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UAVSAR Primary Objectives

- Develop a miniaturized, polarimetric, L-band SAR for use on a UAV.
- For accurate measurements of earth deformation due to
  - Earthquakes
  - Volcanic activity
  - Polar ice cap changes
- Measured using repeat pass interferometry which requires
  - Accurate knowledge of SAR position
  - Two SAR images from nearly the same position (PPA task)
  - Complex data processing to compare phase shift between images
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UAVSAR Enabling Components

- JPL developed a global dGPS for accurate SAR position
  - Inmarsat and Iridium are used for differential corrections with pole to pole coverage
  - $1\sigma$ accuracy is estimated at 10 cm horizontally and 20 cm vertically
  - Position is updated every second with 100 to 280 ms of latency
- The GIII is a transitional platform
  - Aids researchers in SAR development
  - Has unlimited access to national airspace system (NAS), unlike a UAV
- Platform Precision Autopilot (PPA) was developed to enable repeat pass precision in support of UAVSAR for the GIII
• **Aircraft Dimensions**
  - **Wing**
    - Span 77 ft 10 in
    - Area 934.6 ft$^2$
  - Length 83 ft 1 in
  - Height 24 ft 4.5 in
  - Large Internal Volume (1500 cu. Ft.)
  - Max of 12 seats

• **Aircraft Performance**
  - Max Mach – 0.85
  - Max Operating altitude – 45Kft
  - Typical Cruise – 400 to 500 kts
  - Range – ~3000 nautical miles
  - Climb Rate – up to 4,000 fpm

• **Aircraft Instrumentation**
  - Control surface positions
  - Flight Director (FD)
  - Air Data Computer
  - INS
  - Aircraft GPS
  - On-board experiments
  - Data capture and processing system (DCAPS)
The PPA Requirement

- The PPA shall fly within a 5 meter radius of the course for at least 90 percent of the time in conditions of calm to light turbulence
  - In one second, the GIII travels the distance of 2.5 football fields (230 m) and would be outside this 5 m radius with a course misalignment greater than 1¼ deg
  - The factory installed GIII autopilot at best tracks within
    - ± 8 m in altitude
    - ± 40 m in cross track
- JPL desired
  - Angles
    - Roll and pitch < 5 deg
    - Yaw < 15 deg
  - Rates
    - Roll less < 1 deg/sec
    - Pitch and yaw < 0.45 deg/sec
The PPA software was coded in Simulink and consists of three major routines:

- **Navigation**
  - Kalman filter combining accurate 1 Hz dGPS position with 16 Hz INS attitudes
  - Necessary to project position between dGPS updates and correct for latency
- **Guidance**
  - Defines courses between two waypoints
  - Outputs error signals for altitude and cross track
- **Controller**
  - **Altitude**
    - PID with Nz
      - Proportional and integral use altitude error feedback
      - Derivative uses inertial vertical velocity feedback
      - Nz uses inertial vertical acceleration feedback
  - **Cross track**
    - PID using only cross track error feedback
The PPA Hardware

- The three major hardware components in the PPA are
  - Autopilot Interface Computer (AIC) is a Phytec mpc565
    - With autocoded PPA control software
  - Two ILS Interface System (I2S) units which convert AIC command voltages to modulated radio frequency (RF) signals
  - Laptop computer which performs the operator station functions
Aircraft Interface

• The AIC interfaces with the GIII through RF switches between the navigation receiver and ILS antennas
  • Disadvantages of the AIC interface
    • Approach mode initiates a 3 deg pitch down with close to zero input
    • Requires extra hardware to convert commands to RF
    • Requires non-zero AIC output for zero navigation receiver output
      • The non-zero bias required changes with time
      • Noise makes determination of zero navigation receiver output difficult
    • Downstream hardware (Navigation Receiver, FD, and GIII autopilot)
      • Amplifies command
      • Have additional inputs that affect output
  • Advantages of the AIC interface
    • Retains factory safety limits
    • Quickly returned to baseline with the flip of a switch
Instrument Landing System

- ILS consists of two radio transmitters each with a signal at 90 Hz and 150 Hz
  - VHF transmitter for Localizer
  - UHF transmitter for Glideslope
- Localizer and Glideslope receivers on aircraft measure Difference in Depth Modulation (DDM) of the 90Hz and 150 Hz signals.
  - DDM of localizer signal indicates if aircraft is left or right of centerline
  - DDM of glideslope signal indicates if aircraft is above or below glideslope
  - DDM of zero indicates aircraft is along centerline or glideslope
The first three flights were open loop
• The first flight consisted of step commands from the PPA with increasing magnitude
  • The FD commanded and unexpected pre-programmed pitch down maneuver
  • The rest of the flight was flown in altitude hold mode to continue with roll control authority testing
• The second flight was a continuation of the first
  • A mitigation for the pitch down was successfully tested
  • The step commands were tested in both pitch and roll channels
    • Pitch response was incredibly small
• The third flight was flown using the factory installed GIII autopilot while the PPA was engaged but not coupled
  • This data was used to determine that the polarity was correct for all the feedback loops
Lessons Learned

