limited range of feedback gain that results in a stable system. The nonminimum phase behavior also places restrictions on the closed-loop bandwidth. For the hypersonic vehicle control problem, low frequency control is desired and a rule of thumb is that the closed-loop bandwidth must be less than one-half the right-half plane zero location. A right-half plane zero located in the region of the desired gain-crossover frequency makes it impossible to achieve the desired level of tracking performance. The achievable closed-loop bandwidth might be so small that adequate control of the system is not achieved. Direct cancellation of the right-half plane zero with an unstable pole in the controller is not an option. In this work, a modified dynamic inversion controller is developed for a linear, time-invariant model of a hypersonic vehicle. This modified dynamic inversion controller differs from the standard dynamic inversion approach in that it does not attempt to cancel the right-half plane zero with a pole, instead, it retains right-half plane zeros in the closed-loop transfer functions and uses an additional feedback loop to stabilize the zero dynamics.						
15. SUBJECT TERMS Hypersonic vehicle, non-minimum phase, dynamic inversion						
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT: SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 24	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON (Monitor) Dr. Michael W. Oppenheimer	
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code) (937) 255-8490	

Control of an Unstable, Nonminimum Phase Hypersonic Vehicle Model

Michael W. Oppenheimer *

David B. Doman †

Air Force Research Laboratory, WPAFB, OH 45433-7531

Abstract

In this work, a control law for an unstable, nonminimum phase model of a hypersonic vehicle is developed. The control problem is difficult due to the locations of the plant poles and zeros. For an unstable system, feedback is required to stabilize the plant. However, one cannot make the loop gains arbitrarily large without driving one or more of the closed-loop poles into the right-half of the s-plane, since the system is nonminimum phase. Thus, there is a limited range of feedback gain that results in a stable system. The nonminimum phase behavior also places restrictions on the closed-loop bandwidth. For the hypersonic vehicle control problem, low frequency control is desired and a rule of thumb is that the closed-loop bandwidth must be less than one-half the right-half plane zero location. A right-half plane zero located in the region of the desired gain-crossover frequency makes it impossible to achieve the desired level of tracking performance. The achievable closed-loop bandwidth might be so small that adequate control of the system is not achieved. Direct cancellation of the right-half plane zero with an unstable pole in the controller is not an option. In this work, a modified dynamic inversion controller is developed for a linear, time-invariant model of a hypersonic vehicle. This modified dynamic inversion controller differs from the standard dynamic inversion approach in that it does not attempt to cancel the right-half plane zero with a pole, instead, it retains right-half plane zeros in the closed-loop transfer functions and uses an additional feedback loop to stabilize the zero dynamics.

HSV Model

The model to be controlled in this case is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathbf{x}} &= \mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{Bu} \\ \mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{Cx} + \mathbf{Du}\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

*Electronics Engineer, Control Theory and Optimization Branch, 2210 Eighth Street, Ste 21, Email Michael.Oppenheimer@wpafb.af.mil, Ph. (937) 255-8490, Fax (937) 656-4000, Member AIAA

†Senior Aerospace Engineer, Control Theory and Optimization Branch, 2210 Eighth Street, Ste 21, Email David.Doman@wpafb.af.mil, Ph. (937) 255-8451, Fax (937) 656-4000, Senior Member IEEE

where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$, $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$, and $n = 9$, $m = p = 2$. The model outputs are velocity (ft/sec) and flight path angle (deg), while the inputs are elevator deflection (deg) and temperature addition in the combustor (deg R). More specifically, the state-space matrices, derived from a nonlinear model,¹ are

