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Automated Cooperative Trajectories

Project Overview

The NASA Automated Cooperative Trajectories (ACT) project is advancing ADS-B enabled autopilot capabilities to improve airspace throughput and vehicle efficiency.

- **Meta-Aircraft Operations** for safe, reduced separation and decreased air traffic control workload
- **Formation Wake Surfing** for fuel savings

The ACT project is run out of the NASA Armstrong Flight Research Center in Edwards, CA

- NASA’s Transformative Tools and Technologies (T³) and Flight Demonstrations and Concepts (FDC) Projects
- ACT is a small project (1-3 researchers) that started following C-17 CAPFIRE flight experiment* in June 2010
- Next Milestone: 2016 Dual G-III Flight Experiment

NASA Armstrong Contributions
to Formation Flying for Improved Efficiency

- F-18 AFF (1998-2001)
- F-18 / DC-8 SURF (2003)
- C-17 CAPFIRE (2010)
- G-III ACT (2016, planned)

1. Initial propulsion charge = 12 minutes
2. All planes locate thermals within 10 minutes
3. Max altitude > 7,000 ft
4. End task due to low altitude
5. Min altitude = 1,600 ft after 80 minutes

Simulation Studies

- Static Aeroelastic Effects of FF (2007-2008)
- Spanwise Lift Distribution Optimization (2010-2011)
- Peak-Seeking Drag Optimization (2011-2012)

Flight Experiments

- Analysis of Trim and Compressibility Effects (2011) Kless, Aftosmis, Ning (NASA ARC)
- Formation Flight Dispatch Strategy (2013) Hange (NASA ARC)
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Update from Spring 2015

Advocacy and Collaboration
Apr. 8-9: Spring WakeNet USA Meetings, Chicago, USA
Apr. 20-24: Spring NATO Meetings, Rzeszow, POL
Apr. 28: Convergent Aeronautics Solutions (CAS) Proposal Briefing, NASA HQ, Washington DC, USA
Jun. 3-4: RTCA Global Aviation Symposium, Washington DC, USA
Jun. 10: USAF AMC, Scott AFB, Belleville, USA
Oct. 12-16: Fall NATO Meetings, Prague, CZE
Nov. 10-11: Fall WakeNet USA Meetings, Hampton, USA

Technical Status Updates
1. ADS-B Enabled Autopilot Hardware-in-the-Loop Simulation
2. Throttle and Wake Display Piloted Simulation Evaluation
3. G-III Wake Encounter Structural Analysis
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2016 G-III Flight Test - Motivation

Wake surfing for fuel efficiency has been demonstrated in flight.

1995, German Institute for Fluid Mechanics
- 1st In-Flight Demonstration of the Technique
- Peak-Seeking Lateral Control
- 10% Power Reduction

2001, NASA Autonomous Formation Flight
- Independent Confirmation of German Results
- Vortex Mapping
- Manual Control Only
- 14% Fuel Savings

2010, NASA-USAFC-17 CAPFIRE
- 1st Demonstration of Extended Formation Flight
- Primarily Manual Control
- 7-8% Fuel Flow Reduction

2012, DARPA-USAFC-Boeing C-17 $AVE
- 1st Fully Automatic Demonstration
- Prototype to a Production System
- 10% Fuel Flow Reduction

Commercial cargo and passenger operators remain skeptical that these fuel savings can be safely and affordably achieved with civilian airframes and avionics, without aircrew and passenger discomfort.
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2016 G-III Flight Test - Objectives

1. Data-Driven Characterization of the Benefits and Impacts to Commercial Transports
   A. Mature wake surfing performance modeling for commercial transport airframes
   B. Assess passenger ride quality for commercial transport wake surfing
   C. Advance understanding of the effects of commercial transport wake surfing on engines and actuators

2. Suitability Assessment of ADS-B for Cooperative Autonomy
   A. Evaluate a meta-aircraft system architecture based on commercial off-the-shelf civilian data-link technology and autopilot systems.
   B. Characterize the 1090 MHz ADS-B data link for cooperative trajectory procedures.
   C. Characterize the 1090 MHz ADS-B data link for wake surfing applications.

3. Tools and Methods to Support Wake Surfing Technology
   A. Evaluate relative navigation, guidance, and control strategies for wake surfing applications.
   B. Gather pilot comments on wake displays.
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2016 G-III Flight Test - Approach

Phase 1
- Virtual Lead
- Systems Checkout

Phase 2
- NASA G-III Lead Aircraft
- Flight Outside Wake Influence
- ADS-B Characterization
- ADS-B Enabled Autopilot Evaluation

Phase 3
- NASA G-III Lead Aircraft
- Wake Vortex Penetration
- Performance Measurements
- Passenger Ride Quality
- Engine / Actuator Impacts
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ADS-B Hardware-in-the-Loop Simulation

The Autopilot Interface Computer (AIC) provides a programmable ADS-B enabled autopilot capability for the G-III test aircraft.

