

LABORATORY FOR INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS AND CONTROLS

# A Blade Element Approach to Modeling Aerodynamic Flight of an Insect-scale Robot



Taylor S. Clawson, Sawyer B. Fuller Robert J. Wood, Silvia Ferrari

> American Control Conference Seattle, WA May 25, 2016

#### Introduction



#### **RoboBee Background**

- Wing stroke angle  $\phi_w$  controlled independently for each wing
- Thrust and body torques controlled by modulating stroke angle commands



Image Credit: [Ma K.Y., '12], [Ma K.Y., '13]

Video of RoboBee test flight courtesy of the Harvard Microrobotics Lab

# Introduction and Motivation

- Applications
  - Navigation in cluttered environments, requiring precise reference tracking
  - Robust stabilization, subject to large disturbances such as winds and gusts
- Research Goals
  - Control design, implementation, and guarantees
  - Develop high-fidelity simulation tools
- Previous work
  - Simplified RoboBee Flight Model [Fuller, S.B. '14], [Chirarattananon, P. '16]
    - 6 DOF body motion, no wing modeling
    - Linearized, uncoupled, stroke-averaged aerodynamic forces
    - Controlled with hierarchical PID and iterative learning
  - RoboBee Wing Aerodynamics [Whitney, J.P. '10], [Jafferis, N.T. '16]
    - Model wing aerodynamics with blade-element theory
    - Omit body dynamics (constant body position and orientation)

## **Blade-Element Overview**

- Wing is divided span-wise into rigid 2D differential elements
- Differential forces are computed for each element, and then integrated along wingspan for total force on wing
- Tuned to provide close approximation of actual forces in an expression that is:
  - Closed-form
  - Computationally-efficient
  - Provides insight into dominant underlying physics



## Model Description



# **Modeling Setup**

- 3 Rigid bodies
  - Main body + two wings
- 8 DOF model
  - Main body: 6 DOF
  - Wings: 1 DOF each (pitch angle  $\psi_w$ )
    - Stroke angle  $\phi_w$  treated as an input
    - No stroke-plane deviation  $\theta_w$







•  $\mathcal{B}$  to right wing  $\mathcal{R}\left\{\widehat{x}_r, \widehat{y}_r, \widehat{z}_r\right\}$ 

#### **States and Inputs**

Stroke angle trajectory  $\phi_w$  modeled as a function of input *u* following linear second-order system:

$$\ddot{\phi}_w(t) + 2\zeta \omega_n \dot{\phi}_w(t) + \omega_n^2 \phi_w(t) = A_w \sin(\omega_f t) + \bar{\phi}_w$$

For the right wing, for example,

$$A_w = \phi_0 - \frac{\phi_r}{2}, \quad \bar{\phi}_w = -\phi_p$$

x	State	$\phi_W$	Wing stroke angle
u	Control Input	$\phi_0$	Nominal stroke amplitude
Θ	Body orientation	$\phi_p$	Pitch input
r	Body position	$\phi_r$	Roll input
Θ <sub>r</sub>	Right wing orientation	$A_w$	Wing stroke amplitude
$\omega_f$	Flapping frequency	$ar{\phi}_w$	Mean stroke angle







# **Rigid Body Dynamics**

• Angular momentum balance about body CG:

$$\sum \boldsymbol{M}_{G} = \sum \dot{\boldsymbol{H}}_{G}$$
$$\sum \boldsymbol{M}_{G}^{\mathcal{L}} + \sum \boldsymbol{M}_{G}^{\mathcal{R}} = \dot{\boldsymbol{H}}_{G}^{\mathcal{B}} + \dot{\boldsymbol{H}}_{G}^{\mathcal{L}} + \dot{\boldsymbol{H}}_{G}^{\mathcal{R}}$$

