



SOAR 2011: Attitude Control Augmentation Using Wing Load Sensing – A Biologically Motivated Strategy

Rhoe A. Thompson - AFRL/RWGG

Johnny H. Evers - AFRL/RWAV

Kelly C. Stewart - AFRL/RWGN

12-15 July 2011



DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A. Approved for public release. Unlimited distribution.
PA Approval Reference : 96ABW-2011-0318 Eglin AFB

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, 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 Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 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 a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE JUL 2011		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE SOAR 2011: Attitude Control Augmentation Using Wing Load Sensing â A Biologically Motivated Strategy				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES See also ADM202973. BioMav SOAR 2. Held at Chilworth Manor, United Kingdom on July 12-15, 2011. Supporting documents are attached to the report as separate files (PDF, WMV)., The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			



CONTROL SYSTEM COMPARISON

Man-Made vs Natural Systems



NATURAL SYSTEMS

SENSING

Complex Integration of:
Pressure, Force, Rate,
Thermal, Chemical and
Optical Sensors.
Pervasive Nervous System
for Interconnecting
Control to Numerous
Sensing Modalities

CONTROL

Straightforward.
Feedback Activated
Response
Non-Linear Thresholding
Pattern Generation

CHARACTERISTICS:

- +Robust to a wide range of operational variability.
- +Wide tolerance to individual variations.
- +Tolerance to damage.

- Unpredictable (non-linear) behavior.
- Sometimes high individual mission failure rate.
(398 out of 400 salmon fail)

Evolutionary Objective: Population fills an ecological niche. Numerous competing pressures.

MAN-MADE SYSTEMS

SENSING

Straightforward. Few
Sensors. Highly Localized.
Typically Optimized for
Limited Purpose.

CONTROL

Complex modeling and
estimation: Adaptive
parameter estimation, gain
scheduling, data
dependent, model based,
Lyapunov stability theory,
Modern control theory, etc.

CHARACTERISTICS:

- +Highly tuned predictable behavior.
- +High individual success (Pk).
- +Software sophistication not hardware.

- Data dependence (Wind Tunnel data, etc.)
- Brittle designs – limited operational range.
- Expensive to develop and field.

Design Objective: Individual success.



Problem Statement



-For autonomous systems to perform their missions, robust, fault tolerant flight control systems will be required, along with a high level of disturbance rejection for stabilized optical sensing.

- Can high latency optical feedback augmented by low-latency wing strain sensors explain observations in natural systems?


-Can strain sensors on the wings increase stability and robustness while eliminating the need for a dedicated rate gyro (Coriolis sensor)?




Simulation Approach



AFRL GenMAV



Aero Characteristics Using AVL



6DOF Simulation and Control
Constructs Implemented in Simulink


- Configuration with Aileron and Rudder
- Body Torques Around CG Assumed Observable Through Mechanosensing
- Simple PD Attitude Control, PID Altitude
- Dryden Turbulence Model with 2 m/s Equivalent Wind Speed




Force Feedback Augmentation of Attitude Control



Baseline Attitude Control



Body Torque Augmented Control





Direct measure of torque on the body potentially provides a low latency signal to control actuator position and optimize attitude control performance.



Baseline and Closed-Loop Actuator Models




Baseline – First Order Actuator



Body Torque Regulated Actuator Model


$\omega_n = 20$ Hz



- Error in achieved body torque drives actuator position as opposed to knowledge of aerodynamic characteristics.
- Time constants for both actuators were nominally tuned to .017 seconds.



6DOF Simulation Structure







Test Case Description




CASE 1 – Control Force Degradation With and Without Torque Feedback. 2 m/s turbulent wind field.

$$\vec{T}_{achieved} = \vec{T}\left(\frac{\delta_{elev}}{2}, \frac{\delta_{rud}}{2}, \frac{\delta_{ail}}{2}\right)$$



CASE 2 - Impact of Optical Feedback Latency With and Without Torque Feedback. 2 m/s turbulent wind field.

Sensor	Delay
Torque	3 ms
Optical Rate & Position	10, 30, 50 ms







Degraded Control Capability



Yaw & Roll Response



WITH
Torque
Feedback



WITHOUT
Torque
Feedback







Degraded Control Capability



Pitch & Altitude Response



WITH
Torque
Feedback






WITHOUT
Torque
Feedback





Control Surface Response

Full and Degraded Control Comparison





The response of the control surfaces in the presence of compromised torque generation is significantly higher to compensate for the degradation.