**Inputs**
- ADS-B In Messages from the Lead Airplane
- Local Aircraft Data
- Researcher Trajectory Commands
- Researcher-Selectable GNC Gains

**Outputs**
- Analog ILS Localizer and Glideslope Commands
- Pilot Throttle Cues and Wake Display Data
The NASA G-III does not have an autothrottle, so the AIC will give the pilot throttle cues via a tablet display mounted on the yoke.

For situational awareness, a wake display will also be included on the tablet for flight evaluation.
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Throttle and Wake Display Pilot Evaluation

The project designed three wake displays and asked NASA test pilots to evaluate them in the G-III piloted simulation.

- Four NASA Test Pilots
  - Three G-III Test Pilots
  - One Pilot with C-17 FFS Experience and NASA F-18 AFF Experience
- One NASA Engineer
  - Civilian Pilot
  - Designed the Pilot Displays for the G-III UAVSAR
- Initial Feedback
  - Pilots generally found the displays useful
  - No consensus on the best design out of the three
  - Pilots requested rate cues during formation join-up
  - None of the pilots wanted uncertainty information on the wake position estimate – interesting to see if this holds during flight tests.
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G-III Wake Encounter Structural Analysis

The G-III airframe was analyzed for vortex impingement at multiple locations. Critical points are the winglets and the intersection of the vertical and horizontal tail.

Predicted loads are within NASA safety margins for testing without instrumentation and active loads monitoring.

- Medium lead aircraft weights
- One nautical mile in trail
- Altitudes at 30,000 feet and above
- Mach numbers at 0.75 and below
1. Operations, Logistics, and Policy
   A. Impacts to Trailing Airplane
      This area covers loads, fatigue and aeroelastic effects on the trailing aircraft, as well as potential adverse impacts to the engines and control effector actuators due to continuous, long-duration flight in the wake. This topic also covers aircrew and passenger ride quality concerns, as well as the possibility for structural overload during inadvertent wake crossings.
   B. Routing and Scheduling Constraints
      Novel scheduling/routing tools and procedures are needed for homogeneous formations and for the more complex problem of mixed groupings of transports, tankers, fighters, and unmanned aircraft. Some nations operate small numbers of large transports and have a particular interest in heterogeneous formations. Work under this topic must also support interoperability among aircraft from partner nations participating in coalition operations.
      Challenges include the problem of formations composed of aircraft with different departure and/or destination airfields as well as performance characteristics. This topic may also address special considerations applicable to formations of future combat aircraft. In the longer term, we may consider mixed formations of military and civilian aircraft. However there will be some sensitivities to resolve.
   C. Regulations and Policy
      Regulatory agencies, such as the FAA and EASA / Eurocontrol, present challenges related to separation requirements, aircraft and avionics certification, and impacts to airspace control. This topic will also cover any special requirements for pilot training.

2. Onboard Equipment
   A. Applicability to Current Aircraft
      To help expedite the application of this technology to the current generation of aircraft while maintaining an acceptable retrofit/upgrade cost, system architecture studies must be undertaken for likely candidate aircraft. Also taken into account should be other technologies, such as automated aerial refueling systems, which share many of the same requirements as formation flight systems.
   B. Data Links and Sensors
      Data link requirements for automated formation flight include message content, timing, and encoding resolution, as well as reliability. Existing data link technologies, such as 900 MHz ADS-B, may not be able to meet these requirements without modification.
      Flight within the wake has the potential to corrupt onboard wind estimates and control system feedback paths by altering the readings of air data sensors such as angle of attack and sideslip. This topic may also address novel onboard sensors, such as LIDAR, for wake detection.
   C. Avionics and Flight Deck Design
      Requirements for autopilot systems include trim authority and bandwidth. Special modifications to engine control and inner-loop flight control systems may also be required to maintain precise, stable formation flight despite wake disturbance effects. Other avionics, such as IFF and TCAS, might be affected by formation operations. This topic also includes pilot displays for situational awareness and pilot throttle cueing for aircraft without auto-throttle capability.

3. Algorithms and Optimization
   A. Wake Detection and Crossing Prevention
      In situ measurements from onboard sensors combined with information transmitted by other aircraft in the formation can be used to improve estimates of the location and strength of the wake. Additionally, knowledge of the wake location and the performance characteristics of the trailing airplane can be used to develop algorithms to minimize the potential for inadvertent wake crossings, especially during formation maneuvering and data link communication anomalies.
   B. Performance Optimization
      The position of the trailing airplane within the wake can be optimized for minimum fuel flow under the constraints of maintaining acceptable aircraft handling characteristics, ride quality, impact to the airframe, and risk of inadvertent wake crossing. Additionally, real-time manipulation of the aircraft trim schedule, to include some or all of the wing and tail aerodynamic effectors and possibly differential thrust, to account for the wake’s asymmetric upwash field can lower trim drag and improve formation flight efficiency.
   C. Wake Modeling
      Simulation and analysis tools require appropriate and computationally efficient models of wake propagation through the atmosphere and aerodynamic influence effects on the trailing vehicles, possibly including the special applications of turboprop airplanes, rotorcraft and small UAVs. Onboard formation flight systems will require real-time wake propagation algorithms for predicting the size, strength and location of the wake based on information transmitted from the lead.
   D. Formation Control
      Advanced methods are required for control of large (3 or more airplanes) formations to ensure maximum performance, minimum maneuvering requirements and string stability.
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Relation to ET-145 Technology Pillars

