

MASTER OF SCIENCE THESIS

---

# **Nonlinear Geometric Control of a Quadrotor with a Cable-Suspended Load**

**N.N. Vo**

---

August 13, 2017





# **Nonlinear Geometric Control of a Quadrotor with a Cable-Suspended Load**

MASTER OF SCIENCE THESIS

For obtaining the degree of Master of Science in Mechanical  
Engineering at Delft University of Technology

N.N. Vo

August 13, 2017



The work in this Master of Science Thesis was supported by Alten Nederland. Their cooperation is hereby gratefully acknowledged.



**Delft University of Technology**

Copyright © Delft Center for Systems and Control  
All rights reserved.

DELFT UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY  
DELFT CENTER FOR SYSTEMS AND CONTROL

The undersigned hereby certify that they have read and recommend to the Faculty of Mechanical, Maritime and Materials Engineering for acceptance a thesis entitled “**Nonlinear Geometric Control of a Quadroptor with a Cable-Suspended Load**” by **N.N. Vo** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Master of Science**.

Dated: August 13, 2017

Supervisor TU Delft:

---

dr.ir. T. Keviczky

Readers:

---

Dr. J. Alonso-Mora

---

A. Sharifi Kolarijani

Supervisor Alten:

---

ir. B. van Vliet



---

# Abstract

A Quadrotor is a type of Unmanned Aerial Vehicle that has received an increasing amount of attention recently with many applications being actively investigated. Possible applications include search and rescue, surveillance, supply of food and medicines as disaster relief and object manipulation in construction and transportation. An interesting subproblem of load transportation is the control of the position of a cable suspended load. The challenge is in the fact that the Quadrotor-Load system is highly nonlinear and under-actuated. The load cannot be controlled directly and has a natural swing at the end of each Quadrotor movement.

This thesis presents a Nonlinear Geometric Control approach for the position tracking of a cable suspended load. The focus lies on the subsystem of the total Quadrotor-Load system where the cable tension is non-zero, which is analogous to modeling a rigid link between the Quadrotor and Load. The main goal is to investigate the possibilities and limitations of Nonlinear Geometric Control for the purpose of load trajectory tracking of a Quadrotor with a cable-suspended Load, by evaluating the stability of the system and the tracking performance on different load trajectories.

First, an introduction is given on Geometric Mechanics, an approach that applies differential geometric techniques to systems modeling and control, based on the geometric properties of the dynamics of the system. It is shown how the configuration of the Quadrotor-Load system can be described on smooth nonlinear geometric configuration spaces. Analyzing these geometric structures with the principles of differential geometry allows modeling in an unambiguous coordinate-free dynamic fashion, while avoiding the problem of singularities that would occur on local charts.

Next, the Quadrotor-Load system is modeled with the tools of differential geometry in order to make it suitable for Nonlinear Geometric Control. The geometric properties are utilized to define tracking error functions on these same spaces, making it possible to design almost-globally defined controllers. A backstepping approach is applied to generate a cascaded structure with multiple nonlinear Geometric controllers, allowing control of several flight modes that are responsible for the control of 1) Quadrotor attitude, 2) Load attitude and 3) Load position.

Finally, simulations demonstrate the stability and abilities of the Nonlinear Geometric Controller, and a Linear Quadratic Regulator is derived to compare control performance. The tracking performances of both controllers are discussed, final conclusions are presented, and the thesis is concluded with recommendations for future work.





---

# Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors dr.ir. T. Keviczky from *Delft Center of Systems and Control*, and ir. B. van Vliet from *Alten Nederland B.V.* for their assistance during my research and the writing of this thesis. I would also like to thank all colleagues from Alten and TU Delft for their time and advice.

Delft, University of Technology  
August 13, 2017

N.N. Vo



---

# Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1-1 Aim and Motivation . . . . .	2
1-2 Organization of the Report . . . . .	3
<b>2 Dynamic Model</b>	<b>5</b>
2-1 Geometric Mechanics . . . . .	6
2-2 Quadrotor Model . . . . .	10
2-3 Quadrotor-Load Model . . . . .	12
<b>3 Control Design</b>	<b>17</b>
3-1 Nonlinear Geometric Control . . . . .	18
3-1-1 Error Functions . . . . .	18
3-2 Backstepping Control . . . . .	22
3-2-1 Quadrotor Attitude Tracking . . . . .	23
3-2-2 Load Attitude Tracking . . . . .	25
3-2-3 Load Position Tracking . . . . .	26
<b>4 Experiment</b>	<b>29</b>
4-1 Procedure . . . . .	30
4-2 Trajectories . . . . .	31
4-3 Setup . . . . .	35
4-4 Results . . . . .	38
4-5 Summary . . . . .	48

<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions and Future Work</b>	<b>49</b>
5-1	Summary and Conclusions . . . . .	49
5-2	Recommendations for Future Work . . . . .	50
5-2-1	Investigate Implementation . . . . .	50
5-2-2	Minimum Snap Trajectory Generation . . . . .	51
5-2-3	Hybrid System . . . . .	51
<b>A</b>	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>53</b>
A-1	Derivation of Equations of motion . . . . .	53
A-1-1	Load Dynamics . . . . .	53
A-2	Derivation Error dynamics . . . . .	53
A-2-1	Quadrotor Attitude . . . . .	53
A-2-2	Load Attitude . . . . .	54
A-3	LQR controller . . . . .	55
A-4	Classical Modeling . . . . .	56
A-5	Figures . . . . .	57
	<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>65</b>

---

## List of Figures

2-1	Configuration Space of a 2-link arm . . . . .	6
2-2	A manifold locally resembles a Euclidean space . . . . .	7
2-3	Tangent Spaces on different manifolds . . . . .	8
2-4	Quadrotor model representation . . . . .	11
2-5	Quadrotor with Load model representation . . . . .	12
3-1	Transport map $\mathcal{T}(q, r)$ . . . . .	19
3-2	Nonlinear Geometric Control Loop of the QR-Load system [1] . . . . .	22
3-3	QR Attitude Controller . . . . .	23
3-4	Construction of $b_{1c}$ to define $R_c$ . . . . .	25
4-1	Desired Load Position Case A . . . . .	31
4-2	Desired Load Position Case B . . . . .	33
4-3	Desired Load Position Case C . . . . .	33
4-4	Command Filter . . . . .	36
4-5	LQR control design . . . . .	37
4-6	Load Position Tracking NGC Case A . . . . .	38
4-7	Geometric Error functions NGC Case A . . . . .	39
4-8	Geometric Tracking Error functions NGC Case A . . . . .	39
4-9	Controller Comparison Case A. Solid: NGC, Dash-dot: LQR . . . . .	40
4-10	Controller Comparison Case A. Solid: NGC, Dash-dot: LQR . . . . .	41
4-11	Load Position Tracking Nonlinear Geometric Control Case B . . . . .	42
4-12	Geometric Error functions NGC Case B . . . . .	42
4-13	Load Velocity NGC Case A(left) and Case B(right) . . . . .	43
4-14	Geometric Tracking Error functions NGC Case B . . . . .	43
4-15	Controller Comparison Case B. Solid: NGC, Dash-dot: LQR . . . . .	44

4-16 Controller Comparison Case B. Solid: NGC, Dash-dot: LQR . . . . .	44
4-17 Load Position Tracking Nonlinear Geometric Control Case C . . . . .	45
4-18 Geometric Error functions NGC Case C . . . . .	46
4-19 Geometric Tracking Error functions NGC Case C . . . . .	46
4-20 Controller Comparison Case C. Solid: NGC, Dash-dot: LQR . . . . .	47
4-21 Controller Comparison Case C. Solid: NGC, Dash-dot: LQR . . . . .	47
A-1 Model representation . . . . .	57
A-2 Simulink Command Filter . . . . .	58

---

## List of Tables

2-1	Modeling assumptions Quadrotor model . . . . .	10
2-2	Modeling assumptions Quadrotor-Load model . . . . .	12
4-1	Modeling Parameters . . . . .	35
4-2	Hardware Parameters for Bebop Parrot Drone 1 . . . . .	35
4-3	Command Filter Parameters . . . . .	36
4-4	Controller Gains Nonlinear Geometric Controller . . . . .	37





---

# Chapter 1

---

## Introduction

A Quadrotor (QR) is a type of Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) that has received an increasing amount of attention recently with many applications being actively investigated. Possible applications include search and rescue, surveillance, reliable supply of food and medicines as disaster relief and object manipulation in construction and transportation. It has already proven itself useful for many tasks like multi-agent missions, mapping, explorations, transportation and entertainment such as acrobatic performances.

The inspiration for this research is build upon the idea of creating a system of multiple autonomous QRs for a cooperative towing task. The advantage of such systems for object manipulation is the increased reach and the possibility to reduce complexity of the individual robot, decrease cost over traditional robotic systems and high reliability. One can think of examples in nature, where individuals coordinate, cooperate and collaborate to perform tasks that they individually can not accomplish. Redundancy makes development of fail safe control methods possible and can extend the capabilities of a single robot.

Considering a multi-agent task, one can think of multiple QRs assisting in the transportation of a common load in many ways. One interesting method is the transportation of a load suspended via a cable. Prior to a multi-agent load transportation task, research must be done to this task involving a single QR. This research revolves around load position control of a single QR with a cable-suspended load in motion. The suspended object naturally continues to swing at the end of every movement. In case a residual motion can result in damage or in order to avoid obstacles and path following, an accurate positioning is required. Reducing the oscillation, or controlling the position of the suspended load might be necessary, but is challenging in the fact that this cable-suspended system is under-actuated. Possible objectives are minimizing the oscillations of the load during or after motion, minimizing the time to position the load, trajectory tracking, trajectory generation and obstacle avoidance.

## 1-1 Aim and Motivation

The aim is to control the position of a suspended load using a QR. Before considering multiple QRs, it is important to investigate the possibilities of a single QR with load system. Hence, in this research a single QR is considered for the transportation of a cable suspended load, which will exert additional forces and torques on the QR. This is a challenging control problem in the fact that the QR system is under-actuated. Adding a suspended load will add extra DOFs and oscillations of the load occur at the end of every movement.

The system can be divided into two subsystems. The first subsystem is where the cable tension is non-zero and the distance between the QR and the load is defined by the cable length. Both QR and load are coupled as one system. The second subsystem is where the cable tension is zero, such that the QR and load in free fall are two separate decoupled systems. This research focuses on the first subsystem, such that the cable tension is non-zero. In order to control both subsystems, hybrid control must be applied, which is considered out of the scope of this research.

Former work on attitude control of QR and/or load often relies on linear control methods such as PID, MPC and LQR control. The dynamics are linearized around an equilibrium point, describing the system dynamics by a set of linear differential equations. The control of a QR-Load system is a very specific case and scarcely investigated. Former work includes MPC [2] and LQR control approaches, where an optimal control strategy is used to minimize the swing of the load.

The reason that linear control near an equilibrium state is commonly applied, is partly to avoid difficulties that come with modeling and controlling the non-linearities of the system. However, linear control limits the system to small angle movements, as the optimization will not allow large angles that deviate to far from the linearized point. This type of modeling and control will not be sufficient for applications that require fast aggressive maneuvers. Nonlinear control systems are often governed by nonlinear differential equations and are able to represent the dynamics in a more realistic manner. Nonlinear control approaches to minimize the load swing includes a Model Based Algorithm controller applied by [3].

\*\*\*\*\*

Bart: I think you might need some references here.

Nam: Duidelijk: is nog ToDo

\*\*\*\*\*

Nonlinear Geometric Control is a nonlinear model based control technique based on a modeling approach involving the concepts of differential geometry. This results in a globally defined coordinate-free dynamical model, while preventing issues regarding singularities, and enabling the design of controllers that offer almost-global convergence properties. For a study on rigid body dynamics and optimal control problems, where geometric features are incorporated, one can refer to [4].

Former work includes a nonlinear geometric control of a QR [5, 6] and nonlinear geometric control of the load position, load attitude and QR attitude of a QR-Load system [7, 8, 9]. Nonlinear Geometric Control for QR systems is rarely found in literature, despite the advantageous properties of differential geometry.

This motivates to investigate the potential and limitations of a rarely used nonlinear Geometric Control approach, and the performance of a load transportation maneuver, when compared to a commonly used linear control strategy.

Different aspects involving the modeling and control for the QR-Load system must be investigated, for it can be expected that the non-linearity will have a great influence in the representation of the dynamics and the stability, accuracy and type of the control design. It is possible to investigate which advantages or disadvantages this nonlinear approach has compared to a linear approach, in terms of stability and performance.

## 1-2 Organization of the Report

In this first chapter, a brief introduction of the subject is given and the problem is described. This is followed by discussing the aim, motivation and contributions of this thesis for this research. The organization of the report is as follows.

Chapter 2 introduces Geometric Mechanics to understand and derive the system's equations of motion in order to allow nonlinear geometric controller design and analysis. The system configuration space is described on a differentiable manifold using the tools of Differential geometry instead of Euclidean geometry, where the system dynamics evolve in a three dimensional space. The dynamics of the QR-Load system are then described by the laws of kinematics and the application of Newton's laws and Lagrangian mechanics. In contrast with classical modeling techniques, geometric modeling results in a compact, unambiguous and coordinate-free model.

Describing the system dynamics on nonlinear manifolds allows the design of nonlinear geometric controllers on these same manifolds. The control design is presented in Chapter 3. The controller has a cascaded structure, allowing the control of several flight modes that are accountable for the control of different degrees of freedom.