• Blade-element theory used to calculate aerodynamic forces and moments

• Aerodynamic forces act at instantaneous  
centers of pressure 
$$CP_L$$
,  $CP_R$   
 $\sum M_G^{\mathcal{L}} = M_{rd}^{\mathcal{L}} + r_{CP_L/G} \times F_{aero}^{\mathcal{L}} + r_{L/G} \times m_{\mathcal{L}}g$ 

• Angular momentum about *G* calculated as a sum of contributions from each frame

$$\dot{H}_{G}^{\mathcal{B}} = I^{\mathcal{B}} \dot{\omega}_{\mathcal{B}} + \omega_{\mathcal{B}} \times I^{\mathcal{B}} \omega_{\mathcal{B}}$$
$$\dot{H}_{G}^{\mathcal{L}} = I^{\mathcal{L}} \dot{\omega}_{\mathcal{L}} + \omega_{\mathcal{L}} \times I^{\mathcal{L}} \omega_{\mathcal{L}} + r_{L/G} \times m_{\mathcal{L}} a_{L}$$



9

# Wing Rigid Body Dynamics



Negligible wing mass, but very high angular rate/acceleration

#### **Rigid Body Dynamics**

${\mathcal B}$	Body frame	$CP_L$	Center of pressure of
${\mathcal R}$	Right wing frame	G	Center of gravity of B
L	Left wing frame	R	Center of gravity of $\mathcal{R}$
$CP_R$	Center of pressure of $\mathcal{R}$	L	Center of gravity of L



<b>M</b> <sub>rd</sub>	Rotational damping moment
$r_{A/B}$	Position of A w.r.t. B
<b>F</b> <sub>aero</sub>	Total aerodynamic force
т	Mass
g	Gravity vector
$\dot{\pmb{H}}_{G}^{\mathcal{A}}$	Angular momentum of frame $\mathcal{A}$ about G
$I^{\mathcal{A}}$	Inertia tensor of frame $\mathcal{A}$
$\pmb{\omega}_{\mathcal{A}}$	Angular rate of frame $\mathcal{A}$
$\boldsymbol{a}_R$	Acceleration of point <i>R</i>



#### **Blade-Element Aerodynamics**

- Wing is divided spanwise into rectangular, 2D, rigid differential elements
- Differential force  $dF_{aero}$  a function of force coefficient  $C_F$ , local airspeed  $V_{\delta w}$ , dynamic pressure q, reference area dS

$$dF_{aero} = C_F(\alpha)qdS$$

$$q = \frac{1}{2}\rho V_{\delta w} \cdot V_{\delta w}$$

$$dS = c(r)dr$$

$$V_{\delta w} = V_G + V_{A/G} + V_{\delta w/A}$$



## **Blade-Element Aerodynamics**

• Integrate along wingspan to obtain total force  $F_{aero}$ 

$$dF_{aero} = C_F(\alpha)qdS$$

$$F_{aero} = \frac{1}{2} C_F(\alpha) \rho \int_0^R \boldsymbol{V}_{\delta w} \cdot \boldsymbol{V}_{\delta w} c(r) dr$$

• Angle of attack  $\alpha$  approximately constant along wingspan, because velocity  $V_{\delta w}$  is dominated by angular rate  $\omega_R$ 

$$\alpha(t) = \tan^{-1} \frac{V_{\delta w} \cdot \hat{x}_{w}}{V_{\delta w} \cdot \hat{z}_{w}}$$
small
$$V_{\delta w} = V_{G} + V_{A/G} + V_{\delta w/A}$$

$$V_{\delta w/A} = \omega_{\mathcal{R}} \times r_{\delta w/A}$$

• Integral can be decomposed so that it does not have to be evaluated at each step of simulation

R

#### **Blade-Element Aerodynamics**



q	Dynamic Pressure	ρ	Ambient air pressure
$V_{\delta w}$	Velocity of differential element	<b>V</b> <sub>G</sub>	Velocity of robot body CG
$V_{A/G}$	Velocity of hinge point relative to robot body CG	$V_{\delta w/A}$	Velocity of differential element relative to hinge point
α	Angle of attack	$C_F(\alpha)$	Force coefficient
dS	Differential reference area	R	Wingspan
r	Wingspan coordinate	c(r)	Chord length