- **FD pitch down mitigation**
  - It was determined that the copilot could hand fly the aircraft with touch control steering (TCS) button depressed to bypass the initial 3 degree pitch down
    - The TCS disconnects the actuators from the autopilot while depressed
    - The FD cue on the copilot display shows the pitch down intent (~15 sec)
  - **Softer autopilot gains**
    - The standard factory GIII autopilot pitch gains were approximately 1/10th the values in the vendor supplied simulation model
      - This required the use of higher PPA gains
  - **FD**
    - Amplification was initially determined in ground testing prior to flights
      - Gains were found to be three times greater in flight (60 pitch and 150 roll axes)
      - Modeling the additional feedback loops with flight data was ambiguous
    - The derivative of the navigation routine position had 1 Hz spikes at every dGPS update which limited lateral damping
    - I2S and navigation receiver drift and noise are shown in the next two slides
I2S and Navigation Receiver Drift

- Navigation receiver output with constant input
  - Low frequency drift
- At engagement the non-zero output results in an initial vertical velocity and roll transient
  - Increasing the time required to intercept the course
I2S and Navigation Receiver Noise

- Same data from the last slide with smaller time scale
- PPA operator inputs bias in both channels to zero navigation receiver output
  - Manually difficult with noise and drift
  - An algorithm was developed to automate this at the operator station
- PPA controller
  - Has plenty of authority to quickly remove the drift with the integral loop
  - Commands at this point are ~ ±2 mV
- The FD effectively filters this noise from the system

![Graph showing raw data and filtered data over time]
First Success

- Simulation models were updated with flight data
  - New gains were developed and evaluated
- The PPA was initially flown at 35Kft and Mach 0.75
  - A test matrix of gains were evaluated in flight
  - The PPA was successful 3 flights later at this flight condition

- [Graph showing flight error with 5 m Radius, 90 Percentile, 70 Percentile, 50 Percentile]
Euler Angles

- Angles were within desired values
- Roll exhibited wing rocking with a 14 second period
  - Result of derivative of cross track error with 1 Hz dGPS updates
  - Ride quality suffered
Body Rates

- Roll rate was greater than desired value
- Pitch and yaw rates were within the desired values
  - The yaw rate was controlled by the yaw damper
• Gains were evaluated at a second flight condition 30Kft and Mach 0.8 with similar results.
Will the PPA Fly Slower?

- Initial testing of the UAVSAR pod required substantially lower ground speeds
- The PPA was tested at these lower speeds
  - The pitch rate was dramatically higher
    - Because FD pitch rate limits increased at lower speeds (found through more ground testing)
    - And the PPA command was continuously against the FD pitch rate limits
  - Increased pitching resulted in normal acceleration of ± 0.1 g’s with a 5 second period
    - Ride quality really suffered
PPA Final Updates

- Improved command resolution
  - Reduced reference voltage in digital to analog converter
  - Reduced I2S amplification
- Replaced Nz with pitch rate feedback for increased damping
  - Reduced pitch rate especially at low speed
  - Slowed the pitch response to external disturbances (power changes or atmospheric)
- Track angle error used in place of derivative of cross track error
  - Reduced roll activity from derivative spikes
  - Gain is reduced by 30 percent outside 1000 feet increase intercept angle with larger initial offsets
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• Gains were
  • Re-optimized
  • Evaluated throughout the cruise envelope

• Variations in performance are attributed to
  • Pilot throttle inputs
  • Atmospheric instability

![Diagram showing performance throughout the cruise envelope with legends for 5 m Radius, 90 Percentile, 70 Percentile, 50 Percentile, Cruise Envelope, and Max Range.]
Angular Rates

- Rates were summarized with 90 percentiles by Mach
- Pitch and yaw are below desired values
- Roll is a little higher than desired
- Rates are lower at higher Mach numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altitude Range</th>
<th>Graphs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Alt (25-31Kft)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Low Alt Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Alt (33-39 Kft)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Mid Alt Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Alt (41-45 Kft)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="High Alt Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UAVSAR Mission Performance

- Since PPA development has ended there have been 25 UAVSAR missions.
- The results are summarized here, representing:
  - 224 course legs
  - 29 hours of tracking
  - Within 5 meters for 99.88 percent of the time

![Graph showing error distribution with 5 m Radius, 90 Percentile, 70 Percentile, 50 Percentile]
Conclusions

• The PPA system has:
  • Demonstrated success in meeting its requirement of flying the GIII within 5 meters of a course for at least 90 percent of the time in the presence of light turbulence while meeting most of the desired body rates and angles
  • Successfully been used in the field for science missions since December 2007
  • The customer, JPL, has noted the PPA performance most often exceeds the requirements
Questions?