Chapter 4 describes the experiments that are done to investigate the abilities and performance of a nonlinear Geometric Control design. Different tracking objectives are defined in order to compare the performance between an LQR control design and a nonlinear Geometric Control design. The results are presented and findings are discussed.

In the final chapter a summary of the thesis is given, followed by the conclusions that were made based on the results of the research. Finally, recommendations are given which could serve as an starting point for future work.



---

## Chapter 2

---

# Dynamic Model

A mathematical model of the system needs to be derived in order to simulate and study the effects of nonlinear Geometric Control. In Section 2-1, an introduction is given about Geometric Mechanics. This is a modern description of the classical mechanics from the perspective of Differential Geometry, which is a discipline in mathematics that studies manifolds and their geometric properties, using the tools of calculus.

Section 2-2 starts by discussing assumptions that are applied to simplify the model. Next, a dynamical model of the QR is presented. In Section 2-3, the same is done to obtain a dynamical model of the QR-Load system with Geometric Mechanics, resulting in a compact, coordinate-free, unambiguous representation of the dynamics, described on nonlinear manifolds.

## 2-1 Geometric Mechanics

For the derivation of the equations of motions, traditional modeling methods often parameterize the rotations in a local coordinate system. This can be done with Euler Angles, and despite this parametrization might result in singularities, this is a commonly used method to describe rotations. There are 24 possible sets of Euler angles and many different conventions are used, which introduces ambiguity. The definition of Euler angles is not unique and a sequence of rotations is not commutative. Therefore, Euler angles are never expressed in terms of the external frame, or in terms of the co-moving rotated body frame, but in a mixture.

An other disadvantage of Euler angles, is that the transformation from their time rates of change to the angular velocity vector is not globally defined. Furthermore, when angular errors are large, the difference in Euler angles is no longer a good metric to define the orientation error. Hence, the error is rather written as the required rotation to get from the current to a desired orientation, which can be achieved by considering geometric properties of the system.

In Geometric Mechanics the configuration space of systems is a *group manifold* instead of a Euclidean space. The kinetic and potential energies are expressed in terms of this configuration space and their tangent spaces. It explores the geometric structure of a Lagrangian- or Hamiltonian system through the concepts of vector calculus, linear algebra, differential geometry, and nonlinear control theory. Geometric mechanics provides fundamental insights into the nonlinear system mechanics and yields useful tools for dynamics and control theory.

An example is given of a simple 2-link arm, to illustrate different representations of a configuration space, see Figure 2-1. Let the configuration of the arm be defined by two coordinates in a Cartesian coordinate system, which is a local representation. This can be seen in Figure 2-1b, where the colored edges illustrate singularities, because the definition of one point has multiple solutions.

Next, the configuration space is represented as a geometric shape called a *torus*, as shown in Figure 2-1c. It is a smooth manifold where each configuration is mapped uniquely, which allows the configuration to be defined globally.




Figure 2-1: Configuration Space of a 2-link arm

**Manifolds** The fundamental object of differential geometry a manifold. A manifold is a mathematical space, a collection of points, that locally resembles Euclidean space near each

point. Examples are a plane, a ball, a torus and a sphere. Manifolds are important objects in mathematics and physics because they allow more complicated structures to be expressed and understood in terms of the relatively well-understood properties of simpler spaces. Each point of an  $n$ -dimensional manifold has a neighborhood that is homeomorphic to the  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space, meaning that there is a continuous function describing the relation between these spaces, illustrated in Figure 2-2.

\*\*\*\*\*

Bart: Link coordinate free to singularity

Nam: ToDo

\*\*\*\*\*




Figure 2-2: A manifold locally resembles a Euclidean space


A *differentiable manifold* is a smooth and continuous manifold and is locally similar enough to a linear space to allow to do calculus. One can define directions, tangent spaces, and differentiable functions on such a manifold.

Taking the derivative at a point on a manifold is equivalent to a *tangent vector* at that point. Meaning that derivatives are conceptually equivalent to an infinitesimally short tangent vector. Each point of an  $n$ -dimensional differentiable manifold has a tangent space, which is an  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space consisting of all the tangent vectors of *all* curves that pass through that point.

A tangent space describes a relationship between a position and a velocity at that position. This property is of importance for the determination of configuration error functions, which give a measure of the error between a desired state and an actual state. The configuration errors will be described in Section 3-1.

To illustrate a tangent space, a point  $x$  is chosen on a *2-sphere*, which is a manifold denoted by  $\mathbb{S}^2$  and defined by a sphere of dimension 2. The tangent space at point  $x$  is the collection of all tangent vectors at point  $x$  and is denoted by  $T_x\mathbb{S}^2$ , see Figure 2-3a.

**Geometric Configuration Spaces** Several methods exist to describe rotations, such as *Euler Angles*, quaternions or rotation matrices. The main disadvantages of Euler angles are that some functions have singularities and they are a less accurate measure for the integration of incremental changes in attitude over time, compared to other methods. To avoid these



(a) Representation of a manifold with a tangent space

(b) Identity map of manifold  $SO(3)$  with Lie Algebra  $\mathfrak{so}(3)$

Figure 2-3: Tangent Spaces on different manifolds

problems, in Geometric Mechanics rotations are expressed as rotation matrices to provide a global representation of the attitude of a rigid body.

The QR attitude is expressed as a rotation matrix  $R$  in the Special Orthogonal Group  $SO(3)$ , which describes the rotation of a body frame relative to the spatial frame. The manifold  $SO(3)$  is defined as

$$SO(3) \triangleq \{R \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3} | RR^T = I_{3 \times 3}, \det(R) = 1\} \quad (2-1)$$

where  $SO(3)$  is the group of all rotations about the origin of a 3-D Euclidean space, which preserves the origin, Euclidean distance and orientation. [10, 11]

Every rotation has a unique inverse rotation and the identity map satisfies the definition of a rotation. The elements of *Lie Algebra*  $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ , a property associated with  $SO(3)$ , are the elements of the *tangent space* of  $SO(3)$  at the identity element, see Figure 2-3b. These elements define the relation between the rotation  $R$  and its derivative  $\dot{R}$ , such that

$$\dot{R} = R\hat{\Omega} \quad (2-2)$$

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathfrak{so}(n)$  is the vector space of skew-symmetric matrices in  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and defined as

$$\mathfrak{so}(n) \triangleq \{S \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} | S^T = -S\} \quad (2-3)$$

The hat map  $\wedge : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathfrak{so}(3)$  is an isomorphism between  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and the set of  $3 \times 3$  skew symmetric matrices, such that  $\hat{x}y = x \times y$  for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . The vee map  $\vee : \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ , and is the inverse isomorphism of the hat map. Several properties of the hat map are

$$\hat{x}y = x \times y = -y \times x = -\hat{y}x, \quad (2-4)$$

$$\text{tr}[A\hat{x}] = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}[\hat{x}(A - A^T)] = -x^T(A - A^T)^\vee, \quad (2-5)$$

$$\hat{x}A + A^T\hat{x} = (\{\text{tr}[A]I_{3 \times 3} - A\}x)^\wedge, \quad (2-6)$$

$$R\hat{x}R^T = (Rx)^\wedge, \quad (2-7)$$



for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ , and  $R \in SO(3)$ . The mapping between the body angular velocity vector  $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\hat{\Omega} \in \mathfrak{so}(3)$  is written as

$$\hat{\Omega} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\Omega_3 & \Omega_2 \\ \Omega_3 & 0 & -\Omega_1 \\ -\Omega_2 & \Omega_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\Omega_3 & \Omega_2 \\ \Omega_3 & 0 & -\Omega_1 \\ -\Omega_2 & \Omega_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^\vee = \Omega \quad (2-8)$$

The load attitude is expressed as a unit vector  $q$ , which points from  $\{\mathcal{B}\}$  to the load. The configuration space is a *two-sphere*  $\mathbb{S}^2$  defined as

$$\mathbb{S}^2 \triangleq \{q \in \mathbb{R}^3 | q \cdot q = 1\} \quad (2-9)$$

The plane tangent to the sphere at  $q$  is the tangent space

$$T_q \mathbb{S}^2 \simeq \{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^3 | q \cdot \omega = 0\} \quad (2-10)$$

where  $\omega$  is the angular velocity of the suspended load.

## 2-2 Quadrotor Model

Assumptions can be made to simplify the complexity of the mathematical model. Table 2-1 shows the assumptions that are used for modeling the QR system.

### Modeling assumptions Quadrotor model

- The structure of the QR is rigid and symmetric.  
Elastic deformations and shock (sudden accelerations) of the QR are ignored.
- The mass distribution of the QR is symmetrical in the x-y plane.
- The inertia matrix is time-invariant.
- Aerodynamic effects acting on the QR are neglected.  
Blade flapping, Turbulence, Ground Effects.
- The air density  $\rho$  around the QR is constant.
- The propellers are rigid  $\Rightarrow$  The thrust produced by rotor  $i$  is parallel to the axis of rotor  $i$ .
- Drag factor  $d$  and thrust factor  $b$  are approximated by a constant.  
Thrust force  $F_i$  and moment  $M_i$  of each propeller is proportional to the square of the propeller speed.

Table 2-1: Modeling assumptions Quadrotor model

The QR model representation is shown in Figure 2-4. Two Cartesian coordinate frames are defined:

- The body-fixed reference frame  $\{\mathcal{B}\}$  (Body Frame)  
with unit vectors  $\{\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3\}$  along the axes
- The ground-fixed reference frame  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$  (Inertial Frame)  
with unit vectors  $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3\}$  along the axes

such that  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$  is fixed to earth and the body-frame axes  $\mathbf{b}_1$  and  $\mathbf{b}_2$ , coincide with the arms of the QR.

The QR is described as a rigid body with six degrees of freedom, driven by the system inputs: the total upward force  $f$  and the moments  $M = [M_\phi \ M_\theta \ M_\psi]^T$  around the body axes.

The configuration of the QR can be described by 1) the location of the QR's Center of Mass (CM),  $x_Q \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , described in the Euclidean space w.r.t.  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$ , and 2) the *attitude* which is the orientation of  $\{\mathcal{B}\}$  w.r.t.  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$  evolving on a nonlinear space, described by a rotation matrix  $R \in SO(3)$ . Rotations w.r.t.  $\{\mathcal{B}\}$ , about the axes  $b_1, b_2$  and  $b_3$  are parameterized by  $\phi, \theta$  and  $\psi$ , respectively, which is illustrated in Figure 2-4b.

The dynamics of a rigid body can be expressed on the manifold  $SE(3)$ , which is the group of *rigid displacements* in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . A rigid displacement describes both the rotation and the position of  $\{\mathcal{B}\}$  relative to  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$ .

**Rotor dynamics** The complex dynamics of the rotors and their interactions with drag and thrust forces are represented by a simplified model. The angular speed  $\omega_i$  of rotor  $i$ , for




Figure 2-4: Quadrotor model representation

$i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ , generates a force  $F_i$  parallel to the direction of the rotor axis of rotor  $i$ , given by

$$F_i = \left( \frac{K_v K_\tau \sqrt{2\rho A}}{K_t} \omega_i \right)^2 \simeq b \omega_i^2 \quad (2-11)$$

where  $K_v, K_t$  are constants related to the motor properties,  $\rho$  is the density of the surrounding air,  $A$  is the area swept out by the rotor,  $K_\tau$  is a constant determined by the blade configuration and parameters, and  $b$  is the thrust factor.

The torque around the axis of rotor  $i$ , generated due to drag is given by

$$M_i = \frac{1}{2} R \rho C_D A (\omega_i R)^2 \simeq d \omega_i^2 \quad (2-12)$$

where  $R$  is the radius of the propeller,  $C_D$  is a dimensionless constant, and  $d$  is the drag constant.

The required rotor speeds  $\omega_i$  can be calculated for a given desired total thrust  $f$  and total moment  $M = [M_\phi \ M_\theta \ M_\psi]^T$ , by solving the following equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} f \\ M_\phi \\ M_\theta \\ M_\psi \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} b & b & b & b \\ 0 & -lb & 0 & lb \\ lb & 0 & -lb & 0 \\ -d & d & -d & d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \omega_1^2 \\ \omega_2^2 \\ \omega_3^2 \\ \omega_4^2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2-13)$$

where  $l$  is the distance from the rotor to the QR's CM,  $d$  is the drag factor and  $b$  is the thrust factor.

## 2-3 Quadrotor-Load Model

Assumptions are also made to simplify the mathematical model for the QR-Load system. Table 2-2 shows the assumptions that are used for modeling the QR-Load system.

### Modeling assumptions Quadrotor-Load model

- The cable is modeled as a rigid and massless cable.
- The cable is connected to a friction-less joint at the origin of the body-fixed.
- The tension in the cable is considered to be non-zero.  
This implies that the QR-Load subsystem that consists of a QR and a Load in free fall, is disregarded.
- Aerodynamic effects acting on the load are neglected.

Table 2-2: Modeling assumptions Quadrotor-Load model

The total Quadrotor-Load model consists of two subsystems, 1) where the cable tension is zero, and 2) where the cable tension is non-zero. In this research, the focus is only on the subsystem where the cable tension is non-zero.