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -4.8e^{-4} & 2.05 & 0 & -5.1e^{-6} & -32.17 & .084 & 0 & -.513 & 0 \\ -5.8e^{-7} & -.077 & 1 & 1.9e^{-7} & 0 & -9.69e^{-5} & 0 & -1.59e^{-4} & 0 \\ -1.29e^{-5} & .07 & 0 & 2.39e^{-6} & 0 & -.028 & -8.77e^{-5} & -.01 & -7.73e^{-6} \\ 0 & -7846.36 & 0 & 0 & 7846.36 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -.068 & -7368.3 & 0 & .0159 & 0 & -286.5 & -.641 & 1.518 & 1.078e^{-3} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -.076 & -5668.22 & 0 & .018 & 0 & -4.72 & 8.82e^{-4} & -401.39 & -.78 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} -62.589 & 0.0064 \\ -.0222 & -2.61e^{-7} \\ -0.997 & 8.25e^{-7} \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 139.032 & -.000115 \\ 0 & 0 \\ -2500.6 & -.0769 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

where

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} V & \alpha & Q & h & \theta & \eta_f & \dot{\eta}_f & \eta_a & \dot{\eta}_a \end{bmatrix}^T \quad (6)$$

V denotes velocity or true airspeed, α denotes the angle of attack, q denotes the pitch rate, h is the altitude, θ is the pitch attitude, and the last four states represent temporal modal coordinates that describe the first bending mode of the fore and aft fuselage. The outputs of the model that we wish to control are the velocity V and the flight path angle $\gamma = \theta - \alpha$. The idea in this work is to use a dynamic inversion type scheme to control the plant and

provide a desired response. Unfortunately, this plant is nonminimum phase, with poles and transmission zeros at the following locations:

$$\begin{aligned} Poles &= \{-0.39 \pm j20.03, -0.32 \pm j16.94, -1.0035, 0.9322, -5.6e^{-4}, -3.88 \pm j0.041\} \\ Zeros &= \{0, 1.949, -1.948, -0.391 \pm j19.58, -0.321 \pm j16.95\} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Hence, dynamic inversion² (DI) is not an option due to the right-half plane zero. This is because DI will try to cancel plant zeros, thus resulting in a right-half plane pole in the closed-loop system. Fortunately, a DI type scheme can be used to circumvent this issue. Dynamic extension³ retains the nonminimum phase zero (does not try to cancel it with an unstable pole), yet still has the desirable trait of decoupling the system. The following describes the development of a dynamic extension algorithm for the system described above.

Dynamic Extension

Consider the system described in Eq. 1. The vector $\mathbf{y}$ is a set of controlled variables (CVs). Dynamic inversion is used to decouple the system and produce desired responses from the CVs. To begin the development, consider each CV:

$$y_i = \mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{D}_i \mathbf{u}, i = 1, 2 \quad (8)$$

Since each $\mathbf{D}_i$, $i = 1, 2$ is a row of zeros, the input does not explicitly show in the output equation. To obtain an equation with the input, differentiate y to obtain

$$\dot{y}_i = \mathbf{C}_i \dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{B} \mathbf{u} \quad (9)$$

In this case, $\mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{B} \neq \mathbf{0}$, $i = 1, 2$, so there is no need to take any more derivatives of the output. Now, the system dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}} &= \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{B} \mathbf{u} \\ \dot{\mathbf{y}} &= \mathbf{C} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{C} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{u} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

In order to decouple the controlled variables, the matrix $\mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}$ must be right invertible. If this is the case, then

$$\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{B})^{-1} (\dot{\mathbf{y}}_{des} - \mathbf{C} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x}) \quad (11)$$

where $\dot{\mathbf{y}}_{des}$ is a vector of pseudo-controls. In this case,

$$\dot{\mathbf{y}}_{des} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{V}_{tdes} \\ \dot{\gamma}_{des} \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

where V_t is the vehicle's velocity and γ is the flight path angle. Applying the vector u in Eq. 11 to the output and state dynamics equations produces

$$\dot{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{CAx} + \mathbf{CBu} = \mathbf{CAx} + (\mathbf{CB}) (\mathbf{CB}^{-1}) (\dot{\mathbf{y}}_{des} - \mathbf{CAx}) = \dot{\mathbf{y}}_{des} \quad (13)$$

so that the controlled variables follow exactly the pseudo-controls and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}} &= \mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{Bu} = \mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{CB}^{-1}) (\dot{\mathbf{y}}_{des} - \mathbf{CAx}) \\ &= (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{CB})^{-1} \mathbf{CA}) \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{CB}^{-1}) \dot{\mathbf{y}}_{des} \\ &= \mathbf{A}^x + \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{CB}^{-1}) \dot{\mathbf{y}}_{des} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

