Experimental Analysis of Advanced Control and Estimation Systems for Autonomous Ship Landing

Christopher Hendrick, Emma Jacques, Joseph Horn, Jack Langelaan The Pennsylvania State University Anish Sydney

NSWC Carderock Division, Sea-Based Aviation and Aeromechanics Branch

Penn State VLRCOE Review, November 15 – 16 2022







Distribution Statement A: Publication Unlimited

Introduction

- Landing rotorcraft during high sea states is difficult
- Lack of public domain experimental data on ship landing systems
 - Full scale testing is difficult, risky, and expensive
- Testing at model scale is desirable
 - Low risk and cost
 - Controllable environment
 - High volume testing
- Research goals:
 - Sensitivity of landing algorithms to aircraft response characteristics
 - Comparisons between different path planners
 - Vision based deck state estimation



Experimental Setup

Maneuvering and Sea Keeping Basin





USV Platform









UAV Platforms

- 2 UAVs: hexacopter and quadcopter
 - Odroid XU4 single board computer
 - Jevios a33 camera
 - Pixhawk Cube Orange autopilot + PX4 Firmware







Hardware and Software Integration





Relative Deck State Estimator

Vision Based Unscented Kalman Filter





Scalable Fiducial Marker Arrays

- Robustly identify desired landing area
- Measure deck pose accurately from a wide range of distances



$$\boldsymbol{z_{cam}} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{r_{d/c}^c} \\ \boldsymbol{q_{d/c}} \end{bmatrix}$$





Flight Control and Autonomy Algorithms

Explicit Model Following Position Controllers

- Motivation easily varied bandwidths
 - Reference tracking tuned through $G_{ideal}(s)$
 - DRB tuned through K(s)
- Froude scaled control:

$$N_F = \left(\frac{M_{fs}}{M_{ms}}\right)^{1/3} \to \omega_{ms} = \omega_{fs} \sqrt{N_F}$$





Path Planning Algorithms





Baseline and QP Landing Algorithms



Autoregressive Models For Deck Forecasting

Define Output Vectors

$$\vec{y}_{long} = \begin{bmatrix} X_d^{dhf} & \dot{X}_d^{dhf} & \theta_d & Z_d^I & \dot{Z}_d^I \end{bmatrix}^T$$
$$\vec{y}_{lat} = \begin{bmatrix} Y_d^{dhf} & Y_d^{dhf} & \phi_d & \psi_d \end{bmatrix}^T$$
$$\downarrow$$



$$\vec{y}_{k+N} = \underline{\alpha}_1 \vec{y}_{k-1+N} + \underline{\alpha}_2 \vec{y}_{k-2+N} + \dots + \underline{\alpha}_{N_{lag}} \vec{y}_{k-N_{lag}+N}$$





First Tests at the MASK

Control Verification



Landing Sequence, High Amplitude Waves

Estimator Verification in Hover

- Measurement
- Estimated
- Ground Truth

Vision Based Landings

Vision Based Landings

Recent Tests at the MASK

More Recent Tests

- 162 recorded landings
- Focus on path planning and control
 - QP vs baseline
 - Varied tracking bandwidths
 - 3 different stochastic wave conditions

X and Y Landing Errors

X and Y Landing Errors

Deck Prediction Accuracy

Questions

PennState

Appendix

Outer Loops and Froude Scaled Control

• Tracking bandwidth: $\omega_{\theta,fs} \rightarrow \omega_{\theta,cf} = \omega_{\theta,fs} \sqrt{N_F} \rightarrow \omega_{X,cf} = \frac{\omega_{\theta,cf}}{5}$

• Outer loop delay:
$$\frac{\theta(s)}{\theta_{cmd}(s)} \approx \frac{\omega_{\theta,cf}^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta \omega_{\theta,cf} s + \omega_{\theta,cf}^2} e^{-\tau_{\theta} s} \rightarrow \tau_x = \frac{1.65}{\omega_{\theta,cf}} + \tau_{\theta}$$

• PID gains set to meet DRB for scaled level 1 HQ

Quadratic Program Transcription

Discrete Model for QP Trajectory Generation

- Separate QP solvers for inertial *X*, *Y*, and *Z* commands
- Dynamics modeled as theoretical ideal result for EMF position controllers:

$$G_X(s) = \frac{\omega_{X,cf}^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta\omega_{X,cf}s + \omega_{X,cf}^2} e^{-\tau_X s} \to \begin{array}{c} \vec{x}_{X,k+1} = A_X \vec{x}_{X,k} + B_X u_{X,k-\tau_d} \\ \vec{y}_{X,k} = C_X \vec{x}_{X,k} + D_X u_{X,k-\tau_d} \end{array}$$

- Outputs are pos, vel, and accel
- Approximate jerk with a back difference:

$$j_k = \frac{a_k - a_{k-1}}{\Delta t}$$

Vision Based Unscented Kalman Filter

Pose Estimation During Landing