Added Latency

(3 ms Torque | 10 ms Optical)

WITH
Torque
Feedback



WITHOUT
Torque
Feedback





Optical Latency Compensation



Baseline Control Gain Definition

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Commanded Torque} &= J\ddot{\theta} \\
 &= -J\omega_n^2(\theta_{meas} - \theta_{com}) - J2\zeta\omega_n\dot{\theta}_{meas} \\
 &= -K_p(\theta_{meas} - \theta_{com}) - K_d\dot{\theta}_{meas},
 \end{aligned}$$

Taylor Series Compensation For Optical Latency


$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{\theta}_{est} &= \dot{\theta}_m + \frac{T_m}{J} \Delta t_{opt} \\
 \theta_{est} &= \theta_m + (\dot{\theta}_m + \frac{T_m}{J} \Delta t_{opt}) \Delta t_{opt} + \frac{T_m}{2J} \Delta t_{opt}^2 \\
 &= \theta_m + \dot{\theta}_m \Delta t_{opt} + \frac{3T_m}{2J} \Delta t_{opt}^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Control With Body Torque Augmentation

$$\text{Commanded Torque} = -\bar{K}_p(\theta_m - \theta_{com}) - \bar{K}_d\dot{\theta}_m, -\bar{K}_t T_m.$$

Final Form of Gains

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{K}_p &= K_p \\
 \bar{K}_d &= (K_p \Delta t_{opt} + K_d) \\
 \bar{K}_t &= \left(K_p \frac{3\Delta t_{opt}^2}{2J} + K_d \frac{\Delta t_{opt}}{J} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$






Latency Compensation Results




Torque Actuator Regulation – All Cases


PD Attitude Control Only



PD-T Attitude Control




- Addition of torque feedback to the attitude control law provides significant benefit to response.
- Excitation of the actuator loop had to be reduced by increasing actuator damping.
- The latency in conjunction with the initial altitude step function still excited a damped oscillation in the outer altitude hold loop.






Video Animation



- Euler Angles Magnified By 4x
- Turbulence Induced Disturbances
- 50% Control Effectiveness




Vision Based Obstruction Avoidance Agility Demonstration



- Growth Rate Activated Obstruction Avoidance
- Body Torque Feedback to Actuators
- Autonomous Flight Control



Vision Based Obstruction Avoidance Agility Demonstration





Conclusions



- Body torque feedback has the potential to improve performance and robustness of MAV attitude stability.
 - **Turbulent disturbance rejection is markedly improved using body torque error to control actuator position.**
 - **Uncertainty in control capability and aerodynamic characteristics can be robustly dealt with using a torque feedback approach.**
 - Torque feedback can be used to compensate for high levels of optical latency.
- The requirement for a dedicated angular rate sensor can potentially be eliminated if not required for navigation purposes.
- Additional work is required to design and demonstrate specific strain sensing implementations to measure signals proportional to torque.




Conclusions



- Body torque feedback has the potential to improve performance and robustness of MAV attitude stability.

• **Turbulent disturbance rejection is markedly improved using body torque error to control actuator position.**

• **Uncertainty in control capability and aerodynamic characteristics can be robustly dealt with using a torque feedback approach.**





Conclusions




- Body torque feedback has the potential to improve performance and robustness of MAV attitude stability.
 - Turbulent disturbance rejection is markedly improved using body torque error to control actuator position.
 - Uncertainty in control capability and aerodynamic characteristics can be robustly dealt with using a torque feedback approach.
 - **Torque feedback can be used to compensate for high levels of optical latency.**
- The requirement for a dedicated angular rate sensor can potentially be eliminated if not required for navigation purposes.
- Additional work is required to design and demonstrate specific strain sensing implementations to measure signals proportional to torque.




Conclusions



Torque Based Compensation



No Compensation



• **Torque feedback can be used to compensate for high levels of optical latency.**

- The requirement for a dedicated angular rate sensor can potentially be eliminated if not required for navigation purposes.
- Additional work is required to design and demonstrate specific strain sensing implementations to measure signals proportional to torque.



Conclusions



- Body torque feedback has the potential to improve performance and robustness of MAV attitude stability.
 - Turbulent disturbance rejection is markedly improved using body torque error to control actuator position.
 - Uncertainty in control capability and aerodynamic characteristics can be robustly dealt with using a torque feedback approach.
 - Torque feedback can be used to compensate for high levels of optical latency.
- **The requirement for a dedicated angular rate sensor can potentially be eliminated if not required for navigation purposes.**
- **Additional work is required to design and demonstrate specific strain sensing implementations to measure signals proportional to torque.**