As it turns out, the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^x$ are the poles of the zero dynamics and are identically equal to the zeros of the original system (see Eq. 7). So, the state dynamics are determined by the inverse state space system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}} &= \mathbf{A}^x + \mathbf{B} (\mathbf{CB}^{-1}) \mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{x} &= \mathbf{Ix} + \mathbf{0v} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Let $\mathbf{S}$ be a matrix of left eigenvectors of $\mathbf{A}^x$. Then, Eq. 15 can be transformed into the following Jordan form

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \boldsymbol{\xi} + \mathbf{SB} (\mathbf{CB}^{-1}) \mathbf{v} \quad (16)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \mathbf{SA}^x \mathbf{S}^{-1}$. The states in Eq. 16 are related to the original states through the transformation $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{Sx}$.

The transmission zeros are defined as the values of $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$, the vectors z_I, w_I , the input zero directions or z_O, w_O , the output zero directions that satisfy

$$\begin{bmatrix} (\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) & -\mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{CA} & \mathbf{CB} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_I \\ \mathbf{w}_I \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0} \quad (17)$$

or

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_O & \mathbf{w}_O \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} (\boldsymbol{\zeta} \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) & -\mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{CA} & \mathbf{CB} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0} \quad (18)$$

From the output zero case, solve for $\mathbf{z}_0$ to get

$$-\mathbf{z}_0\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{w}_0(\mathbf{CB}^{-1}) = 0 \quad (19)$$

Solving for $\mathbf{w}_0$ yields

$$\mathbf{w}_0 = \mathbf{z}_0\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{CB}^{-1}) \quad (20)$$

Substituting Eq. 20 into the first output equation in Eq. 18 yields

$$\mathbf{z}_0(\zeta\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) + \mathbf{w}_0\mathbf{CA} = \mathbf{z}_0(\zeta\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{CB}^{-1})\mathbf{CA}) = \mathbf{0} \quad (21)$$

Hence, the transmission zeros are the eigenvalues of the matrix $(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{CB}^{-1})\mathbf{CA})$, which is identically equal to the matrix $\mathbf{A}^x$ defined above. This result shows that the transmission zeros of the original system are poles of the zero dynamics of the dynamic inversion. In order to obtain stable zero dynamics, the desired dynamics of the CVs must be modified. This requirement is due to the nonminimum phase behavior of the original system. Additionally, the vectors $\mathbf{z}_0$ are the eigenvectors of $\mathbf{A}^x$. Gathering all these eigenvectors into a matrix, $\mathbf{Z}_0$, it is seen that $\mathbf{Z}_0$ is a matrix of left eigenvectors of $\mathbf{A}^x$. Hence, $\mathbf{Z}_0 = \mathbf{S}$. Then, from Eq. 20,

$$\mathbf{W}_0 = \mathbf{Z}_0\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{CB}^{-1}) = \mathbf{SB}(\mathbf{CB}^{-1}) \quad (22)$$

Modified Dynamic Inversion Controller

Case 1

Suppose that one transmission zero, ζ_i , is in the right-half plane and would thus result in unstable zero dynamics. Without loss of generality, suppose that the output zero direction is given by

$$\mathbf{w}_0^{RHP} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & w_0^{RHP}{}_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (23)$$

