



THE UNIVERSITY
of ADELAIDE

ROBUST ACTUATOR CONTROLLER
FOR ACTIVE-TRUSS-BASED
MORPHING WING

BY

DIFAN TANG

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ENGINEERING SCIENCE

AT

SCHOOL OF MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE

NOVEMBER 2012

Contents

Abstract	iv
Declarations	vi
Acknowledgement	vii
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	x
List of Acronyms	xiv
Nomenclature	xv
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Active-Truss-Based Morphing Wing	1
1.2 Unknown-Inputs Estimation	7
1.2.1 Estimation of Partially Unknown Inputs	8
1.2.2 Estimation of Completely Unknown Inputs	12
1.3 Problems to be Addressed	22
1.4 Aims and Objectives	24
Chapter 2 ACTIVE-TRUSS-BASED MORPHING WING	25
2.1 Actuator Length Determination for Desired Wing Profile	25
2.2 ATBMW Prototype and Modelling	33
Chapter 3 UIE-INTEGRATED LQG CONTROLLER	37
3.1 Problem Statements and Assumptions	37

3.2	Controller Structure	39
3.2.1	Overview	39
3.2.2	Unknown-Input Estimator.....	41
3.2.3	LQG Controller	42
3.3	Closed-Loop Analysis	45
3.3.1	Estimation and Suppression of Unknown Inputs	45
3.3.2	Controller Stability.....	48
3.3.3	Controller Parameters Selection.....	52
Chapter 4	SIMULATIONS.....	58
4.1	Influence of UIE-related Parameters	58
4.1.1	Low-pass Filter	59
4.1.2	State Observer Gain	62
4.1.3	UIE Gain K_d	66
4.2	Unknown-Inputs Estimation and Compensation.....	70
4.2.1	Exogenous Disturbances Estimation and Compensation.....	70
4.2.2	Compensation of Modelling Errors.....	74
4.3	Compensation of Un-modelled Wing Structural Dynamics.....	78
Chapter 5	WIND TUNNEL EXPERIMENTS	85
5.1	Experiment Setup	85
5.2	Tests Arrangement	88
5.3	Results and Discussions	91

5.3.1	Case 1: High-lift Scenario	91
5.3.2	Case 2: Worst-case Scenario	100
Chapter 6	CONCLUSIONS	103
6.1	Outcomes of the Research	103
6.2	Future Work	104
Appendix A	105
Bibliography	107

Abstract

The active-truss-based morphing wing (ATBMW) is a new type of smart structure, which is more efficient than airfoils with conventional control surfaces. However, the sophisticated ATBMW framework and large numbers of actuators make it difficult to obtain the overall structural dynamics for controller design and inconvenient to tune actuators on board. Our research therefore aims to develop an actuator-level control scheme to simplify the process of controller implementation on ATBMWs so that the above problems regarding controller design and on-board tuning can be bypassed.

The proposed control scheme is based on the concept of unknown-input estimation and compensation in a servomechanism. A new unknown-input estimator (UIE) is developed and integrated with a Linear-Quadratic-Gaussian (LQG) controller to provide enhanced compensation of uncertainties. By doing so, the resultant controller can be designed and tuned simply using the dynamics of the actuator, without the necessity to know the dynamics of the entire wing structure. Existing techniques for estimating unknown inputs to a system require at least one or more of the following: detailed knowledge on unknown inputs, derivatives of measured outputs, inversion of plant dynamics, constrained state observer design, parameter optimisation (global optimum not guaranteed), or complicated designs. The new UIE developed in this thesis is exempted from the aforementioned limitations and features a simple structure and straightforward design.

To validate the proposed UIE-integrated LQG controller, an ATBMW prototype with 5 linear actuators is built. For comparison, a PID controller is introduced in both simulations and experiments. Both types of controllers are designed using two sets of models obtained via system identification: one set represents actuator dynamics only, while the other set includes wing structural dynamics.

In simulation study, system sensitivity and stability robustness are firstly investigated against parameters associated with the UIE component, with guidelines for designing the proposed UIE-integrated LQG controller validated. The mechanism of unknown-input compensation is then demonstrated by dividing unknown inputs into exogenous disturbances and internal uncertainties and examining the two situations separately.

Compared with a standard LQG controller, the UIE-integrated LQG controller shows enhanced capability in rejecting unknown inputs. Lastly, the UIE-integrated LQG controller is implemented on all the 5 actuators in the presence of only internal uncertainties, and compared with the PID controller. Superior performance of the UIE-integrated LQG controller over the PID algorithm is observed in simulations.

In experimental study, wind tunnel tests were conducted to further validate the efficacy of the UIE-integrated LQG controller under both aerodynamic loads and modelling errors. The performance of the UIE-integrated LQG controller designed according to actuator dynamics is closely comparable to that of its congener based on wing structural dynamics, and both outperform the PID controller.