The QR-Load model is shown in Figure 2-5. The unit vector  $q \in \mathbb{S}^2$  gives the direction from the QR to the Load expressed in  $\{\mathcal{B}\}$ . The position of the QR and Load are related by

$$x_Q = x_L - Lq \quad (2-14)$$

where  $x_Q \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is the position of the QR's CM expressed in  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$ ,  $x_L \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is the position of the load expressed in  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$ , and  $L$  is the length of the cable.




Figure 2-5: Quadrotor with Load model representation

The configuration of the load can be described by its location  $x_L \in \mathbb{R}^3$  w.r.t.  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$ , evolving in Euclidean space, and the load attitude evolving on a nonlinear space  $\mathbb{S}^2$ , described by the unit vector  $q \in \mathbb{S}^2$ . Rotations of the load w.r.t.  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$ , about the axes  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are denoted by  $\phi_L$  and  $\theta_L$ , respectively, see Figure 2-5b.

**Euler-Lagrange** To develop the Euler-Lagrange equations for mechanical systems that evolve on manifolds, an approach developed by [4, 12, 13, 14] is applied. The basic idea is to express the variations of the curves evolving on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  and  $SO(3)$ . This approach is based on Hamilton's principle, which states that the evolution of a physical system is a solution of the functional equation given by

$$\frac{\delta S}{\delta \mathbf{x}(t)} = 0 \quad (2-15)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  defines the configuration space.  $S$  is the action integral, defined as

$$S = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathcal{L} dt \quad (2-16)$$

where  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{T} - \mathcal{U}$  is the Lagrangian of the system, and  $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U}$  are the kinetic and potential energy, respectively.

Hamilton's principle of least action states that the path a conservative mechanical system takes between two states  $\mathbf{x}_1$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2$  at time  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , is the one for which Equation 2-16 is a stationary point, resulting in

$$\delta S = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \delta \mathcal{L} dt = 0 \quad (2-17)$$

where  $\delta \mathcal{L}$  is the variation of the Lagrangian. For systems with non-conservative forces and moments, Equation 2-17 is extended to

$$\delta S = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\delta W + \delta \mathcal{L}) dt = 0 \quad (2-18)$$

where  $\delta W$  is the virtual work. Equation 2-18 is applied to the QR-Load system, where the configuration manifold is  $\mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2 \times SO(3)$ . With the following states

$$\mathbf{x} = [x_L \quad \dot{x}_L \quad q \quad \omega \quad R \quad \Omega]^T \quad (2-19)$$

where  $\omega$  is the angular velocity of the load and  $\Omega$  denotes the angular velocity of the body-fixed frame.

The kinetic energy  $\mathcal{T}$  and the potential energy  $\mathcal{U}$  for the system are denoted as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &= \frac{1}{2} m_Q \dot{x}_Q \cdot \dot{x}_Q + \frac{1}{2} m_L \dot{x}_L \cdot \dot{x}_L + \frac{1}{2} \Omega \cdot J \cdot \Omega \\ \mathcal{U} &= m_Q g x_Q \cdot e_3 + m_L g x_L \cdot e_3 \end{aligned} \quad (2-20)$$

where  $J \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$  is the inertia tensor of the QR, and  $g$  is the gravity constant.

The energy can be rewritten in terms of  $q$  and  $x_L$ , by substituting Equation 2-14, giving

$$\mathcal{T} = \frac{1}{2} (m_Q + m_L) \dot{x}_L \cdot \dot{x}_L - m_Q L \dot{x}_L \cdot \dot{q} + \frac{1}{2} m_Q L^2 \dot{q} \cdot \dot{q} + \frac{1}{2} \Omega \cdot J \cdot \Omega \quad (2-21)$$

$$\mathcal{U} = (m_Q + m_L) g x_L \cdot e_3 - m_Q g L q \cdot e_3 \quad (2-22)$$

**Variations** The variations of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  are approximated by a first-order Taylor approximation, which results in

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\mathcal{T} &\approx \frac{\partial\mathcal{T}}{\partial\dot{x}_L}\delta\dot{x}_L + \frac{\partial\mathcal{T}}{\partial\dot{q}}\delta\dot{q} + \frac{\partial\mathcal{T}}{\partial\Omega}\delta\Omega \\ &= ((m_Q + m_L)\dot{x}_L - m_Q L\dot{q}) \cdot \delta\dot{x}_L + (-m_Q L\dot{x}_L + m_Q L^2\dot{q}) \cdot \delta\dot{q} + (J\Omega) \cdot \delta\Omega \\ \delta\mathcal{U} &\approx \frac{\partial\mathcal{U}}{\partial x_L}\delta x_L + \frac{\partial\mathcal{U}}{\partial q}\delta q \\ &= ((m_Q + m_L)ge_3) \cdot \delta x_L - (m_Q g L e_3) \cdot \delta q\end{aligned}\quad (2-23)$$

The first term of virtual work is obtained from  $f$  acting on the QR and is given by the following term,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta W_1 &= f R e_3 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{\partial x_Q}{\partial \mathbf{q}_j} \delta \mathbf{q}_j \\ &= f R e_3 \cdot (\delta x_L - L \delta q)\end{aligned}\quad (2-24)$$

where  $\mathbf{q}_j = x_L, q, R$  and  $x_Q$  is substituted by Equation 2-14. The second term of virtual work is obtained from  $M$  acting on the QR. This gives the following term

$$\begin{aligned}\delta W_2 &= M \cdot \sum_{j=1}^3 \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial \dot{\mathbf{q}}_j} \delta \dot{\mathbf{q}}_j \\ &= M \cdot (R^T \delta R)\end{aligned}\quad (2-25)$$

The variations in energy and the virtual work can be substituted into Equation 2-18, such that

$$\delta S = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\delta W_1 + \delta W_2 + \delta\mathcal{T} - \delta\mathcal{U}) dt \quad (2-26)$$

While  $x_L, \dot{x}_L$  vary on  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , Equation 2-26 is also a function of variations on manifolds, where  $\delta R$  is a variation on  $SO(3)$  and  $\delta q$  is a variation on  $\mathbb{S}^2$ . These so called infinitesimal variations define how the curves on the manifold "vary", and are obtained as shown in [1, 15, 12, 14, 16].

$$\begin{aligned}\delta R &= R\hat{\eta} \in T_R SO(3), \text{ where } \eta \in \mathbb{R}^3, \hat{\eta} \in \mathfrak{so}(3) \\ \delta q &= \xi \times q \in T_q \mathbb{S}^2, \text{ where } \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3, \xi \cdot q = 0\end{aligned}\quad (2-27)$$

The following variations follow from differentiation,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\dot{q} &= \dot{\xi} \times q + \xi \times \dot{q}, \\ \delta\dot{R} &= \dot{R}\hat{\eta} + R\dot{\hat{\eta}}, \\ \delta\hat{\Omega} &= \delta(R^T \dot{R}) \\ &= \delta R^T \dot{R} + R^T \delta \dot{R} \\ &= (R\hat{\eta})^T \dot{R} + R^T (\dot{R}\hat{\eta} + R\dot{\hat{\eta}}) \\ &= \hat{\eta}^T \hat{\Omega} + \hat{\Omega}\hat{\eta} + \dot{\hat{\eta}} \\ &= (\hat{\Omega}\hat{\eta})^\wedge + \dot{\hat{\eta}}, \\ \delta\Omega &= (\hat{\Omega}\hat{\eta}) + \dot{\hat{\eta}}\end{aligned}\quad (2-28)$$

These variations are substituted into Equation 2-26, allowing it to be a function of variations in each generalized coordinate.

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta S &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\delta W_1 + \delta W_2 + \delta \mathcal{T} - \delta \mathcal{U}) dt \\
&= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (((m_Q + m_L)\dot{x}_L - m_Q L \dot{q}) \cdot \delta \dot{x}_L + (f R e_3 - (m_Q + m_L) g e_3) \cdot \delta x_L) dt \\
&\quad + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} ((m_Q L^2 \dot{q} - m_Q L \dot{x}_L) \cdot \delta \dot{q} + (m_Q g L e_3 - f L R e_3) \cdot \delta q) dt \\
&\quad + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\Omega^T J \cdot \delta \Omega + M \cdot (R^T \delta R)) dt
\end{aligned} \tag{2-29}$$

After rearranging and setting each variation to 0, the following equations of motion for the QR-Load system are found.

$$\frac{d}{dt} x_L = \dot{x}_L \tag{2-30}$$

$$(m_Q + m_L)(\ddot{x}_L + g e_3) = (q \cdot f R e_3 - m_Q L(\dot{q} \cdot \dot{q}))q \tag{2-31}$$

$$\dot{q} = \omega \times q \tag{2-32}$$

$$m_Q L \dot{\omega} = -q \times f R e_3 \tag{2-33}$$

$$\dot{R} = R \hat{\Omega} \tag{2-34}$$

$$J \dot{\Omega} + \Omega \times J \Omega = M \tag{2-35}$$

where Equations 2-31 and 2-33 are the load position and attitude dynamics, and Equation 2-35 represents the QR attitude dynamics.

The dynamics of the complete QR-Load system can be globally expressed on the Special Orthogonal Group  $SO(3)$ , *two-sphere*  $\mathbb{S}^2$  and Special Euclidean Group  $SE(3)$ , which are all smooth manifolds. This results in a compact notation of the equations of motion, making the large amount of trigonometric functions unnecessary, that normally are introduced by Euler angles.

## Summary

In this chapter, the dynamical model of the Quadrotor-Load system was derived. The motivation to use Geometric Mechanics and a basic understanding of its concepts are given in order to understand the difference between a Nonlinear Geometric model and a model obtained with classical modeling approaches.

With the tools of differential geometry, the system dynamics are expressed on nonlinear configuration manifolds, which results in a globally defined, compact, unambiguous representation of the model. This dynamical model is used for a nonlinear geometric control approach, which is discussed in the next chapter.





---

## Chapter 3

---

# Control Design

Section 3-1 introduces Nonlinear Geometric Control and concepts of geometric properties that are used for analysis and control design. In the previous chapter, the configuration spaces of the system dynamics were expressed on nonlinear manifolds,. In Section 3-1-1, error functions and geometric mappings are defined on these same nonlinear manifolds in order to measure the error between current and desired states.

In order to deal with the under-actuated nature of the system, a backstepping control approach is applied to stabilize the system . This control design allows multiple controllers to operate in a cascaded structure, which results in the possibility to track a load position, while stabilizing the system. The control design with its different flight modes and the corresponding controllers, are discussed in Section 3-2.

### 3-1 Nonlinear Geometric Control

Many control systems are developed for the standard form of ordinary differential equations

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u) \quad (3-1)$$

where  $x$  is the state and  $u$  the control input. It is assumed that the state and the control input lie in Euclidean spaces, and the system equations are defined in terms of smooth functions between Euclidean spaces. However, for many mechanical systems, the configuration space can only be expressed locally as a Euclidean space. A nonlinear space is required to express the configuration space globally, which is discussed in the previous chapter.

Geometric Control Theory is the study on how geometry of the state space influences control problems. In control systems engineering, the underlying geometric features of a dynamic system are often not considered carefully. Differential Geometric control techniques utilize these geometric properties for control system design and analysis. The objective is to express both the system dynamics and control inputs on nonlinear manifolds instead of local charts. In contrast to locally defined linear control, nonlinear geometric control can be defined almost globally, avoiding singularities that would occur in the representation of large angles and complex maneuvering.

The design of the controllers for the QR attitude can be found in [5], and the controllers of load attitude- and position this can be found in [1]. Thorough stability analyses are presented in these references. For a deeper understanding of Lyapunov stability analysis in geometric control, the reader can refer to [16]. Other control systems that are able to switch between control modes, such as the hybrid control described in [17], require complicated reachability set analysis to guarantee safe switching between different flight modes. Nonlinear Geometric Control does not require such analysis, as the region of attraction for each flight mode covers the configuration space almost globally. A study on global nonlinear dynamics of various classes of closed loop attitude control systems can be found in [18].

#### 3-1-1 Error Functions

The control of a trajectory tracking problem requires state feedback to define tracking errors, a measure of the difference between the current states and the desired states. Since the closed-loop system dynamics evolve on nonlinear manifolds, which describe the configuration space of the QR attitude  $\in SO(3)$  and the load attitude  $\in \mathbb{S}^2$ , error functions are defined on these same manifolds [16]. These functions play a role in the definition of the potential function for the closed-loop system and form the basis for both stabilizing and tracking controllers of the QR-Load system.

#### Quadrotor Attitude Error

Recall that  $R$  is the rotation matrix to describe the QR attitude, and  $R_d$  is the desired rotation matrix. To describe the relative rotation from the body frame to the desired frame, an *attitude error* is defined as  $R_d^T R$ . Note that  $R_d^T R$  is again a rotation matrix itself. Based on this attitude error, the *tracking error function*  $\Psi_R$  on  $SO(3)$  is chosen to be

$$\Psi_R(R, R_d) = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} [I - R_d^T R] \quad (3-2)$$

such that  $\Psi_R$  is locally positive-definite about  $R_d^T R = I$  within the region where the rotation angle between  $R$  and  $R_d$  is less than  $180^\circ$ . It can be shown that this region where  $\Psi_R < 2$  almost covers  $SO(3)$  [19].