This means that only pseudo-input 2 excites the bad zero state (the state corresponding to the nonminimum phase zero). Hence, we select $\dot{y}_{des2}$ to include a stabilizing term, from the bad zero state (ξ^{RHP}), such that

$$v_2 = \dot{\gamma}_{des} + k_i \xi^{RHP} \quad (24)$$

In Jordan form, the dynamics of the bad zero state become

$$\dot{\xi}^{RHP} = \zeta_i \xi^{RHP} + \mathbf{w}_0^{RHP} \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{bmatrix} = \zeta_i \xi^{RHP} + 0v_1 + w_{0i12}v_2 = \zeta_i \xi^{RHP} + w_{0i12} (\dot{\gamma}_{des} + k_i \xi^{RHP}) \quad (25)$$

Thus,

$$\xi^{RHP} = \frac{w_0^{RHP}{}_2 \dot{\gamma}_{des}}{s - (\zeta_i + w_0^{RHP}{}_2 k_i)} \quad (26)$$

Note that k_i is selected so that $(\zeta_i + w_{0i12}k_i) < 0$. Substituting this result into Eq. 24, the new pseudo-control becomes

$$v_2 = \dot{\gamma}_{des} + k_i \frac{w_0^{RHP}{}_2 \dot{\gamma}_{des}}{s - (\zeta_i + w_0^{RHP}{}_2 k_i)} = \frac{s - \zeta_i}{s - (\zeta_i + w_0^{RHP}{}_2 k_i)} \dot{\gamma}_{des} \quad (27)$$

With perfect inversion, $v_1 = \dot{V}_t$ and $v_2 = \dot{\gamma}$. Thus,

$$\begin{bmatrix} V_t \\ \gamma \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{s} \dot{V}_t \\ \frac{1}{s} \dot{\gamma} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{s} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{s} \frac{s - \zeta_i}{s - (\zeta_i + w_0^{RHP}{}_2 k_i)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{V}_{t_{des}} \\ \dot{\gamma}_{des} \end{bmatrix} \quad (28)$$

So, as desired, the system is now decoupled, however, the right-half plane zero is still present. This is the penalty for a nonminimum phase plant. Figure 1 shows a standard dynamic inversion controller, while Figure 2 shows the modifications necessary to implement the modified dynamic inversion control law. Note that both Figures 1 and 2 are drawn assuming that the $\mathbf{D}$ matrix in Eq. 1 is identically zero and that the matrix $\mathbf{CB}$, Eq. 9, is nonzero and invertible. A slight modification must be made if these conditions are not met.

Case 2

Again, suppose that one transmission zero, ζ_i , is in the right-half plane and would thus result in unstable zero dynamics. Now, let the output zero direction be given by

$$\mathbf{w}_0^{RHP} = \begin{bmatrix} w_0^{RHP}{}_1 & w_0^{RHP}{}_2 \cdots w_0^{RHP}{}_p \end{bmatrix} \quad (29)$$

In this case, multiple pseudo-inputs excite the bad zero state (the state corresponding to the nonminimum phase zero). In order to stabilize the system, select one pseudo-input to stabilize the state associated with the right-half plane zero (ξ^{RHP}). Hence, let

$$v_i = \dot{\gamma}_{desi} + k_i \xi^{RHP} \quad (30)$$

Then, from the form of $\mathbf{w}_0^{RHP}$ given in Eq. 29, the dynamics of the bad zero state become

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\xi}^{RHP} &= \zeta_i \xi^{RHP} + \mathbf{w}_0^{RHP} \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \\ \vdots \\ v_p \end{bmatrix} = \zeta_i \xi^{RHP} + w_0^{RHP}{}_1 v_1 + w_0^{RHP}{}_2 v_2 + \cdots + w_0^{RHP}{}_p v_p \\ &= \zeta_i \xi^{RHP} + \cdots + w_0^{RHP}{}_i (\dot{y}_{desi} + k_i \xi^{RHP}) + \cdots + w_0^{RHP}{}_p v_p\end{aligned}\quad (31)$$

