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F/A-18 AAW Airplane
F/A-18 AAW Control Surfaces

- **Trailing edge flap**: +45°/-8°, 18°/s
- **Aileron**: +45°/-25°, 100°/s
- **Inboard leading edge flap**: +34°/-5°, 15°/s
- **Outboard leading edge flap**: +34°/-10°, 45°/s
- **Rudder**: ± 30°, 56°/s
- **Stabilator**: +10.5°/-24°, 40°/s
Flight Test Background

• Phase I - from Nov 02 to Jun 03
  – Flutter clearance, air data calibration, aerodynamic and loads model development

• Phase II - from Dec 04 to Mar 05
  – Boeing & DFRC CLAW designs

• Phase IA - Mar 05
  – Aeroservoelastic research

• Phase IIA - Mar 05
  – CLAW’s at several test points were redesigned
AAW Design Test Points
**AAW Phase I Test Maneuvers**

- OBES ASE/flutter clearance
- Air data calibration
  - Tower flyby
  - Level accel’s
  - POPU’s
  - Slow $\beta$ sweeps
- Simulated OLEF failure (left OLEF)
- OBES pitch and roll doublets
- Demonstration maneuvers
  - 5-g WUT
  - 1-g bank-to-bank/360° rolls (incremental build-up to full stick or load limit)
  - 4-g RPO
OBES Pitch Doublets

![Graph showing OBES Pitch Doublets with time and amplitude axes.](image)
AAW Aileron Flexibility

Phase I - Lessons Learned

• Phase I flight tests using OBES provided good data for aerodynamic and loads model development, but hindsight showed some of the doublet maneuvers were too small
• Phase I results showed no tendency for aileron reversal (flexibility of the aileron may have contributed to this)
• The AAW airplane was unable to accomplish any testing at two of the highest dynamic pressure test points
• Aileron hinge moment loads were a design driver for the Phase II CLAW’s
Both Boeing and NASA DFRC teams developed control laws for each design test point
- Boeing used ISMD design process
- NASA used CONDUIT® design process
Verification testing and limited validation testing conducted by Boeing (FAST and piloted HIL)
Extensive HIL V&V testing conducted at DFRC
- Aerodynamic modeling issues were examined for safety-of-flight
- IADS displays were used as part of test (built confidence in them before they were used for flight test)
- Several errors in the flight code caught and fixed
  - Rudder trim gain had incorrect value
  - Transient free switches caused control surfaces to drift

AAW Phase II RFCS Envelopes
AAW 1-g Phase II Flight Test

• 1-g bank to bank and 360° rolls
  – Tested the primary AAW technology (ability to roll the airplane using only wing control surfaces)
  – Tested the ability of the control laws to achieve acceptable roll performance and flying qualities while maintaining loads within limits

• Learned how well the aerodynamic and loads models predicted the vehicle’s response (issues were linearity and superposition)
Region I - Subsonic 1-g Rolls

Region I - Subsonic 1-g 360° Roll

Region II - Supersonic 1-g Rolls

Region II - Supersonic 1-g 360° Roll
Region III - Subsonic 1-g Rolls

Roll Axis HOS/LOS Comparison
Region II - Supersonic (open-loop)

\[ \tau = 0.25 \]
Roll Axis HOS/LOS Comparison
Region II - Supersonic (closed-loop)

• **Windup Turn**
  - Tested the ability of the control law designs to reduce wing loads (maneuver load control) or replicate basic F/A-18 trim schedules

• **Rolling Pull Out**
  - Tested the primary AAW technology (ability to roll the airplane using only wing control surfaces)
  - Tested the ability of the control laws to achieve acceptable roll performance and flying qualities while maintaining loads within limits

• **Learned how well the aerodynamic and loads models predicted the vehicle’s response (issues were linearity and superposition)**
Region I - Subsonic 4-g RPO
Region I - Subsonic 4-g RPO

Phase II - Lessons Learned

- The RFCS worked well in both Phases I and Phase II
- The AAW program was the first program at DFRC to utilize a RFCS in a safety of flight critical envelope
- The IADS® displays worked well for safety monitoring
- Comparison of the flight data and predicted airplane response ranged from fair to excellent