In conclusion, the new UIE is capable of effective estimation of unknown inputs. The UIE-integrated LQG controller has an enhanced capacity to compensate a wide class of unknown inputs including exogenous disturbances and internal uncertainties, and meanwhile the ease of design is maintained. The most significant merit of applying the proposed controller on an ATBMW is that the implementation of actuator controllers is considerably simplified despite the complexity of the ATBMW framework. The controller can be based on actuator dynamics only, and can be tuned on individual actuators before the actuators are assembled on the wing. Therefore, the process of controller implementation is free from structural coupling constraints, and there is no need to obtain wing structural dynamics for controller design and to further tune actuators on board.

Beyond the merits mentioned above, the proposed controller has broader significance in the following two aspects. Firstly, it provides a unified solution to simplifying actuator controller implementation on ATBMWs despite the variations and complexity of ATBMW structures, and is thus significant to successful realisations of a wide range of promising ATBMW concepts; Secondly, the enhanced capacity of disturbance rejection is crucial to aerodynamic improvements achieved by ATBMWs as it ensures reliable performance of wing morphing in the presence of unmeasured and unpredictable exogenous loads.

Declarations

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

DIFAN TANG

Date

Acknowledgement

I wish to give my sincere gratitude to my supervisors Dr Lei Chen and Associate Professor Eric Hu, for their support, guidance and assistance, from general aspects of project management to specific technical details.

I would also like to thank the staff in the mechanical and electronic workshops at the School of Mechanical Engineering, the University of Adelaide, for building the active-truss-based morphing wing prototype as well as providing handy helps and advice throughout the project. In particular, my thanks go to Dr Michael Riese, Mr Richard Patemen, Mr Silvio De Ieso, and Mr Philip Schmidt.

An additional mention goes to Mr Jing Han NG, Mr Pee Ter SEET, Mr Teng Chern ONG, and Mr Adrian Tat Chuan CHIAM, who contributed to the project in wing prototype detailing. Special appreciation is given to Dr Kristy Hansen, for her advice and help in setting up the wind tunnel.

Last but not least, I wish to acknowledge my great debt to my parents, Mr Canming Tang and Mrs Wen Wen, as well as my wife Wei Wei, for their consistent support and encouragement along my journey of study.

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Models of Category I – actuator dynamics	35
Table 2.2: Models of Category II – wing structural dynamics distributed at individual actuators	35
Table 2.3: Fits of identified models to acquired data.....	36
Table 4.1: Weights used in the UIE-integrated LQG controller design for actuator B according to the corresponding model in Category I.....	60
Table 4.2: Parameters of the UIE-integrated LQG controller for actuator B with the low-pass filter cutoff frequency ω_c as the variable of interest.....	60
Table 4.3: Parameters of the UIE-integrated LQG controller for actuator B with the state observer gain L as the variable of interest	62
Table 4.4: Parameters of the UIE-integrated LQG controller for Actuator B with the UIE gain K_d as the variable of interest.....	68
Table 4.5: Parameters of the UIE-integrated LQG controller for Actuator B	71
Table 4.6: Weights used for the UIE-integrated LQG controller design based on actuator dynamics	80
Table 4.7: Parameters of the UIE-integrated LQG controller designed according to actuator dynamics	80
Table 4.8: Disturbed response $ y(j\omega_d) $ of actuator extension (mm) from the setpoint when subjected to the equivalent disturbing input $ d_e(j\omega_d) $	81
Table 4.9: Stability robustness index β (dB) of the individual SISO closed-loop system for each actuator.....	81
Table 4.10: Parameters of the PID controller based on actuator dynamics	81

Table 4.11: Relative tracking errors under the PID controller and the UIE-integrated LQG controller designed according to actuator dynamics	84
Table 5.1: Weights used in the UIE-integrated LQG controller design based on wing structural dynamics.....	90
Table 5.2: Parameters of the UIE-integrated LQG controller designed according to wing structural dynamics.....	90
Table 5.3: Disturbed response $ y(j\omega_d) $ of actuator extension (mm) from the setpoint when subjected to the equivalent disturbing input $ d_e(j\omega_d) $	90
Table 5.4: Stability robustness index β (dB) of the individual SISO closed-loop system for each actuator	90
Table 5.5: Parameters of the PID controller based on wing structural dynamics	91
Table 5.6: Relative tracking errors in Tests A, B, and C of Case 1	92
Table 5.7: Relative tracking errors due to limited actuator positioning precision	99