1. Operations, Logistics, and Policy
   A. Impacts to Trailing Airplane
      Passenger Ride Quality
      Engine / Actuator Impacts
   B. Routing and Scheduling Constraints
      Interaction with the WakeNet USA Community
      Discussions with NASA Airspace Modeling and Control Groups
   C. Regulations and Policy
      Discussions with FAA and RTCA

2. Onboard Equipment
   A. Applicability to Current Aircraft
      ILS Autopilot Interface
      ADS-B Characterization and Evaluation
   B. Data Links and Sensors
      ADS-B Characterization and Evaluation
      ILS Autopilot Interface
      Pilot Throttle and Wake Displays

3. Algorithms and Optimization
   A. Wake Detection and Crossing Prevention
      Wake Prediction and Estimation
      Wake Avoidance
   B. Performance Optimization
      Trajectory Optimization
      Trim Optimization
   C. Wake Modeling
      Prediction-to-Flight Comparisons for 60k Ibs Class Airplane
   D. Formation Control
      Relative Guidance and Control
      Flight Comparisons for 60k Ibs Class Airplane

Challenges include the problem of formations composed of aircraft with different departure and/or destination airfields as well as performance characteristics. This topic may also address special considerations applicable to formations of future combat aircraft. In the longer term, we may consider mixed formations of military and civilian aircraft. However, there will be some sensitivities to resolve.

Requirements for autopilot systems include trim authority and control and inner-loop control effector actuator bandwidth. Special modifications to engine control and inner-loop control effector actuator bandwidth may also be required to maintain bandwidth. Special modifications to engine control and inner-loop control effector actuator bandwidth may also be required to maintain flight control systems.

Aerodynamic influence effects on the trailing vehicles, possibly including the special applications of turboprop airplanes, rotorcraft and small UAVs. Onboard formation flight systems will require real-time wake propagation algorithms for predicting the size, strength and location of the wake based on information transmitted from the lead.
Technology Validation Roadmap

**Path To Commercially-Viable Automated Meta-Aircraft Operations**

- **1995**
  - **Proof of concept**
  - **No data link**
  - **10% power reduction**
  - **Rudimentary peak-seeking control**
  - **German Institute for Fluid Mechanics**
  - **DO-228**

- **2001**
  - **Research data link and autopilot**
  - **14% fuel savings (manual)**
  - **Validated system requirements**
  - **Detailed wake effect mapping**
  - **NASA Dryden Flight Research Center**
  - **F/A-18**

- **2001**
  - **Manually flown**
  - **No data link or autopilot**
  - **9% fuel savings (2-ship)**
  - **Inconclusive 3-ship evaluation**
  - **US Air Force Test Pilot School**
  - **T-38**

- **2010**
  - **Proof of extended formation concept**
  - **Production military data link and autopilot**
  - **7-8% fuel savings (manual)**
  - **NASA DFRC / USAF FTC**
  - **C-17**

- **2012 - 2013**
  - **Modified C-17 autopilot**
  - **Production military data link**
  - **10% fuel savings (autopilot)**
  - **Wake avoidance algorithms**
  - **C-17**

**Partnership between NASA AFRC, ARC, GRC, and LaRC (proposed)**

- **2013 - 2017**
  - **Airspace simulation study**
  - **Hardware-in-the-loop multi-vehicle simulation**
  - **Flight research**
  - **G-III**

**Operational Demonstration with Industry Partners (to be determined)**

- **2018 - 2020**
  - **Commercial Data Link (1090 MHz ADS-B In and Out)**
  - **Meta-Aircraft functionality integrated with commercial avionics**
  - **FAA participation (in the US NAS)**
  - **Pilot / ATC displays and procedures**
  - **Demonstrate scheduling / routing tools**
  - **Commercial transport class aircraft**

- **Close Formation Flight Research**

- **Extended Formation Flight Research**

**Path To Commercially-Viable Automated Meta-Aircraft Operations**

- **Optimal Scheduling and Real-Time Routing Tools**
- **Wake Estimation and Avoidance, Performance Optimization**
- **Suitability of ADS-B for Wake Surfing**
- **Flight Data: Performance and Ride Quality**