Using Equation 2-5 and 2-27, the derivative of the tracking error function  $\Psi_R$  with respect to  $R$  along the direction of  $\delta R = R\hat{\eta}$  for  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_R \Psi(R, R_d) \cdot R\hat{\eta} &= -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}[R_d^T R \hat{\eta}] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (R_d^T R - R^T R_d)^\vee \cdot \eta \end{aligned} \quad (3-3)$$

where the *vee map*  $^\vee : \mathfrak{so}(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  is the inverse of the *hat map* defined in Section 2-1. From this equation, the QR attitude tracking error  $e_R \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is chosen as follows

$$e_R = \frac{1}{2} (R_d^T R - R^T R_d)^\vee \quad (3-4)$$

It is important to note that the velocities  $\dot{R}$  and  $\dot{R}_d$  cannot be compared directly, since they do not lie in the same space. At time  $t = t_0$ , assume that  $R(t_0) = q$  and  $R_d(t_0) = r$ , then  $\dot{R}$  and  $\dot{R}_d$  lie in their own tangent spaces, denoted by  $T_q SO(3)$  and  $T_r SO(3)$ , respectively. For this reason,  $\dot{R}_d$  must be transformed into a vector on  $T_q SO(3)$  to allow a meaningful comparison with  $\dot{R}$ . Defining a velocity error can be achieved with a mathematical object called a *transport map*, which enables the comparison of tangent vectors living in different spaces.

In Figure 3-1, two curves  $R(t)$  and  $R_d(t)$  evolve on manifold  $SO(3)$ . Transport map  $\mathcal{T}(q, r) : T_r SO(3) \mapsto T_q SO(3)$  allows comparison of the velocity curves  $\dot{R}$  and  $\dot{R}_d$ .




Figure 3-1: Transport map  $\mathcal{T}(q, r)$

The *velocity error*  $\dot{e}$  is a vector field along  $R$  corresponding to the transport map. It defines the velocity error between the curves  $R$  and  $R_d$ , and is defined as

$$\dot{e} = \dot{R} - \dot{R}_d(R_d^T R) \quad (3-5)$$

This equation is rewritten to obtain the angular velocity tracking error, as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{R} - \dot{R}_d(R_d^T R) &= R\hat{\Omega} - R_d\hat{\Omega}_d(R_d^T R) \\
 &= R(\Omega)^\wedge - (RR^T)R_d\hat{\Omega}_dR_d^T R \\
 &= R(\Omega)^\wedge - R(R^T R_d\Omega_d)^\wedge \\
 &= R(\Omega - R^T R_d\Omega_d)^\wedge
 \end{aligned} \tag{3-6}$$

The angular *velocity tracking error*  $e_\Omega$  expressed in  $\{\mathcal{B}\}$  is defined as

$$e_\Omega = \Omega - R^T R_d\Omega_d \tag{3-7}$$

Similar to the form of Equation 2-34,  $e_\Omega$  represents the angular velocity vector of the relative rotation matrix  $R_d^T R$ , represented in  $\{\mathcal{B}\}$ . Hence, it can be shown that the following equation holds

$$\frac{d}{dt}(R_d^T R) = (R_d^T R)\hat{e}_\Omega \tag{3-8}$$

The values of the QR attitude tracking error  $e_R$  and the QR angular velocity tracking error  $e_\Omega$  are used later on to design control for the QR attitude.

### Load Attitude Error

The load attitude dynamics evolve on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  and its tangent space  $T\mathbb{S}^2$ , where the error of the load attitude is described in a similar approach. The error between the load attitude  $q$  and the desired load attitude  $q_d$  is defined by the error function  $q_d^T q$ . Based on the error function, the tracking error function  $\Psi_q$  on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  is chosen to be

$$\Psi_q = 1 - q_d^T q \tag{3-9}$$

The derivative of the tracking error function  $\Psi_q$  is given by

$$d_1\Psi_q(q, q_d) = \hat{q}^2 q_d \tag{3-10}$$

From this equation, the load attitude error function  $e_q$  is defined as follows

$$e_q = \hat{q}^2 q_d \tag{3-11}$$

Again, a *transport map* is used for a comparison between the tangent vectors on different tangent spaces. Using the tracking error  $\Psi_q$  and the transport map  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{S}^2}$ , a closed-loop energy function evolving on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  is derived [16, 11.3.2]. From this energy function, the load angular velocity error function is defined as

$$e_{\dot{q}} = \dot{q} - (q_d \times \dot{q}_d) \times q \tag{3-12}$$

The values of the load attitude tracking error  $e_q$  and the load angular velocity tracking error  $e_{\dot{q}}$  are used later on to design control for the load attitude.

**Load Position Error**

The tracking errors for the load position and load velocity are defined as

$$e_x = x - x_d \quad (3-13)$$

$$e_v = v - v_d \quad (3-14)$$

where  $v_d = \dot{x}_d$ . Furthermore,  $x_d(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  must be a smooth twice-differentiable load trajectory, such that functions are well defined. The values of the position error  $e_x$  and the velocity error  $e_v$  are used later on to design control for the load position.

### 3-2 Backstepping Control

A backstepping approach will be used in this research for the control of the load trajectory tracking problem, and is commonly used for QR control[20]. Backstepping control is a Lyapunov based control technique for the stabilization of nonlinear dynamical systems, developed by [21]. The method relies on a *triangular structure* of the system in a certain set of coordinates. The system is split into subsystems in a cascaded structure and recursive techniques allow a systematic design of feedback control laws and corresponding Lyapunov functions.

The control structure is created by starting with a stable system as the most inner subsystem. By "stepping back" from this subsystem, a control loop can be added around it containing a control law that defines a change of coordinates. This creates a virtual control input, that must stabilize the inner structure. The control law is designed by using states as virtual control inputs, such that each loop computes a virtual command signal for the adjacent inner loop. This is repeated until the final external control is reached.

The backstepping approach is able to calculate the control inputs  $f$  and  $M$  that are required to stabilize the QR, while several controllers are able to track different states, see Figure 3-2. The inner controller determines what the required control inputs are, driven by  $R_c$ . The next controller calculates how to drive the computed rotation matrix  $R_c$  based on  $q_c$ , such that the QR is stabilized. And the last controller determines which load attitude  $q_c$  is required, such that the desired load position  $x_{L,d}$  is tracked.




Figure 3-2: Nonlinear Geometric Control Loop of the QR-Load system [1]

Since the QR has only four actuators, it is not possible to control all DOFs of the QR-Load system simultaneously. The backstepping approach allows control of different flight modes in which a combination of DOFs is controlled. The flight modes and their functions are defined below in order, from the most inner loop to the most outer loop.

- QR Attitude Controlled Mode
  - Track a desired QR attitude  $R_d(t)$  or commanded signal  $R_c(t)$
  - Optional tracking of a desired heading direction  $b_{1_d}(t)$ , the first column of  $R_d(t)$
  - Calculate the control input  $M$  for the QR-Load system
- Load Attitude Controlled Mode
  - Track a desired load attitude  $q_d(t)$  or commanded signal  $q_c(t)$

- Calculate a computed QR attitude  $R_c$  for the QR attitude controller
- Calculate the control input  $f$  for the QR-Load system
- Load Position Controlled Mode
  - Track a desired load position  $x_{L,d}(t)$
  - Calculate a computed load attitude  $q_c$  for the load attitude controller
  - Calculate the control input  $f$  for the QR-Load system

where the subscript  $d$  denotes a desired tracking reference, which must be given whenever it is not calculated by a controller. For example in Figure 3-3, where the QR attitude controller works as a standalone controller, without taking load attitude and position into account. The subscript  $c$  denotes a computed tracking reference, calculated by the controllers.




Figure 3-3: QR Attitude Controller

### 3-2-1 Quadrotor Attitude Tracking

The QR Attitude Controlled Mode is designed to control the QR attitude by tracking a smooth desired QR attitude  $R_d(t)$ . Analysis of the error dynamics  $e_R$  and  $e_\Omega$  requires the calculation of their time derivatives.

Using Equations 3-4 and 3-7, the derivative of the attitude tracking error  $e_R$  can be written as

$$\dot{e}_R = \frac{1}{2}(R_d^T R \hat{e}_\Omega + \hat{e}_\Omega R^T R_d)^\vee \quad (3-15)$$

The derivative of the angular velocity tracking error  $e_\Omega$ , follows from Equations 2-34, 3-7 and  $\hat{\Omega}_d \Omega_d = 0$ , such that

$$\dot{e}_\Omega = \dot{\Omega} + \hat{\Omega} R^T R_d \hat{\Omega}_d - R^T R_d \dot{\Omega}_d \quad (3-16)$$

Recall from Equation 2-34, that the kinematics equation for the desired attitude can be written as

$$\dot{R}_d = R_d \hat{\Omega}_d \text{ and } \hat{\Omega}_d = R_d^T \dot{R}_d \quad (3-17)$$

The desired angular acceleration  $\dot{\Omega}_d$  follows from the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\hat{\Omega}}_d &= (\dot{R}_d^T \dot{R}_d) + (R_d^T \ddot{R}_d) \\ &= (R_d \hat{\Omega}_d)^T (R_d \hat{\Omega}_d) + (R_d^T \ddot{R}_d) \\ &= -\hat{\Omega}_d \hat{\Omega}_d + R_d^T \ddot{R}_d \end{aligned} \quad (3-18)$$

such that,

$$\dot{\Omega}_d = (-\hat{\Omega}_d \hat{\Omega}_d + R_d^T \ddot{R}_d)^\vee \quad (3-19)$$

By substituting Equation 2-35 into Equation 3-16, the following equation is obtained

$$\dot{e}_\Omega = J^{-1}(-\Omega \times J\Omega + M) + \hat{\Omega} R^T R_d \Omega_d - R^T R_d \dot{\Omega}_d \quad (3-20)$$

From this, the control input  $M$  is defined [19], and consists of a proportional term, a derivative term and a canceling term, as follows

$$M = -k_R e_R - k_\Omega e_\Omega + \Omega \times J\Omega - J(\hat{\Omega} R^T R_d \Omega_d - R^T R_d \dot{\Omega}_d) \quad (3-21)$$

Rapid exponential convergence of the attitude error function and angular velocity error function can be achieved by adding the parameter  $\epsilon$  to Equation 3-21 as done in [1], where  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ , given by

$$M = -\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} k_R e_R - \frac{1}{\epsilon} k_\Omega e_\Omega + \Omega \times J\Omega - J(\hat{\Omega} R^T R_d \Omega_d - R^T R_d \dot{\Omega}_d) \quad (3-22)$$

Substituting Equation 3-22 into Equation 3-20 results in the time derivative of the angular velocity tracking error, given by

$$\dot{e}_\Omega = J^{-1}\left(-\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} k_R e_R - \frac{1}{\epsilon} k_\Omega e_\Omega\right) \quad (3-23)$$

for any positive constants  $k_R, k_\Omega$ .

Equation 2-6 is used to rewrite the time derivative of  $e_R$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e}_R &= \frac{1}{2}(R_d^T R \dot{e}_\Omega + \dot{e}_\Omega R^T R_d)^\vee \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\text{tr}[R^T R_d]I - R^T R_d)e_\Omega \equiv C(R_d^T R)e_\Omega \end{aligned} \quad (3-24)$$

where  $\|C(R_d^T R)\|_2 \leq 1$ , such that  $\|\dot{e}_R\| \leq \|e_\Omega\|$  for all  $R_d^T R \in SO(3)$ , guaranteeing that  $\dot{e}_R$  will be bounded, whenever  $e_\Omega$  is bounded. In [5] it is proven that the Lyapunov functions, which are functions of the error dynamics  $e_R, e_\Omega, \dot{e}_R, \dot{e}_\Omega$  described above, are non-increasing and bounded. With this controller stability analysis, it is proven that the zero equilibrium of the closed loop tracking error  $(e_R, e_\Omega) = (0, 0)$  is exponentially stable, if the initial conditions satisfy

$$\Psi_R(R(0), R_d(0)) < 2 \quad (3-25)$$

$$\|e_\Omega(0)\|^2 < \frac{2}{\lambda_M(J)} \frac{k_R}{\epsilon^2} (2 - \Psi_R(R(0), R_d(0))) \quad (3-26)$$

where  $\lambda_M(\cdot)$  denotes the maximum eigenvalue.

Furthermore, there exist constants  $\alpha_R, \beta_R > 0$  such that

$$\Psi_R(R(t), R_d(t)) \leq \min\left\{2, \alpha_R e^{-\beta_R t}\right\} \quad (3-27)$$

Equations 3-25 and 3-26 determine the domain of attraction, which is the region in which the trajectory of the system is able to converge to an asymptotically stable equilibrium point.



The domain of attraction almost covers  $SO(3)$ , this is referred to as almost-global exponential attractiveness.

Note that the tracking of the QR attitude does not require any specification of the thrust magnitude  $f$ . During this flight mode, the translational motion can only be controlled partially, which makes this flight mode suitable for attitude maneuvers with short time periods. For a QR system without load, in [5] a tracking controller is described that calculates both a thrust magnitude  $f$  and total moment  $M$  in order to track a QR position trajectory.

### 3-2-2 Load Attitude Tracking

The Load Attitude Controlled Mode is designed to track a desired load attitude  $q_d$ . In order to influence the load dynamics, see Equation 2-33, the load attitude controller calculates a computed QR attitude  $R_c$  for the QR attitude controller, which replaces  $R_d$ .

The commanded directions of the body frame axes are defined by  $R_c$ , and is defined as follows

$$R_c = [b_{1c}; b_{3c} \times b_{1c}; b_{3c}] \quad (3-28)$$

$\Omega_d$  is replaced by  $\Omega_c$ , where  $\Omega_c$  is defined by

$$\hat{\Omega}_c = R_c^T \dot{R}_c \quad (3-29)$$

which will influence the QR attitude dynamics, see Equation 2-35.