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: A typical example of the ATBMW	3
Figure 1.2: An experimental ATBMW rib constructed by Austin et al. (1994).....	4
Figure 1.3: A conceptual ATBMW formed by repeated cellular trusses (Ramrakhyani et al., 2005).....	5
Figure 1.4: Simulation of ATBMW trailing edge shape morphing	6
Figure 1.5: Basic concept of an extended state observer	8
Figure 1.6: Optimal linear regulator with disturbance accommodating controller (Johnson, 1971).....	10
Figure 1.7: Basic concept of a continuous-time DOB for SISO systems	17
Figure 1.8: A discrete-time DOB for SISO systems (Du et al., 2010).....	18
Figure 1.9: A continuous-time DOB for MIMO systems (Shahruz, 2009)	19
Figure 2.1: A strut in plane with local and global Cartesian coordinate systems	27
Figure 2.2: Actuator force and its decomposed components in global coordinates..	29
Figure 2.3: ATBMW prototype	33
Figure 3.1: Schematic of the UIE-integrated LQG controller	40
Figure 3.2: Schematic of the proposed UIE isolated from the controller	47
Figure 3.3: Un-modelled dynamics $M(s)$ in the closed-loop system	51
Figure 3.4: Equivalent block diagram depiction of the closed-loop system with un-modelled dynamics $M(s)$	51

Figure 4.1: Magnitude of system sensitivity $S(j\omega)$ at $\omega_d = 5$ (rad/s) versus low-pass filter cutoff frequency ω_c	61
Figure 4.2: Stability robustness index β versus low-pass filter cutoff frequency ω_c	61
Figure 4.3: Magnitude of system sensitivity $S(j\omega)$ at $\omega_d = 5$ (rad/s) versus $\ L\ _2$ of the state observer gain	63
Figure 4.4: Stability robustness index β versus $\ L\ _2$ of the state observer gain	63
Figure 4.5: Closed-loop stability with $L_1 = [223.6386 \quad 7.1040]^T$ in the presence of un-modelled dynamics $M_p(s)$	65
Figure 4.6: Closed-loop stability with $L_2 = [22.3811 \quad 0.4567]^T$ in the presence of un-modelled dynamics $M_p(s)$	65
Figure 4.7: Equivalent exogenous disturbance in voltage at the control input channel simulated according to Eq (4.2)	67
Figure 4.8: Reference tracking trajectory for actuator B.....	69
Figure 4.9: Relative tracking error Δ against K_d	69
Figure 4.10: Simulated equivalent exogenous disturbance force.....	71
Figure 4.11: Tracking trajectories of the standard LQG controller before and after the exogenous disturbance is introduced.....	72
Figure 4.12: Estimation of the equivalent exogenous disturbance.....	73
Figure 4.13: Tracking trajectories of the UIE-integrated LQG controller before and after the exogenous disturbance is introduced	73
Figure 4.14: The relative tracking deviation of the standard LQG controller and the UIE-integrated LQG controller in the presence of the exogenous disturbance.....	74

Figure 4.15: The control effort $u_c(t)$ produced by the LQG component of the UIE-integrated LQG controller before and after the exogenous disturbance is introduced	74
Figure 4.16: Tracking trajectories of the standard LQG controller with and without modelling errors	76
Figure 4.17: Tracking trajectories of the UIE-integrated LQG controller with and without modelling errors	76
Figure 4.18: The relative tracking deviation of the standard LQG controller and the UIE-integrated LQG controller with modelling errors	77
Figure 4.19: The control effort $u_c(t)$ from the LQG component of the UIE-integrated LQG controller with and without modelling errors	77
Figure 4.20: The control effort $\hat{d}_e(t)$ from the UIE component of the UIE-integrated LQG controller with and without modelling errors	78
Figure 4.21: Schematic of the PID controller used for comparison.....	80
Figure 4.22: ATBMW morphing process in a high-lift scenario	82
Figure 4.23: Reference length trajectory of actuators for accomplishing the ATBMW morphing process in a high-lift scenario	82
Figure 5.1: Schematic of the hardware setup for controller implementation.....	86
Figure 5.2: Setup for wind tunnel tests	86
Figure 5.3: ATBMW installation in the wind tunnel	87
Figure 5.4: Lift coefficient of the ATBMW prototype in Case 1 tests	93
Figure 5.5: Tracking trajectories of actuator B in Case 1 using the PID controller based on wing structural dynamics (Test C)	95
Figure 5.6: Tracking trajectories of actuator B in Case 1 using the UIE-integrated LQG controller based on actuator dynamics (Test A)	95