Solving for ξ^{RHP} yields

$$\xi^{RHP} = \frac{w_0^{RHP}{}_1 v_1 + \cdots + w_0^{RHP}{}_{i-1} v_{i-1} + w_0^{RHP}{}_i \dot{y}_{desi} + w_0^{RHP}{}_{i+1} v_{i+1} + \cdots + w_0^{RHP}{}_p v_p}{s - (\zeta_i + w_0^{RHP}{}_i k_i)} \quad (32)$$

Substituting Eq. 32 into Eq. 30 and simplifying yields

$$v_i = \frac{(s - \zeta_i) \dot{y}_{desi}}{s - (\zeta_i + w_0^{RHP}{}_i k_i)} + k_i \left(\frac{w_0^{RHP}{}_1 v_1 + \cdots + w_0^{RHP}{}_{i-1} v_{i-1} + w_0^{RHP}{}_{i+1} v_{i+1} + \cdots + w_0^{RHP}{}_p v_p}{s - (\zeta_i + w_0^{RHP}{}_i k_i)} \right) \quad (33)$$

Thus, exact decoupling is not obtained. In order to achieve decoupling, it is necessary to add another term to cancel the effects of $v_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, p : k \neq p$. Hence, modify Eq. 30 to the following:

$$v_i = \dot{y}_{desi} + k_i \xi^{RHP} + \sum_{j, j \neq i} \frac{q_{ij} \dot{y}_{desj}}{s + \zeta_i} \quad (34)$$

Substituting Eq. 34 into Eq. 31 produces

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\xi}^{RHP} &= \zeta_i \xi^{RHP} + \mathbf{w}_0^{RHP} \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \\ \vdots \\ v_p \end{bmatrix} = \zeta_i \xi^{RHP} + w_0^{RHP}{}_1 v_1 + w_0^{RHP}{}_2 v_2 + \cdots + w_0^{RHP}{}_p v_p \\ &= \zeta_i \xi^{RHP} + \cdots + w_0^{RHP}{}_i \left(\dot{y}_{desi} + k_i \xi^{RHP} + \sum_{j, j \neq i} \frac{q_{ij} \dot{y}_{desj}}{s + \zeta_i} \right) + \cdots + w_0^{RHP}{}_p v_p\end{aligned}\quad (35)$$

Solving for ξ^{RHP} in Eq. 35 and substituting this result into Eq. 34 gives

$$v_i = \dot{y}_{desi} + k_i \left[\frac{w_0^{RHP}{}_i \dot{y}_{desi} + \sum_{j, j \neq i} \left(v_j w_0^{RHP}{}_j + w_0^{RHP}{}_i \frac{q_{ij} \dot{y}_{desj}}{s + \zeta_i} \right)}{s - (\zeta_i + w_0^{RHP}{}_i k_i)} \right] + \sum_{j, j \neq i} \frac{q_{ij} \dot{y}_{desj}}{s + \zeta_i} \quad (36)$$

Grouping like terms and simplifying Eq. 36 gives

$$v_i = \frac{(s - \zeta_i) \dot{y}_{desi}}{s - (\zeta_i + w_0^{RHP_i} k_i)} + \frac{\sum_{j,j \neq i} \left(k_i v_j w_0^{RHP_j} + \frac{s - \zeta_i}{s + \zeta_i} q_{ij} \dot{y}_{desj} \right)}{s - (\zeta_i + w_0^{RHP_i} k_i)} \quad (37)$$

For complete decoupling, the second set of terms in Eq. 37 must be identically zero. Using this constraint and solving for v_j gives

$$v_j = \frac{-(s - \zeta_i) q_{ij} \dot{y}_{desj}}{(s + \zeta_i) k_i w_0^{RHP_i}} \quad (38)$$