The unit vector  $b_{1c}$  is the first column of  $R_c$  and is constructed by normalizing the projection of a desired heading angle  $b_{1d} \in \mathbb{S}^2$  onto the plane normal to  $b_{3c}$ , see Figure 3-4. Defining  $b_{1c} \in \mathbb{S}^2$  orthogonal to  $b_{3c}$  guarantees that  $R_c \in SO(3)$  [19].




Figure 3-4: Construction of  $b_{1c}$  to define  $R_c$

$b_{1c}$  is defined as follows

$$b_{1c} = -\frac{1}{\|b_{3c} \times b_{1d}\|} (b_{3c} \times (b_{3c} \times b_{1d})) \quad (3-30)$$

Such that  $b_{2c} = b_{3c} \times b_{1c}$ , and  $b_{1d}$  is chosen, not parallel to  $b_{3c} \in \mathbb{S}^2$ , the third column of  $R_c$ .  $b_{3c}$  is defined by a normalization of  $F$ ,

$$b_{3c} = \frac{F}{\|F\|} \quad (3-31)$$

where  $F$  is defined by a normal component  $F_n$ , a proportional-derivative component  $F_{pd}$  and feedforward control force  $F_{ff}$

$$F = F_n - F_{pd} - F_{ff} \quad (3-32)$$

The inclusion of  $F_n$  ensures that  $b_{3c}$  is always well defined.  $F_n$  is defined as

$$F_n = -(q_d \cdot q)q \quad (3-33)$$

The control forces  $F_{pd}$  and  $F_{ff}$  are defined for trajectory tracking in [16, 11.2.5] as follows

$$\begin{aligned} F_{pd} &= -k_P \hat{q}^2 q_d - k_D (\dot{q} - (q_d \times \dot{q}_d) \times q) \\ &= -k_q e_q - k_\omega e_{\dot{q}} \end{aligned} \quad (3-34)$$

and

$$F_{ff} = m_Q L \langle\langle q, q_d \times \dot{q}_d \rangle\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3} (q \times \dot{q}) + m_Q L (q_d \times \ddot{q}_d) \times q \quad (3-35)$$

for positive constants  $k_q, k_\omega$ .

This controller affects the control input  $f$ , which is defined as

$$f = F \cdot R e_3 \quad (3-36)$$

and the control input  $M$  will be defined as

$$M = -\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} k_R e_R - \frac{1}{\epsilon} k_\Omega e_\Omega + \Omega \times J\Omega - J(\hat{\Omega} R^T R_c \Omega_c - R^T R_c \dot{\Omega}_c) \quad (3-37)$$

It is proven in [1] and [16, Lemma 11.23] that the zero equilibrium of the closed loop tracking error  $(e_q, e_{\dot{q}}, e_R, e_\Omega) = (0, 0, 0, 0)$  is exponentially stable, if the initial conditions satisfy

$$\Psi_q(q(0), q_d(0)) < 2 \quad (3-38)$$

$$\|e_{\dot{q}}(0)\|^2 < \frac{2}{m_Q L} k_R (2 - \Psi_q(q(0), q_d(0))) \quad (3-39)$$

The domain of attraction is defined by Equations 3-25, 3-26, 3-38 and 3-39. Equation 3-38 states that the initial load attitude error should be less than  $180^\circ$ , which means that the controller achieves almost-global exponential convergence for load attitude  $q$ . Furthermore, there exist constants  $\alpha_q, \beta_q > 0$  such that

$$\Psi_q(q(t), q_d(t)) \leq \min \left\{ 2, \alpha_q e^{-\beta_q t} \right\} \quad (3-40)$$

### 3-2-3 Load Position Tracking

The Load Position Controlled Mode is designed to track a desired load position  $x_{L,d}$ . Analysis of the error dynamics  $e_x$  and  $e_v$  requires the calculation of their time derivatives.

The derivative of the load position error  $e_x$  is given by

$$\dot{e}_x = e_v \quad (3-41)$$

and from Equation 2-31 and given that  $\dot{e}_v = \ddot{x}_L - \ddot{x}_{L,d}$  follows

$$(m_Q + m_L) \dot{e}_v = -(m_Q + m_L)(g e_3 + \ddot{x}_{L,d}) - m_Q L (\dot{q} \cdot \dot{q}) q + (q \cdot f R e_3) q \quad (3-42)$$

Equations 3-41 and 3-41 are used in a stability analysis of the controller. The load position controller calculates a computed load attitude  $q_c$  for the load attitude controller.  $R_d$  and  $q_d$  are replaced by  $R_c$  and  $q_c$ , respectively. In order to stabilize the error dynamics, it is proven in [1] that the required computed load attitude is defined as

$$q_c = -\frac{A}{\|A\|} \quad (3-43)$$

where

$$A = -k_x e_x - k_v e_v + (m_Q + m_L)(\ddot{x}_{L,d} + g e_3) + m_Q L(\dot{q} \cdot \dot{q})q \quad (3-44)$$

Furthermore, Equation 3-33 is redefined as

$$F_n = (A \cdot q)q \quad (3-45)$$

which is substituted in Equation 3-32, resulting in a new control input  $f$ .

This controller ensures that the zero equilibrium of the closed loop tracking error  $(e_x, e_v, e_q, e_{\dot{q}}, e_R, e_{\Omega}) = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$  is exponentially attractive, if the initial conditions satisfy

$$\Psi_q(q(0), q_c(0)) < \psi_1 < 1 \quad (3-46)$$

$$\|e_x(0)\|^2 < e_{x_{max}} \quad (3-47)$$

where  $e_{x_{max}}$  and  $\psi_1$  are fixed design depended constants.

The domain of attraction is defined by Equations 3-25, 3-26, 3-46 and the following equation

$$\|e_{\dot{q}}(0)\|^2 < \frac{2}{m_Q L} k_q (\psi_1 - \Psi_q(q(0), q_d(0))) \quad (3-48)$$

## Summary

In this chapter, control design based on Nonlinear Geometric Control is discussed. What is particular in this control technique, is the fact that error functions are defined on non-Euclidean manifolds, similar to the manifolds that describe the configuration space of the system. Since these manifolds are locally Euclidean, local stability properties of a closed-loop equilibrium solution can be determined by using standard Lyapunov methods. Based on these error functions, controllers are designed in a backstepping approach, enabling both load position tracking and stabilization of the system. Using the geometric properties of the system allows the design of globally defined controllers that ensure almost-global convergence of the QR attitude and load attitude. In order to test the control performance of a load position tracking objective, experiments are defined in the next chapter.



---

## Chapter 4

---

# Experiment

The experimental procedure is explained in Section 4-1. It is discussed what experiments can be done in order to investigate closed-loop stability and the tracking performance of Nonlinear Geometric Control. In addition, a comparison will be made between the performances of the Nonlinear Geometric Controller and a linear LQR controller.

The controllers are tested on their ability to track a desired load trajectory. Section 4-2 presents several desired load trajectories that create different challenges for load position tracking, and it is discussed what could be expected from these experiments.

\*\*\*\*\*

Bart: Challenge of what? control challenges?  
Nam: challenges for load position tracking, b



\*\*\*\*\*

In Section 4-3 the experimental setup is discussed. The model parameters for the QR-Load system are presented, as well as the controller parameters for both Nonlinear Geometric controller and LQR controller. The notion of a backstepping command filter is made to explain a mathematical simplification in the experiments.

Finally, in Section 4-4 the results that are obtained from the load trajectory tracking experiments are presented and discussed. The stability of the closed-loop system is demonstrated for the Nonlinear Geometric Controller and the differences in linear- and nonlinear controller performance are discussed.

## 4-1 Procedure

The goal of the experiments is to analyze the controller performance and closed-loop stability in a load position tracking task. The load positions are described by smooth trajectories  $x_{L,d}(t)$  in order to get well-defined control functions. In this work the desired load paths are generated by hand. The corresponding required velocity and acceleration are calculated by a *command filter*, which is explained in more detail in Section 4-3. Performance of both Nonlinear Geometric Control and LQR control can be evaluated by comparing their ability to track a load trajectory with minimal error. Stability is evaluated by analyzing the error functions, as described in Chapter 3. For the purpose of load transportation, both controllers can be used. The difference is in the definition of the problem.

In linear control, a linearized model is obtained by assuming small angles of both load and QR around an equilibrium point. The model is obtained by assuming an equilibrium point such that the QR is in a hover position with the load hanging directly underneath it. The LQR cost function allows control of the inputs  $f$  and  $M$ , and the states which define the QR position, QR attitude and load attitude. As a result, the linearized model does not allow direct reference tracking of the load position. This limitation illustrates an important difference between the use of a linear and a nonlinear model.

The LQR controller in this thesis is designed to track a QR position and to minimize the load swing. The tuning of the LQR controller involves a trade-off between accurate QR movements and minimal load swing. The QR position is based on the same desired load trajectories that are used for the nonlinear Geometric controller. When assuming small angles and minimal load swing, the QR position should be approximately a cable length above the predefined desired load position. Note that this will not allow a direct comparison of the load trajectory tracking performance, nevertheless this will illustrate important differences between the controllers.

## 4-2 Trajectories

This section discusses a number of cases that describe different load trajectories for the QR-Load system. A description is given of desired trajectory and the challenges that are involved.

### Case A

In the first case, a smooth step-like trajectory is generated to investigate the step response of the system. The step response is a commonly used analysis tool to obtain information about the stability of a dynamical system. A step function is used to investigate the effects of a sudden input to the desired load position. Typical response properties that can be investigated are: rise time, overshoot, settling time and steady-state error. The goal is to transport the load from a starting position along the direction of the x-axis to a final position. Figure 4-1 shows the desired trajectory over time.

The geometric control design requires the desired load trajectory to be twice-differentiable. For this reason a smooth step-like function is generated. The load position controller outputs a commanded load attitude signal  $q_c$ , see Equation 3-43, which is a function of  $x_{L,d}$ ,  $\dot{x}_{L,d}$  and  $\ddot{x}_{L,d}$ . It can be expected that the step response is only able to track a trajectory up to a limited steepness. The commanded acceleration in Equation 3-44 is required to be bounded, such that

$$\| (m_Q + m_L)(\ddot{x}_{L,d} + ge_3) + m_Q L(\dot{q} \cdot \dot{q})q \| < B \quad (4-1)$$

where  $B$  is a design parameter to guarantee Lyapunov stability [1]. This might result in large errors, and it must be investigated whether the system is able to maintain stable. Input constraints are not yet considered in the control design, this might be required to avoid input commands that are out of reach and




Figure 4-1: Desired Load Position Case A

\*\*\*\*\*

Bart: Did you found out with Daniel why a steep step works with simple pid controllers?

Nam: Waarschijnlijk..  $e_v$  wordt instantaan oneindig.

PID: De gecalculeerde gewenste input wordt instantaan oneindig. De werkelijk response is gelimiteerd door het systeem. Een actuator zal zijn hoogst mogelijke output geven, maar 1

sample periode erna is dat al niet meer nodig, omdat  $e_v$  dan weer gezakt is.

NGC: load position controller berekent een commanded load attitude  $q_c = \frac{A}{\|A\|}$ , waar  $A = -k_x e_x - k_v e_v + (m_Q + m_L)(\ddot{x}_{L,d} + g e_3) + m_Q L(\dot{q} \cdot \dot{q})q$ . Als  $e_v \rightarrow \infty$ , dan krijg je rotzooi. Het lijkt me dat de controller hierdoor niet meer goed gedefinieerd is.

Verderop in een paper staat nog: *Assumed that commanded acceleration is uniformly bounded such that  $\|(m_Q + m_L)(\ddot{x}_{L,d} + g e_3) + m_Q L(\dot{q} \cdot \dot{q})q\| < B$* . En dat is niet het geval wanneer er een keiharde step wordt toegepast.

Voorlopige conclusie:

PID: controller berekent één sampletijd een oneindig hoge desired input, actuatoren zullen pieken, maar het systeem klappt niet (per se).

NGC: load position controller kan geen commanded state meer berekenen voor desired input, waarschijnlijk gaan de control laws hierdoor overhoop.

Verder [16] geeft een voorbeeld voor trajectory tracking op  $\mathcal{S}^2$ : "Let  $t \mapsto r(t)$  be a twice-differentiable reference trajectory with bounded velocity ...". Wellicht dat met een steile smooth step en een limiet op inputs, dat  $q_c$  (en de rest van de controllers) wel goed gedefinieerd is?

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

Bart: Also speed of response/ rise time is important or not? With high rise time it is easy to have no overshoot but mostly this is not desired behavior.

Nam: Edited, please check

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

Bart: You mentioned "What could be expected from these experiments" – I don't see the expectation for the step response om this paragraph

Nam: Added. Compleet genoeg?

\*\*\*\*\*

## Case B

The nonlinear geometric controllers are expected to be able to deal with large angles in the QR attitude, allowing aggressive maneuvering. This can be tested by describing the next trajectory as a sine wave, growing in amplitude over time, in the direction of one axis in  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$ . This will result in a increasing distance between the load positions at each end of the movement, requiring increasing velocities on both the QR and the load. To achieve this, it can be expected that the QR requires large rotations. It is investigated whether the system is able to perform load position tracking while dealing with increasing QR rotations.