## **Controller Modeling**



## **Controller Modeling Motivation**



- Open-loop flight deviates quickly from hovering
- To validate model against hovering flight requires duplicating flight test controller for closed-loop simulations



#### **Controller Overview**

- Flight test controller detailed in [Ma, K.Y. '13]
- Control design replicated in simulation for purpose of validation



- Altitude: (PID) Desired lift force
- Lateral: (PID) Desired body orientation
- Attitude: (PID) Desired torque
- Signal: Generate signal for piezoelectric actuators

## Altitude Controller



$$f_{L,des} = -k_{pa}e - k_{ia} \int_0^t e \, d\tau - k_{da} \dot{e}$$
$$e = z_{des} - z$$

Compute desired lift  $f_{L,des}$  from the error in altitude

$f_{L,des}$	Desired lift force
$k_{pa}$	Proportional gain
е	Error
k <sub>ia</sub>	Integral gain
k <sub>da</sub>	Derivative gain
Z <sub>des</sub>	Desired altitude
Ζ	Current altitude

#### Lateral Controller



$$\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}_{des} = -k_{pl}(\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}_d) - k_{dl}(\dot{\boldsymbol{r}} - \dot{\boldsymbol{r}}_d)$$

Compute desired body orientation from the position error and velocity error

$\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{des}$	Desired body vector
$k_{pl}$	Proportional gain
r	Position of robot
$r_d$	Desired position of robot
k <sub>dl</sub>	Derivative gain

#### **Attitude Controller**



$$\boldsymbol{\tau}_{des} = -k_p \hat{\boldsymbol{z}}_{des} - k_d L \boldsymbol{\chi}$$

where the body Euler angles  $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$  are used to compute

$$\boldsymbol{\omega} = L\boldsymbol{\Theta}$$
$$\boldsymbol{\chi} = \frac{s}{s+\lambda}\boldsymbol{\Theta}$$

.

$\pmb{ au}_{des}$	Desired body torque
$k_p$	Proportional gain
$\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{des}$	Desired body vector
k <sub>d</sub>	Derivative gain
L	Nonorthogonal transformation matrix
ω	Body angular rate

#### Model Validation



#### **Forced Response**



High frequency forced response of simulation closely matches experimental data

#### **Open-loop Flight**





Simulation (bottom) shows similar instability to experiment (top) in open-loop flight

#### **Closed-loop Flight**



Qualitative comparison of simulated (left) experimental (right) closed-loop trajectories

#### Simulation



Closed-loop simulation of hovering flight

## Flight Comparisons



## **Future Work and Conclusion**

- Proportional Integral Filter (PIF) Compensator
  - Submitted to CDC '17
  - Based on linearization of full equations of motion about hovering
- Intelligent control
  - Preliminary work: [Clawson, T.S. '16]
  - Use adaptive control architecture to learn on-line
- Detailed dynamics analysis
  - Analyze periodic maneuvers and find set points
  - Determine stability of various set points

This model combines accurate aerodynamic force calculations with dynamic modeling to create an integrative flight model



#### A Blade Element Approach to Modeling Aerodynamic Flight of an Insect-scale Robot

Taylor S. Clawson, Sawyer B. Fuller<sup>1</sup>,

#### Robert J. Wood<sup>2</sup>, Silvia Ferrari

<sup>1</sup>Mechanical Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, WA <sup>2</sup>Engineering and Applied Sciences + Wyss Institute, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA



Further questions: Taylor Clawson tsc83@cornell.edu

**Related Work** 

Clawson, Taylor S., et al. "Spiking neural network (SNN) control of a flapping insect-scale robot." *Decision and Control (CDC), 2016 IEEE 55th Conference on.* IEEE, 2016. 28