Figure 5.7: Tracking trajectories of actuator B in Case 1 using the UIE-integrated LQG controller based on wing structural dynamics (Test B)	96
Figure 5.8: Relative tracking deviations in Tests A, B, and C	96
Figure 5.9: Tracking trajectories of actuator O in Case 1 using the PID controller based on wing structural dynamics (Test C)	97
Figure 5.10: Tracking trajectories of actuator O in Case 1 using the UIE-integrated LQG controller based on actuator dynamics (Test A)	97
Figure 5.11: Tracking trajectories of actuator O in Case 1 using the UIE-integrated LQG controller based on wing structural dynamics (Test B)	98
Figure 5.12: Relative tracking deviations in Tests A, B, and C	98
Figure 5.13: Lift coefficient of the ATBMW prototype in Case 2 tests	100
Figure 5.14: Tracking trajectories of actuator B in Case 2 using the PID controller based on wing structural dynamics (Test C)	101
Figure 5.15: Tracking trajectories of actuator B in Case 2 using the UIE-integrated LQG controller based on actuator dynamics (Test A)	101
Figure 5.16: Tracking trajectories of actuator B in case 2 using the UIE-integrated LQG controller based on wing structural dynamics (Test B)	102
Figure 5.17: Relative tracking deviations in Tests A, B, and C	102

List of Acronyms

ATBMW	active-truss-based morphing wing
DOB	disturbance observer
LQ	linear-quadratic
LQG	Linear-Quadratic-Gaussian
MIMO	Multi-Input Multi-Output
PID	proportional-integral-derivative
PIO	proportional-integral observer
SISO	Single-Input Single-Output
SMA	shape memory alloy
UIDO	unknown-input-decoupled observer
UIE	unknown-input estimator
UIO	unknown-input observer

Nomenclature

Latin Letters	Definition	Unit
a	Average cross section area of a strut	m^2
A	System matrix (continuous-time domain)	
a_w	Planform area of an airfoil	m^2
b	Coefficient (general)	
B	Input matrix (continuous-time domain)	
c	Coefficient (general)	
C	Output matrix (continuous-time domain)	
C_L	Lift coefficient	
d	Unknown/disturbance input (general)	
D	Direct transmission term (continuous-time domain)	
d_e	Unknown/disturbance input (equivalent)	
e	Error	
E	Young's modulus	N/m^2
f	Force (in local Cartesian coordinate system)	N
F	Force (in global Cartesian coordinate system)	N
F_L	Lift force	N
g	Order of derivatives	
G	Transfer function (general)	
H	Transfer function (feedback controller)	
i	The i^{th} quantity	
I	Identity matrix	
j	Imaginary operator	
J	Performance index	
k	The k^{th} quantity	
K	Controller gain (scalar)	
K	Controller gain (matrix)	

Latin Letters	Definition	Unit
l	Length of a strut	m
L	State observer gain matrix	
m	Denominator order of a transfer function	
M	Transfer function (un-modelled dynamics)	
n	Number (general)	
N	Filter coefficient (for the derivative term of PID)	
p	Numerator order of a transfer function	
P	Transfer function (actual plant)	
P_n	Transfer function (nominal plant)	
q	Nodal displacement along the axial direction of a strut	m
Q	Weighting matrix	
r	Reference input	
R	Weighing scalar	
R	Weighing matrix	
s	Complex variable	
S	Sensitivity function	
t	Time (general)	s
T	Transformation matrix	
t_s	Sampling interval	s
u	Control input	
U	Nodal displacement (in global Cartesian coordinate system)	m
V	Volume of a strut	m ³
v_a	Air velocity	m/s
w	Process noise	
W	General matrix	
x	System state	
y	System output	
z	Variable of z-transform	
Z	General matrix	

Greek Letters	Definition	Unit
α	Deviation	
β	Stability robustness index	
γ	General scalar	
Γ	Stiffness matrix (in global Cartesian coordinate system)	N/m
δ	Impulse function	
Δ	Ratio of tracking deviation	%
ε	Strain	
ζ	General matrix	
η	System state (intermediate variable)	
θ	Angle	rad
Θ	Transformation matrix	
κ	Stiffness matrix (in local Cartesian coordinate system)	N/m
κ	Generalised stiffness of a single strut	N/m
μ	Matrix of nonlinear functions	
ζ	Residual unknown input/disturbance	
ρ	Density of air	kg/m ³
σ	Stress	N/m ²
τ	Time constant	s
v	Residuals	
Φ	General Matrix	
Ψ	Transformation matrix	
ω	Frequency	rad/s
ω_c	Cutoff frequency of a low-pass filter	rad/s

Superscripts	Definition	Unit
(i)	The i^{th} quantity	
(k)	The k^{th} quantity	
(e)	The e^{th} element	

Subscripts	Definition	Unit
0	Before change (initial state)	
a	Actuator related	
act	Actual	
c	Nominal controller related	
d	Unknown input/disturbance related	
D	Derivative	
dac	Disturbance-accommodating-controller	
des	Desired	
e	External	
f	Filter related	
i	The i^{th} quantity	
I	Integral	
k	The k^{th} quantity	
L	State observer related	
P	Proportional	
t	After change (final state)	
v	Intermediate variable related	
w	Internal model related	
z	Discrete-time domain related	