The trajectory is generated by the product of signals A and B, shown in Figure 4-2a, of which the first signal is a sine and the second consists of a smooth step up and down. This product results in signal C, shown in the same figure, which is chosen to be the trajectory in the direction of the y-axis of  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$ . Figure 4-2b shows the desired trajectory over time.






Figure 4-2: Desired Load Position Case B

### Case C

This case is generated in order to investigate the response on tracking multiple conditions at the same time. The trajectory along the y-axis in  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$  is described as a sine wave with an increasing and decreasing amplitude over time, as in case B. While following this wave, the load is commanded to move forward along the x-axis, while tracking an increasing and decreasing height. The changing amplitude of the trajectory that moves from side to side, requires varying velocities to 'keep up' with the trajectory.

In this case it can also be expected large QR rotations are required to track the changing amplitude of the sine wave and the varying velocities. While doing so, the QR is expected to lose height due to the rotations, It can be investigated how the close-loop system responds to the forward movement, while tracking a swinging motion and whether the controller can correct for the expected height loss, while tracking an up and down movement.

Figure 4-3 shows the desired trajectory over time, and a three dimensional representation.





Figure 4-3: Desired Load Position Case C

\*\*\*\*\*

Bart: Which multiple disciplines? Do you mean Large QR rotations leads to less lifting force which might limit the tracking performance in z-direction

Nam: Ik bedoelde eigenlijk, meerdere objectives. Hoge zijwaartse snelheden, terwijl het hoogte moet tracken. Indirect daarmee ook testen of het hoogte kan houden terwijl de QR kantelt. Beetje herschreven, beter? 

\*\*\*\*\*

## 4-3 Setup

**Model parameters** The simulations are developed using Matlab<sup>®</sup> and Simulink<sup>®</sup> R2013b. The model parameters to define the system are based on a Parrot<sup>®</sup> Bebop Drone 1, also used in a research by [22], see Table 4-1. The maximum thrust per rotor defines the maximum total thrust and moment.  $m_L$  and  $L$  are chosen arbitrarily.

Parameter	Value		Description
$m_Q$	0.4	$kg$	Quadrotor Mass
$l$	0.126	$m$	Arm length from QR CM to rotor
$I_{xx}$	$2.23 \times 10^{-3}$	$kgm^2$	Quadrotor Inertia about x-axis
$I_{yy}$	$2.99 \times 10^{-3}$	$kgm^2$	Quadrotor Inertia about y-axis
$I_{zz}$	$4.8 \times 10^{-3}$	$kgm^2$	Quadrotor Inertia about z-axis
$f_{i,max}$	1.96	$N$	Maximum thrust per rotor
$m_L$	0.1	$kg$	Load Mass
$L$	0.7	$m$	Cable Length


Table 4-1: Modeling Parameters


In order to get a feel for realistic physical limits, these can be based on hardware data, which could be found on the web <sup>1</sup>. These values are shown in Table 4-2, and can be compared with the simulation results, in order to check whether the outcome is in the same order of magnitude of a real physical system.

Value		Description
13	$m/s$	Maximum top speed
2.5	$m/s$	Maximum vertical speed
30	$deg$	Maximum inclination



Table 4-2: Hardware Parameters for Bebop Parrot Drone 1

\*\*\*\*\*

Bart: Inclination of what? Is this the same as  Attitude?

Nam: Yes. Just general definition of inclination  ellingshoek/inclinatie

\*\*\*\*\*

**Command Filtering**  consequence of a backstepping control approach, is that it increases the order of the commanded states. The controllers generate control laws that are a function of the commanded signals and their derivatives. As can be seen in Chapter 3, the control laws require the values  $R_c, \dot{R}_c, \ddot{R}_c, q_c, \dot{q}_c$  and  $\ddot{q}_c$ . Time derivatives of the virtual control variables may be quite complex and the calculation could result in high computational costs. Instead of analytic differentiation of these terms, which can be tedious, these values can be obtained with the use of a *Command Filter*  [24]. The result of a command filter is that

<sup>1</sup><http://blog.parrot.com/2016/01/12/comparison-bebop-2-vs-bebop-drone/>

the command signal is being pre-filtered by low pass filters and generates an estimation of the derivatives of the commanded signal. Backstepping command filters are implemented to compute  $\dot{R}_c, \ddot{R}_c, \dot{q}_c, \ddot{q}_c, \dot{x}_{L,d}$  and  $\ddot{x}_{L,d}$ . This approach is explained in more detail in [25]. The nonlinear state space representation of this filter is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_c \\ \dot{x}_c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4-2)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{q}_1(t) \\ \dot{q}_2(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2\zeta\omega_n \left( S_R \left\{ \frac{\omega_n^2}{2\zeta\omega_n} [S_M(x_c^o) - q_1] \right\} - q_2 \right) \\ q_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4-3)$$

where  $S_M$  and  $S_R$  are functions that can limit the magnitude and rate. The implemented command filter is shown in Figure 4-4.




Figure 4-4: Command Filter

The chosen values for  $\omega_n$  and  $\zeta$  for the command filters are shown in Table 4-3. The parameters were determined by trial and error. The higher the value for  $\omega_n$ , the higher the frequencies that are passed through the filter. Whenever the frequency was chosen too high, noisy derivatives are calculated, resulting in a destabilization of the system. Choosing the values too low resulted in slow responses, and a bad estimation of the derivatives. The damping ratio  $\zeta$  was chosen high, in order to give a sufficient damping. No limits for the magnitude and rates are implemented, meaning that  $S_M$  and  $S_R$  are omitted.

	Filter		
	$R$	$q$	$x_{L,d}$
$\omega_n$	30	25	25
$\zeta$	0.98	0.98	0.98

Table 4-3: Command Filter Parameters

**Geometric Control** The chosen controller gains in Equations 3-21, 3-34 and 3-44 can be found in Table 4-4.

**LQR Control** Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) control uses an algorithm to obtain a state-feedback controller, minimizing a cost function depending on the states and weight factors. An LQR design is shown in Figure 4-5

Gain	Case A	Case B	Case C
$k_R$	0.9	0.9	0.9
$k_\Omega$	0.1	0.1	0.1
$k_q$	3.9	3.9	3.9
$k_\omega$	2	2	2
$k_x$	6	6	6
$k_v$	2.75	2.75	2.75

Table 4-4: Controller Gains Nonlinear Geometric Controller




Figure 4-5: LQR control design

LQR control is based on a small angle assumption. Therefore, following a traditional modeling method, the rotation matrix is represented with a local coordinate system, for example with an Euler Angle parameterization. A continuous time linearized model of the system used in this controller is represented in the following form

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A\mathbf{x} + Bu \quad (4-4)$$

$$y = C\mathbf{x} + Du \quad (4-5)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  is the state vector and  $u$  is the input vector, defined as follows

$$\mathbf{x} = [x \ y \ z \ \phi \ \theta \ \psi \ \phi_L \ \theta_L \ \dot{x} \ \dot{y} \ \dot{z} \ \dot{\phi} \ \dot{\theta} \ \dot{\psi} \ \dot{\phi}_L \ \dot{\theta}_L]^T \quad (4-6)$$

$$u = [f \ M_\phi \ M_\theta \ M_\psi]^T \quad (4-7)$$

Using `Matlab` command `lqr(A,B,Q,R)`, an optimal gain matrix  $K$  is calculated, such that the state-feedback law  $u = -K(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_{\text{ref}})$  [26] minimizes the quadratic cost function. Where the cost function is defined as

$$J(u) = \int_0^\infty (\mathbf{x}^T Q \mathbf{x} + u^T R u) dt \quad (4-8)$$

The weight matrices  $Q$  and  $R$  define the effects of the states and inputs in the cost function, and the gain matrix  $K$  can be calculated. The derivation of the state space matrices  $A, B, C, D$ , the weight matrices  $Q, R$  and the calculated gain matrix  $K$  can be found in Section A-3.

## 4-4 Results

In this section the results of the experiments are discussed, for each case separately. The load tracking performance for the Nonlinear Geometric Controller is discussed by analyzing the desired and actual load trajectories, together with the corresponding load position and velocity errors.

The stability of the closed-loop system is investigated by observing whether the controller is able to bring the system to a stationary final state. The error dynamics are analyzed through the error functions, as described in Chapter 3. The configuration errors  $\Psi_R, \Psi_q$  and the corresponding tracking errors of the QR attitude  $e_R, e_\Omega$ , load attitude  $e_q, e_{\dot{q}}$  are presented. Finally, the load position tracking results of the Nonlinear Geometric Controller and a LQR Controller are compared.

### Case A

In this case, the desired trajectory was shaped like a smooth step-like function to investigate the response of the system to a sudden input. The desired and actual load trajectory are shown in Figure 4-6a. The corresponding load position and velocity error are shown in Figure 4-6b.




Figure 4-6: Load Position Tracking NGC Case A

Since this function is different from a normal step function, it might be less meaningful to say something about the rise time. Normally one checks the time it takes to reach 90% of the step height. In this case, the step is a smooth function, meaning that the system is not forced to the step height instantly, but in a smooth manner. However, it can be seen in Figure 4-9c that the required time such that 90% of the desired value is reached for the first time is 0.61s. It can be observed that the system responds with approximately 15% overshoot in the y-direction, and loses height during this maneuver. This was to be expected due to large QR rotations. The error remains within a 5% error bound after 1.26s, to eventually reach a steady-state at the step size of 0.25m.

Figure 4-7a and 4-7b show the tracking errors of the QR attitude and load attitude, respectively. The error in QR attitude and angular velocity are large at the moments the slope starts and ends, indicating the required sudden QR rotation and high angular velocity are larger than the system can manage. Nevertheless, the figures indicate that the errors in both QR and load attitude are driven to zero relatively fast. Furthermore, Figure 4-8a and 4-8b show that the tracking error functions of the QR and load, respectively, are also driven to zero. From this can be concluded that  $(e_x, e_v, e_q, e_{\dot{q}}, e_R, e_{\Omega}) = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$  is exponentially stable.




Figure 4-7: Geometric Error functions NGC Case A




Figure 4-8: Geometric Tracking Error functions NGC Case A

For both control approaches, Figure 4-9a shows the load position along the desired load position  $x_{L,d}$  and Figure 4-9b shows the corresponding load position error. From this can be observed that the LQR controller has a slower response, larger overshoot and higher settling time. Due to the aggressive maneuver by the NGC control, the system has a steady-state

offset in height. It was found that this can be resolved by tuning the controller with smaller gains or decreasing the cut-off frequency of the low pass filters, which both result in smoother, but slower responses.

Figure 4-9c shows the absolute position error over the desired load position in percentages. It can be observed that the LQR controller requires more time to stabilize the load angle, whereas the NGC controller is capable of damping the oscillation in a smooth manner.




Figure 4-9: Controller Comparison Case A. Solid: NGC, Dash-dot: LQR

Figure 4-10a shows the QR attitude with respect to  $\{I\}$ , and a huge difference in the QR rotations during the maneuver can be observed, note the difference in scale. It is obvious that the NGC controller is capable of handling more aggressive maneuvers. Figure 4-10b shows the load angle with respect to  $\{I\}$ . The NGC controller allows larger angles of the load attitude, while stabilization is reached relatively fast. The LQR controller tries to minimize the swing along the entire trajectory, not allowing large angles of the load attitude.






Figure 4-10: Controller Comparison Case A. Solid: NGC, Dash-dot: LQR

### Case B

In this case, the desired trajectory was designed to investigate the response of the system to increasing distance and velocities between the ends of a swinging motion. Figure 4-15a shows the load position along the desired load position  $x_{L,d}$  of both controllers and the corresponding position and velocity error.




Figure 4-11: Load Position Tracking Nonlinear Geometric Control Case B

Figure 4-12a and 4-12b show the tracking errors of the QR attitude and load attitude, respectively. The error in QR attitude and angular velocity is small compared to the results in case A.




Figure 4-12: Geometric Error functions NGC Case B

In Figure 4-13 the actual and desired velocity for case A and case B are shown. Despite the fact that case B requires higher velocities, the trajectory gradually increases the distance of the load position, which requires less sudden aggressive commanded rotations.




Figure 4-13: Load Velocity NGC Case A(left) and Case B(right)

Both QR and load attitude errors stay bounded during the trajectory and are driven to zero. Furthermore, Figure 4-14a and 4-14b show a gradual increase and decrease in error, similar to the profile of the desired velocity. All error functions are driven to zero, and it can be concluded that  $(e_x, e_v, e_q, e_{\dot{q}}, e_R, e_{\Omega}) = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$  is exponentially stable.




Figure 4-14: Geometric Tracking Error functions NGC Case B

Figure 4-15a shows the actual and desired load position for both control approaches. The shape of the actual load position appears to be quite similar. However, taking a look at Figure 4-15b shows the load position error for both control approaches. From this becomes clear that the LQR controller fails in the load position tracking, where errors reach values up to  $1.1m$ .

The profile of the QR rotation angles are surprisingly alike, as can be seen in Figure 4-16a. However, it can be seen in Figure 4-16b that the load swings significantly more when controlled by the LQR. This shows that the LQR controller struggles with both keeping up

with the position, while minimizing the load swing.




Figure 4-15: Controller Comparison Case B. Solid: NGC, Dash-dot: LQR




Figure 4-16: Controller Comparison Case B. Solid: NGC, Dash-dot: LQR

### Case C

The last case is designed Figure 4-17a shows the desired load position, and Figure 4-17b shows that the error is dominated by the overshoot in the x-direction, due to the fast desired swinging motion.

While tracking the required QR attitude, which tilts the QR to reach the desired velocities in the right direction, it can be seen that the system has difficulties to also maintain the desired height, which can be explained by the fact that the total force will not point upwards if the QR is tilted. Despite the fact that the QR is moving from side to side, the upward force is still controlled to track the desired height.




Figure 4-17: Load Position Tracking Nonlinear Geometric Control Case C

Figure 4-18a and 4-18b show the tracking errors of the QR attitude and load attitude, respectively.

Observations:  $(e_x, e_v, e_q, e_{\dot{q}}, e_R, e_{\Omega}) = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$  is exponentially stable. Figure 4-19a and 4-19b show the tracking error functions of the QR and load, respectively.

Observations: there exist constants  $\alpha_q, \beta_q > 0$  such that

$$\Psi_q(q(t), q_d(t)) \leq \min \left\{ 2, \alpha_q e^{-\beta_q t} \right\} \quad (4-9)$$

Figure 4-20a shows the load position along the desired load position  $x_{L,d}$  for both control approaches.

Figure 4-20b shows the load position error for both control approaches. OTHER GAINS FOR LQR!

Very small penalty on load angle results in swinging load; decreasing load position error, but very bad anti-swing. Observations: fact that LQR can not control load position is obvious.

Figure 4-21a shows the QR attitude with respect to  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$ .

In Figure 4-21b the load angle with respect to  $\{\mathcal{B}\}$  is shown.

Observations: Load angles are huge, check results




Figure 4-18: Geometric Error functions NGC Case C




Figure 4-19: Geometric Tracking Error functions NGC Case C




Figure 4-20: Controller Comparison Case C. Solid: NGC, Dash-dot: LQR




Figure 4-21: Controller Comparison Case C. Solid: NGC, Dash-dot: LQR

## 4-5 Summary

The Nonlinear Geometric Controller was tested for its ability to track various load trajectories. The control design is capable of stabilizing the system and enables tracking of a load trajectory. of tracking various load position tracking

The LQR control commands small rotations in order to succeed in both position tracking of the QR and minimization of the load swing. The NGC control commands large QR rotations in order to create a large influence on the load attitude dynamics, see Equation 2-33.

High gains in the QR attitude controller forces the QR to large and fast rotations.

Near the equilibrium configuration, the LQR controller is able to reduce the swing fast and accurate, as can be seen in the results of case A. However, the shortcomings of the LQR controller become evident when it is commanded to track fast trajectories. Following these trajectories continuously requires fast changing movements, far away from the equilibrium configuration. The controller is not able to cope with the fast changing dynamics, resulting in overshoots and slow responses, lagging behind the desired trajectory.

The controllers are functions of the computed tracking references  $q_c, R_c$  and their derivatives. These terms are approximated by a command filter, which means that the accuracy decreases because high frequency terms are filtered.



# Conclusions and Future Work

Geometric Mechanics creates a new perspective

### 5-1 Summary and Conclusions

This report starts with an introduction to subject. The aim is described and the motivation for this research is given. This chapter ends with a description of the organization of the report.

After the main introduction, the concepts of Geometric Mechanics are introduced. Differential Geometry is a mathematical discipline that is used to study geometric problems. Instead of employing Euclidean spaces that are defined by Cartesian coordinates, the configuration space of the system is described on nonlinear manifolds. With the tools of differential geometry, differential calculus and integral calculus, a globally defined model is obtained.

Based on the geometric model, a nonlinear geometric control design is discussed. A back-stepping approach allows different DOFs of the under-actuated system to be controlled in a cascaded structure. The controllers are driven by error functions, which are defined on the geometric spaces through matrix operations that arise from linear algebra.

The geometric control is based on are functions of error functions defined on nonlinear manifolds. by Differential Geometry.

Next, the experiment is defined. The nonlinear controller is used to track desired load trajectories in different situations. The nonlinear performance is compared to an LQR control Testing the nonlinear Geometric Controller To compare with a common linear controller, LQR control is used to compare

Results are,

This research The conclusions that can be extracted from the experiments is that

The NGC controller is designed to track a load position, where the LQR controller is designed to track a QR position and to minimize the load swing. The tuning of the LQR controller involves a trade-off between accurate QR movements and minimal load swing.

Tuning of the controller can be done by checking the responses of the error functions. Too high gains for the QR attitude controller will create aggressive responses to errors. This will require large and fast rotations, which results in overshoot and destabilization of the closed-loop system. Too small gains however will result in slow responses, and small rotations, creating large errors in the load position.

The LQR control pushes the system to its equilibrium rather than commands small rotations in order to succeed in both position tracking of the QR and minimization of the load swing.

The largest differences between the LQR and NGC controllers lie in the fact that

This illustrates the differences

The NGC control commands large QR rotations in order to create a large influence on the load attitude dynamics, see Equation 2-33.

The nonlinear geometric controller depends on feed forward terms that are obtained from the desired trajectories. Trajectory generation approaches exist that are able to generate the required desired position, velocity and acceleration by however it is possible to compute these with trajectory generating algorithms too.

## 5-2 Recommendations for Future Work

### 5-2-1 Investigate Implementation

**Digital Control** The concept of Geometric Control is shown under the assumption of continuous-time control. However, an analysis must be done in the discrete-time domain for the implementation of a real-time application. This must verify whether it is feasible to run the controller on an on-board processor on a QR. The control performance could be limited by the bandwidth of either the discretized control system or the wireless communication. It must be investigated whether the control system is still able to deal with the fast dynamics that are required for aggressive maneuvering. Continuous-time Euler-Lagrange equations could be found by minimizing the action integral, which is a function of the Lagrangian. In a similar procedure the discrete-time Euler-Lagrange can be obtained, by minimizing the summation of a discrete Lagrangian, which is demonstrated in [4].

**Model identification and validation** In this thesis the model parameters are either obtained from examples in literature or arbitrarily chosen. In practice, identification and validation of the QR model and rotor dynamics is required. The mathematical model requires inclusion of the masses, inertia matrix and lengths of the QR, as well as the drag and thrust constants of the rotors, that are very unlikely to be identical.

As a theoretical extension the influence of model mismatches could be simulated.

**Robustness** The control in this thesis assumes perfect state feedback. In practice the controller depends on visual feedback or data obtained from an on-board inertial measurement unit. Unlike in simulations, this data will contain noise, uncertainties and possibly drift. Based on a nonlinear geometric approach for a QR without load, [6] includes uncertainties in

the translational dynamics and rotational dynamics to prove the robustness against unstructured uncertainties. This work could be extended to a QR-Load system to investigate the effects of non-perfect state feedback.

Due to uncertainties In what way would parameter choice in the controllers affect robustness?  
To test the controller for

How to estimate states?

Parameter Estimation can be done by

State Estimation can be done by

Drawback: assumes all states to be known

Model based. What if analytical model is not accurate?

What parameters must be

### 5-2-2 Minimum Snap Trajectory Generation

The trajectories described in Section ?? were arbitrarily generated by hand to test the performance of the controller in different situations. Whenever more complex trajectories are desired, or when an optimal trajectory is required, this approach is no longer efficient and too complex to solve by hand. A recommended extension to this thesis is the automatic generation of a trajectory. This approach is presented by [27] and applied in [9, 28]. A QP problem is solved by minimizing the second derivative of the acceleration (snap), which guarantees a smooth optimal trajectory. The QP allows inclusion of constraints, such as maximum inputs and checkpoints in trajectories, by formulating these as constraints of the QP problem. Furthermore, it is proven that the system is *differential flat*, meaning that all states and inputs can be expressed in terms of only four states and their derivatives. This property is used to transform the high-dimensional optimization problem into a four-dimensional problem.

### 5-2-3 Hybrid System

This thesis is only focused on the subsystem where the tension in the cable is non-zero. A possible extension is to apply hybrid control, such that the controller is able to switch between two subsystem models whenever the cable tension switches between zero and non-zero. A trajectory generation method that accounts for the switching dynamics of the hybrid system is presented in [9]. In [1, 9, 28] both subsystems are expressed in the form of one hybrid model.



---

# Appendix A

---

## Appendix

### A-1 Derivation of Equations of motion

#### A-1-1 Load Dynamics

Let  $x_{CM}$  denote the position of the center of mass of the combined Quadrotor-Load system, expressed in  $\{\mathcal{I}\}$ . Which can be found by

$$\begin{aligned} m_Q(x_Q - x_{CM}) + m_L(x_L - x_{CM}) &= 0 \\ (m_Q + m_L)x_{CM} &= m_Q x_Q + m_L x_L \end{aligned} \tag{A-1}$$

Applying Newton's laws of motion to (A-1) and inserting (2-14) gives the

$$\begin{aligned} (m_Q + m_L)\ddot{x}_{CM} &= fRe_3 - (m_Q + m_L)ge_3 \\ (m_Q + m_L)(\ddot{x}_L + ge_3) &= fRe_3 + m_Q L\ddot{q} \end{aligned} \tag{A-2}$$

Here comes the derivation of  $\ddot{q}$ , obtained by geometric mechanics.

### A-2 Derivation Error dynamics

#### A-2-1 Quadrotor Attitude

From the angular velocity tracking error  $e_\Omega$  follows

$$\begin{aligned} e_\Omega &= \Omega - R^T R_d \Omega_d, \\ \hat{e}_\Omega &= \hat{\Omega} - R^T R_d \hat{\Omega}_d R_d^T R \end{aligned} \tag{A-3}$$

The attitude tracking error is given by

$$e_R = \frac{1}{2}(R_d^T R - R^T R_d)^\vee \tag{A-4}$$

where its time derivative is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{e}_R &= \frac{1}{2}(\dot{R}_d^T R + R_d^T \dot{R} - \dot{R}^T R_d - R^T \dot{R}_d)^\vee \\
 &= \frac{1}{2}((R_d \hat{\Omega}_d)^T R + R_d^T (R \hat{\Omega}) - (R \hat{\Omega})^T R_d - R^T (R_d \hat{\Omega}_d))^\vee \\
 &= \frac{1}{2}(-\hat{\Omega}_d R_d^T R + R_d^T R \hat{\Omega} + \hat{\Omega} R^T R_d - R^T R_d \hat{\Omega}_d)^\vee \\
 &= \frac{1}{2}(R_d^T R(\hat{\Omega} - R^T R_d \hat{\Omega}_d R_d^T R) + (\hat{\Omega} - R^T R_d \hat{\Omega}_d R_d^T R) R^T R_d)^\vee
 \end{aligned} \tag{A-5}$$

which can be rewritten by substituting Equation A-3 as follows

$$\dot{e}_R = \frac{1}{2}(R_d^T R \hat{e}_\Omega + \hat{e}_\Omega R^T R_d)^\vee \tag{A-6}$$

The time derivative of the angular velocity tracking error  $e_\Omega$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{e}_\Omega &= \dot{\Omega} - \dot{R}^T R_d \Omega_d - R^T \dot{R}_d \Omega_d - R^T R_d \dot{\Omega}_d \\
 &= \dot{\Omega} - (R \hat{\Omega})^T R_d \Omega_d - R^T (R_d \hat{\Omega}_d) \Omega_d - R^T R_d \dot{\Omega}_d \\
 &= \dot{\Omega} + \hat{\Omega} R^T R_d \Omega_d - R^T (R_d \hat{\Omega}_d) \Omega_d - R^T R_d \dot{\Omega}_d
 \end{aligned} \tag{A-7}$$

where  $\hat{\Omega}_d \Omega_d = \Omega_d \times \Omega_d = 0$ . Substituting Equation 2-35 results in

$$\dot{e}_\Omega = J^{-1}(-\Omega \times J\Omega + M) + \hat{\Omega} R^T R_d \Omega_d - R^T R_d \dot{\Omega}_d \tag{A-8}$$

## A-2-2 Load Attitude

For the load attitude tracking problem on manifold  $\mathbb{S}^2$ , the error function  $E_{cl}$  is defined as follows [16, p.]

$$E_{cl}(v_q, w_r) = \Psi(q, r) + \frac{1}{2} \|v_q - \mathcal{T}(q, r) \cdot w_r\|_{\mathbb{G}}^2 \tag{A-9}$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{G}}$  denotes the norm on tensors, induced by a Riemannian metric. The error function and transport map are defined for  $\mathbb{S}^2$  as follows

$$\Psi_{\mathbb{S}^2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}) = k_P(1 - \langle\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x} \rangle\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}) \tag{A-10}$$

and

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{S}^2}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{r}) \cdot \mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{v}) \times \mathbf{x} \tag{A-11}$$

where  $\mathbf{r}(t)$  is the reference trajectory, and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}^2$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbb{S}^2$ . Substituting Equations A-10 and A-11 into Equation A-9 results in the following closed-loop energy function

$$E_{cl}(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) = k_P(1 - \langle\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x} \rangle\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^3}) + \frac{1}{2} m \|\mathbf{v} - (\mathbf{r}(t) \times \dot{\mathbf{r}}(t)) \times \mathbf{x}\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}^2 \tag{A-12}$$

### A-3 LQR controller

The linearized model is written into a first order ODE of the form

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A\mathbf{x} + Bu \quad (\text{A-13})$$

$$y = C\mathbf{x} + Du \quad (\text{A-14})$$

with the following state- and input vectors

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} &= [x \ y \ z \ \phi \ \theta \ \psi \ \phi_L \ \theta_L \ \dot{x} \ \dot{y} \ \dot{z} \ \dot{\phi} \ \dot{\theta} \ \dot{\psi} \ \dot{\phi}_L \ \dot{\theta}_L]^T \\ u &= [f \ M_\phi \ M_\theta \ M_\psi]^T \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-15})$$