Letting

$$q_{ij} = k_i w_0^{RHP_i} \quad (39)$$

produces

$$v_j = \frac{-(s - \zeta_i) \dot{y}_{desj}}{(s + \zeta_i)} \quad (40)$$

As before, with perfect inversion, $v_1 = \dot{V}_t$ and $v_2 = \dot{\gamma}$. Then, in this case, the expression between the desired and actual controlled variables becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \\ \vdots \\ v_i \\ \vdots \\ v_p \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{-(s - \zeta_i)}{(s + \zeta_i)} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{-(s - \zeta_i)}{(s + \zeta_i)} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{s - \zeta_i}{s - (\zeta_i + w_0^{RHP_i} k_i)} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \frac{-(s - \zeta_i)}{(s + \zeta_i)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{y}_{des1} \\ \dot{y}_{des2} \\ \vdots \\ \dot{y}_{desi} \\ \vdots \\ \dot{y}_{desp} \end{bmatrix} \quad (41)$$

So, as desired, the system is now decoupled, however, the right-half plane zero is still present. This is the penalty for a nonminimum phase plant.

Results

For the system described by Eqs. 1- 5, one zero is located in the RHP (see Eq. 7). In this case, $\mathbf{w}_0$ associated with the nonminimum phase zero is

$$\mathbf{w}_{0i} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.000844 & 18.866 \end{bmatrix} \quad (42)$$

For an initial design, assume that

$$\mathbf{w}_{0i} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 18.866 \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 18.866 \end{bmatrix} \quad (43)$$

so that case 1 applies. Thus, it can be seen that only the pseudo-input associated with the flight path angle, γ , affects the bad zero state. Let

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= \dot{y}_{1des} = \dot{V}_{tdes} \\ v_2 &= \dot{y}_{2des} + k\xi^{RHP} = \dot{\gamma}_{des} + k\xi^{des} \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Then,

$$\dot{\xi}^{RHP} = \lambda^{RHP}\xi^{RHP} + 18.866v_2 = \lambda^{RHP}\xi^{RHP} + 18.866(\dot{\gamma}_{des} + k\xi^{RHP}) \quad (45)$$

Solving for ξ^{RHP} yields

$$\xi^{RHP} = \frac{18.866}{s - (1.949 + 18.866k)} \dot{\gamma}_{des} \quad (46)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} v_2 &= \dot{\gamma}_{des} + k\xi^{RHP} = \dot{\gamma}_{des} + k \left(\frac{18.866}{s - \{1.949 + 18.866k\}} \right) \dot{\gamma}_{des} \\ &= \left(\frac{s - 1.949}{s - \{1.949 + 18.866k\}} \right) \dot{\gamma}_{des} \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Selecting k in Eq. 48 to yield an all-pass filter, $k \approx -0.20667$ yields

$$v_2 = \left(\frac{s - 1.949}{s + 1.949} \right) \dot{\gamma}_{des} \quad (48)$$

Note that a right half plane zero has two effects on the system, the first a magnitude and the second a phase. Unfortunately, the phase effects cannot be altered with this technique, however, the magnitude effects can be eliminated by choosing k so that an all-pass filter is obtained. Thus, the pole has been placed at the mirror (about the $j\omega$ axis) location in the left half of the s -plane. Now, the pseudo-input relationship becomes

$$\mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{s-1.949}{s+1.949} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{V}_{tdes} \\ \dot{\gamma}_{des} \end{bmatrix} \quad (49)$$

With perfect inversion, the following closed-loop system is obtained

$$\mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} V_t \\ \gamma \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{s} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{s-1.949}{s(s+1.949)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{V}_{tdes} \\ \dot{\gamma}_{des} \end{bmatrix} \quad (50)$$

Figures 3 and 4 show the velocity and flight path angle responses along with the ideal response found using Eq. 50 and the control deflection time histories. A small amount of error exists and this is directly related to the assumption in Eq. 43. It should be pointed

out that prefilters were wrapped around the inversion controller. For the velocity channel, a simple proportional-integral prefilter was used, while for the flight path angle channel, a proportional-integral-derivative prefilter was used. The prefilters were the same for the simulation runs of cases 1 and 2.