The model is linearized about the hovering flight mode. All translational and rotational velocities are zero during hover. The positional states and the yaw angle do not affect the dynamics, and are set equal to zero. A thrust input  $u_1 = g(m_Q + m_L)$  is required to maintain hover, and all other control inputs are set equal to zero. The states and inputs in the equations of motion are substituted by an initial condition and a perturbation

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} \rightarrow \dot{\mathbf{x}}_0 + \delta\dot{\mathbf{x}}, \quad \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}_0 + \delta\mathbf{x}, \quad u \rightarrow u_0 + \delta u \quad (\text{A-16})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(0) &= \mathbf{0} \\ u(0) &= [g(m_Q + m_L) \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]^T \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-17})$$

The linearized equations of motion are rearranged in Equation A-18, as done in [29], and substituted back into Equation A-13.

$$M_1\delta\ddot{\mathbf{x}} + M_2\delta\dot{\mathbf{x}} = M_3\delta u \quad (\text{A-18})$$

With  $I_L = m_L L^2$  and  $m_T = m_Q + m_L$ , the matrices  $M_1, M_2, M_3$  are defined as follows

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} m_T & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & Lm_L \\ 0 & m_T & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & Lm_L & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_T & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & I_{xx} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I_{yy} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I_{zz} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_L L & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I_L + L^2 m_L & 0 \\ m_L L & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & I_L + L^2 m_L \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{A-19})$$

$$M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -gm_T & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & gm_T & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & gLm_L & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & gLm_L \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{A-20})$$

$$M_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{A-21})$$

The tuning parameters of the LQR controller are chosen as follows

$$Q =$$

$$R =$$

Matlab command `lqr(LQRA,LQRB,Q,R)` generates the following gain matrix  $K$

$$K =$$

## A-4 Classical Modeling

This section describes the derivation of the model by using classical modeling techniques.

When assuming small angle maneuvers, *Euler-angles* can be used to locally parameterize the orientation of the body-fixed reference coordinate frame with respect to the inertial reference coordinate frame. Simple linear controllers are often based on a linearized dynamical model, applying this small angles assumption.

The following equations of motion follow from Newton's law.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_Q &= v_Q \\ m_Q \dot{v}_Q &= f Re_3 - m_Q g e_3 - T q \\ \dot{x}_L &= v_L \\ m_L \dot{v}_L &= -m_L g e_3 + T q \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-22})$$

where  $x_Q = x_L - Lq$ .  $T$  is the cable tension, defined by  $T = |f|q$ , where  $|f| = m_L \dot{v}_L$  is the magnitude of the force.

Because Euler-Angles are used, a function is required that maps a vector of the Z-X-Y Euler angles to its rotation matrix  $R \in SO(3)$ , which is denoted as [20]

$$R_{ZXY}(\phi, \theta, \psi) = \begin{bmatrix} c_\psi c_\theta - s_\phi s_\psi s_\theta & -c_\phi s_\psi & c_\psi s_\theta + c_\theta s_\phi s_\psi \\ c_\theta s_\psi + c_\psi s_\phi s_\theta & c_\phi c_\psi & s_\psi s_\theta - c_\psi c_\theta s_\phi \\ -c_\phi s_\theta & s_\phi & c_\phi c_\theta \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{A-23})$$






Figure A-1: Model representation

The Z-X-Y Euler angles rotate  $\{B\}$ , as can be seen in Figure A-1a. The first rotation by yaw angle  $\psi$  is around the z-axis of  $\{I\}$ . Next is the rotation by roll angle  $\phi$ , and the last rotation is by pitch angle  $\theta$ .

The unit vector  $q$  from the QR to the load is represented in  $\{B\}$ . Define  $\phi_L$  as the rotation of the load around the z-axis, measured from  $\vec{b}_1$ , and  $\theta_L$  is the angle between the cable and the z-axis of  $\{B\}$ , see Figure A-1b. The Cartesian coordinates can be retrieved through

$$x_L = x_Q + qL \quad (\text{A-24})$$

where

$$q = \begin{bmatrix} s_{\theta_L} c_{\phi_L} \\ s_{\theta_L} s_{\phi_L} \\ -c_{\theta_L} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{A-25})$$

Differentiating Equation A-24 and A-25 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x}_L &= \ddot{x}_Q + \ddot{q}L \\ \ddot{q} &= \begin{bmatrix} \ddot{\theta}_L c_{\theta_L} c_{\phi_L} - \ddot{\phi}_L s_{\theta_L} s_{\phi_L} - \dot{\phi}_L^2 s_{\theta_L} c_{\phi_L} - \dot{\theta}_L^2 s_{\theta_L} c_{\phi_L} - 2\dot{\theta}_L \dot{\phi}_L c_{\theta_L} s_{\phi_L} \\ \ddot{\theta}_L c_{\theta_L} s_{\phi_L} + \ddot{\phi}_L s_{\theta_L} c_{\phi_L} - \dot{\phi}_L^2 s_{\theta_L} s_{\phi_L} - \dot{\theta}_L^2 s_{\theta_L} s_{\phi_L} + 2\dot{\theta}_L \dot{\phi}_L c_{\theta_L} c_{\phi_L} \\ \ddot{\theta}_L s_{\theta_L} + \dot{\theta}_L^2 c_{\theta_L} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-26})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x}_Q &= \frac{1}{m_Q} (f(c_\psi s_\theta + c_\theta s_\phi s_\psi) - T s_{\theta_L} c_{\psi_L}) \\ \ddot{y}_Q &= \frac{1}{m_Q} (f(s_\psi s_\theta - c_\psi c_\theta s_\phi) - T s_{\theta_L} s_{\psi_L}) \\ \ddot{z}_Q &= \frac{1}{m_Q} (f(c_\phi c_\theta) - T c_{\theta_L}) - g \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-27})$$

## A-5 Figures



Figure A-2: Simulink Command Filter

---

# Bibliography

- [1] K. Sreenath, Taeyoung Lee, and V. Kumar, “Geometric control and differential flatness of a quadrotor UAV with a cable-suspended load,” in *52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 2269–2274, IEEE, dec 2013.
- [2] R. P. K. Jain and T. Keviczky, “MSc Thesis: Transportation of Cable Suspended Load using Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: A Real-time Model Predictive Control approach,” 2015.
- [3] S. Sadr, S. Ali, A. Moosavian, and P. Zarafshan, “Dynamics Modeling and Control of a Quadrotor with Swing Load,” *Journal of Robotics, Hindawi Publishing Corporation*, vol. 2014.
- [4] T. Lee, *Computational Geometric Mechanics and Control of Rigid Bodies*. PhD thesis, The University of Michigan, 2008.
- [5] T. Lee, M. Leok, and N. H. McClamroch, “Geometric Tracking Control of a Quadrotor UAV on  $SE(3)$ ,” *49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, no. 3, pp. 5420–5425, 2010.
- [6] F. Goodarzi, D. Lee, and T. Lee, “Geometric nonlinear PID control of a quadrotor UAV on  $SE(3)$ ,” *Control Conference (ECC), 2013 European*, pp. 3845–3850, 2013.
- [7] K. Sreenath, N. Michael, and V. Kumar, “Trajectory generation and control of a quadrotor with a cable-suspended load - A differentially-flat hybrid system,” in *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 4888–4895, 2013.
- [8] K. Sreenath, T. Lee, and V. Kumar, “Geometric control and differential flatness of a quadrotor UAV with a cable-suspended load,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 2269–2274, 2013.
- [9] S. Tang, “Aggressive Maneuvering of a Quadrotor with a Cable-Suspended Payload,” tech. rep., University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 2014.
- [10] N. Chaturvedi, A. Sanyal, and N. McClamroch, “Rigid-Body Attitude Control,” *IEEE Control Systems*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 30–51, 2011.

- [11] R. M. Murray, Z. Li, and S. S. Sastry, *A Mathematical Introduction to Robotic Manipulation*, vol. 29. 1994.
- [12] T. L. T. Lee, N. McClamroch, and M. Leok, "A lie group variational integrator for the attitude dynamics of a rigid body with applications to the 3D pendulum," *Proceedings of 2005 IEEE Conference on Control Applications, 2005. CCA 2005.*, pp. 962–967, 2005.
- [13] T. Lee, M. Leok, and N. H. McClamroch, "Lagrangian mechanics and variational integrators on two-spheres," *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering*, vol. 79, no. 9, pp. 1147–1174, 2009.
- [14] T. Lee, M. Leok, and N. H. McClamroch, "Stable Manifolds of Saddle Points for Pendulum Dynamics on  $S^2$  and  $SO(3)$ ," p. 9, 2011.
- [15] T. Lee, M. Leok, and N. H. McClamroch, "Lie group variational integrators for the full body problem in orbital mechanics," *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy*, vol. 98, no. 2, pp. 121–144, 2007.
- [16] F. Bullo and A. D. Lewis, *Geometric control of mechanical systems: modeling, analysis, and design for simple mechanical control systems*. Springer, 2005.
- [17] J. H. Gillula, H. Huang, M. P. Vitus, and C. J. Tomlin, "Design of guaranteed safe maneuvers using reachable sets: Autonomous quadrotor aerobatics in theory and practice," in *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 1649–1654, 2010.
- [18] N. A. Chaturvedi, T. Lee, M. Leok, and N. H. McClamroch, "Nonlinear dynamics of the 3D pendulum," *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 3–32, 2011.
- [19] T. Lee, M. Leok, and N. McClamroch, "Control of complex maneuvers for a quadrotor UAV using geometric methods on  $SE(3)$ ," *arXiv*, 2010.
- [20] R. Mahony, V. Kumar, and P. Corke, "Multirotor Aerial Vehicles: Modeling, Estimation, and Control of Quadrotor," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 20–32, 2012.
- [21] I. Kanellakopoulos, P. V. Kokotovic, and A. S. Morse, "Systematic Design of Adaptive Controllers for Feedback Linearizable Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 36, no. 11, pp. 1241–1253, 1991.
- [22] U. A. V. Cornelis and M. Vlaar, "Incremental Nonlinear Dynamic Inversion flight control," no. November, 2014.
- [23] J. A. Farrell, M. Polycarpou, M. Sharma, and W. Dong, "Command Filtered Backstepping," pp. 1923–1928, 2008.
- [24] J. Farrell, M. Polycarpou, and M. Sharma, "Backstepping-Based Flight Control with Adaptive Function Approximation," *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 1089–1102, 2005.
- [25] B. M. Borra, "Nonlinear UAV Flight Control Using Command Filtered Backstepping," *Simulation*, no. March, pp. 1–161, 2012.

- [26] E. Reyes-Valeria, R. Enriquez-Caldera, S. Camacho-Lara, and J. Guichard, “LQR control for a quadrotor using unit quaternions: Modeling and simulation BT - Electronics, Communications and Computing (CONIELECOMP), 2013 International Conference on,” pp. 172–178, 2013.
- [27] D. Mellinger and V. Kumar, “Minimum snap trajectory generation and control for quadrotors,” in *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 2520–2525, 2011.
- [28] S. Tang and V. Kumar, “Mixed Integer Quadratic Program Trajectory Generation for a Quadrotor with a Cable-Suspended Payload,” *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 2216–2222, 2015.
- [29] J. D. A. Becker, *Modeling and Control of a Quadrotor with Dynamic Inertia*. PhD thesis, 2013.



---

# Nomenclature

$\epsilon$	Tuning parameter to enable rapid exponential convergence of $e_R, e_\Omega$
$\lambda_M(\cdot)$	Maximum eigenvalue
$\omega_i$	Angular speed of rotor $i$
$\{\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3\}$	Unit vectors along the axes of $\{\mathcal{B}\}$
$\{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3\}$	Unit vectors along the axes of $\{\mathcal{I}\}$
$\{\mathcal{B}\}$	Body Frame
$\{\mathcal{I}\}$	Inertial World Frame
$b$	Thrust factor
$d$	Drag factor
$f$	Total thrust in direction of $\mathbf{b}_3$ , expressed in $\{\mathcal{B}\}$ . $f = \sum_{i=1}^4 F_i$
$F_i$	Force generated by rotor $i$
$g$	Gravitation constant
$J \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$	Inertia tensor of QR
$L$	Length of the cable
$l$	Distance from the rotor to the QR CM
$M$	Total moment around axes of $\{\mathcal{B}\}$ , expressed in $\{\mathcal{B}\}$ . $M = [M_\phi \quad M_\theta \quad M_\psi]^T$
$M_i$	Drag moment generated by each propellor
$q \in \mathbb{S}^2$	Unit vector from QR to Load
$x_L \in \mathbb{R}^3$	Position of the load

$x_Q \in \mathbb{R}^3$	Position of the QR CM
$x_{CM}$	Position CM of QR-Load system



---

# Acronyms

<b>QR</b>	Quadrotor
<b>UAV</b>	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
<b>CM</b>	Center of Mass
<b>DOF</b>	Degree of Freedom
<b>PID</b>	Proportional-Integral-Derivative (Controller)
<b>LQR</b>	Linear Quadratic Regulator
<b>MPC</b>	Model Predictive Control
<b>NGC</b>	Nonlinear Geometric Control
<b>QP</b>	Quadratic Programming