Now, relax the assumption in Eq. 43 so that case 2 applies. Using Eqs. 38, 39, and 40 and selecting v_2 to stabilize the bad zero state yields

$$v_2 = \dot{y}_{2des} + k\zeta^{RHP} = \dot{\lambda}_{des} + k\zeta^{RHP} + \frac{q_{21}\dot{V}_{tdes}}{s + \lambda^{RHP}} \quad (51)$$

Selecting $q_{21} = kw_0^{RHP}{}_1$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= \frac{s - \lambda^{RHP}}{s + \lambda^{RHP}} \dot{V}_{tdes} \\ v_2 &= \frac{s - \lambda^{RHP}}{s - (\lambda^{RHP} + w_0^{RHP}{}_2 k)} \dot{\gamma}_{des} \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Now, the pseudo-input relationship becomes

$$\mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{s - \lambda^{RHP}}{s + \lambda^{RHP}} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{s - \lambda^{RHP}}{s - (\lambda^{RHP} + w_0^{RHP}{}_2 k)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{V}_{tdes} \\ \dot{\gamma}_{des} \end{bmatrix} \quad (53)$$

With perfect inversion, the following closed-loop system is obtained

$$\mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} V_t \\ \gamma \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{s} \left(\frac{s - \lambda^{RHP}}{s + \lambda^{RHP}} \right) & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{s} \left(\frac{s - \lambda^{RHP}}{s - \{\lambda^{RHP} + w_0^{RHP}{}_2\}} \right) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{V}_{tdes} \\ \dot{\gamma}_{des} \end{bmatrix} \quad (54)$$

Figures 5 and 6 shows the velocity and flight path angle responses along with the ideal response found using Eq. 54. Notice that the error between the actual and ideal responses is much less than that seen in Fig. 4. Again, this is directly attributable to utilizing the case 2 work.

Conclusions

In this work, a dynamic inversion type controller was developed for an unstable, non-minimum phase hypersonic vehicle model. The technique used here allows decoupling of the system, in the same way that standard dynamic inversion allows decoupling. The difference is that the nonminimum phase zero cannot be cancelled by an unstable pole. Hence, the nonminimum phase zero is retained in the closed loop and a user selected gain is used to place the left half plane pole.

References

¹Bolender, M. A. and Doman, D. B., “A Non-Linear Model for the Longitudinal Dynamics of a Hypersonic Airbreathing Vehicle,” *Proceedings of the 2005 Guidance, Navigation and Control Conference*, AIAA Paper No. 2005-6255, August 2005.

²Oppenheimer, M. W. and Doman, D. B., “Reconfigurable Inner Loop Control of a Space Maneuvering Vehicle,” *Proceedings of the 2003 Guidance, Navigation and Control Conference*, AIAA Paper No. 2003-5358, August 2003.

³Snell, A., “Decoupling of Nonminimum Phase Plants and Application to Flight Control,” *Proceedings of the 2002 Guidance, Navigation and Control Conference*, AIAA Paper No. 2002-4760, August 2002.

List of Figure Captions

Figure 1: Standard Dynamic Inversion.

Figure 2: Modified Dynamic Inversion.

Figure 3: Velocity and Flight Path Angle vs. Time - Case 1.

Figure 4: Control Deflections vs. Time - Case 1.

Figure 5: Velocity and Flight Path Angle vs. Time - Case 2.

Figure 6: Control Deflections vs. Time - Case 2.

Standard Dynamic Inversion




FIGURE 1:

Modified Dynamic Inversion




FIGURE 2:




FIGURE 3:




FIGURE 4:




FIGURE 5:




FIGURE 6: