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Abstract: In this paper, the decision parts of a launch rocket—guidance law (GL) and autopilot—are discussed. In the controller design, the differential geometry and sliding mode control are employed. In addition to the individual GL and autopilot system, stability of the integrated guidance/autopilot (G/A) system are discussed. Finally, various simulations are demonstrated to examine the feasibility and performance of the rocket’s integrated G/A system. Copyright © 2005 IFAC
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1. INTRODUCTION

The control of flight vehicles has been an important topic ever since the range of human activities was extended from the earth to the universe. It becomes even more influential to mankind as the modern technology progresses, such as invention of the rockets that transport spacecrafts and satellites beyond the sky. In this paper, the controller design of trajectory-following launch rockets are discussed. Specially, GL and autopilot systems are the two control units in which we are interested among whole rocket system. Conventionally, the autopilot system design of spacecrafts and aircrafts are based on the optimal control theory and the systematical discussion can be found in (Bryson, 1994). Yet, inventive work that utilize adaptive control and neural network control on the G/A of autonomous launch vehicles is proposed by (Johnson et al., 2001). Nevertheless, the rocket autopilot systems with quaternion representation and sliding mode control design in our previous research works (Yeh, 2003) and (Cheng, 2004) have also acquired excellent performance, and are reinvented in this paper.

In this paper, new GL and autopilot systems are proposed. The utilization of differential geometry and sliding mode theory in GL is designed for the launch rocket to follow the preset trajectory. To construct a whole-phase-single-strategy rocket autopilot system that is suitable in both endo- and exo-atmosphere, we apply the sliding mode theory and use a wingless rocket airframe based on TVC/DCS (Thrust Vector Control/Divert Control System). In addition to the respective GL and autopilot subsystems, the integrated G/A systems are discussed, and the design methodologies of the system parameters are suggested. Various simulations including aerodynamic model are demonstrated at the last to verify the feasibility and test the performance of the rocket’s integrated G/A systems.

2. NEW GL FOR LAUNCH ROCKETS

3-D Geometry Modelling Generally speaking, GLs and autopilot systems are both the strategic parts in an airframe; decisions and control commands are made by them. GLs guide the airframe’s directions based on the current state
of the airframe and the circumstanes, while autopiilot systems which depend on a well-designed controller follow the guidance commands stably. The illustrative and conceptual flowchart of the commands in an airframe is shown in Fig. 1, and the GL system is discussed in this section. The GL is designed for a transport rocket to trace a preset optimal launching trajectory from the earth to the space. The preset optimal launching trajectory is firstly to find the position of the rocket and variation of mass of the rocket.

Accordingly, (5) becomes:

$$\tau' = \{ \tau \mid [r(\tau) - r_R] \cdot \hat{r}(\tau) = 0 \}$$

In (4), we avoid directly computing the time derivative of $r_D$ due to the inevitable time delay and resultant numerical error. Instead, we use the fact that $v_D$, the velocity of the projection point, is identical to the projection of the rocket velocity on $t$, i.e. $(v_R \cdot t)t$. Since it is exactly the component of $v_R$ parallel to $t$, we define $v_{R||} = (v_R \cdot t)t$ and $v_{R\perp} = v_R - v_{R||}$, the component of $v_R$ perpendicular to $t$ and on the $n$-$b$ plane. Similarly, we also avoid computing the time derivative of $v_D$ directly in (5). We instead use the fact that $a_D$, the acceleration of the projection point, is equivalent to the summation of $(a_R \cdot t)t$, the projection of the rocket acceleration on $t$, and the normal acceleration of the trajectory. The latter is determined by its radius of curvature and the component of rocket velocity in $n$ direction, i.e.

$$\frac{|v_{R||}|^2}{\kappa} n = |v_R|^2 n$$

Likewise, we also define $a_{R||} = (a_R \cdot t)t$ and $a_{R\perp} = a_R - a_{R||}$. Divide the acceleration of the rocket into components as:

$$a_R = g_R + \frac{F_R}{m} = g_R + \frac{m}{m} v_R + a_{RP}$$

where $g_R$ is the gravity, $F_R$ is the propelent force, and $a_{RP}$ is the acceleration due to the propelant of the rocket and variation of mass of the rocket. Accordingly, (5) becomes:

$$a = \kappa |v_{R||}|^2 n - g_{R\perp} - \frac{m}{m} v_{R\perp} - a_{R\perp}$$

Guidance Laws Design Applying the sliding mode control theory, we define the sliding surface variable as

$$S_g = v + \lambda \tau$$

where $\lambda$ is a $3 \times 3$ diagonal P.D. matrix, and $S_g$ is a $3 \times 1$ vector. Since $\dot{\tau} = v$, thus $S_g = 0$ implies $\{r, v\} \rightarrow 0$ exponentially. To design a controller capable of leading the convergence to $S_g$, we choose the Lyapunov function candidate

$$V_g(S_g) = \frac{1}{2} S_g^T S_g$$
Taking the time derivative of $V_g$, we have:
\[
\dot{V}_g = S^T_g (\kappa |v_R|) \| n - g_R - \frac{m}{M} v_R - a_{R\perp} - \lambda v_R - d_g ) ,
\]
where the disturbance $d^{(3\times1)}_g$ is specially taken into consideration, which comes from both parametric uncertainties and unmodelled dynamics. Parametric uncertainties might be caused by the estimated errors of position, velocity, mass, variance of mass, propellant force, etc., whereas unmodelled dynamics could be aerodynamics, parasitic dynamics, etc. Without loss of generality, we assume that there exists an upper bound $d^{\max}_g$ on the disturbance $d_g$, i.e. $|d_g| \leq d^{\max}_g$. Design the control law as:
\[
a_{R\perp} = \kappa |v_R| \| n - g_R - \frac{m}{M} v_R - \lambda v_R - (\dot{d}^{\max}_g + \eta_g) sgn(S_g) ,
\]
where $\eta_g^{(3\times1)} > 0$ is an adjustable vector variable, and $sgn(S_g) = [sgn(S_{g1}), sgn(S_{g2}), sgn(S_{g3})]^T$. With the designed control law, we get:
\[
\dot{V}_g = S^T_g d_g - S^T_g \dot{d}^{\max}_g sgn(S_g) - S^T_g \eta_g sgn(S_g) 
\leq -\eta_g \| S_g \|.
\]
Accordingly, the system trajectories will reach the sliding surface $S_g = 0$ in finite time less than
\[
\max \left[ \frac{|S_{0g}|}{\eta_g} \right] ,
\]
remain on it, and then are constrained by the sliding surface itself, namely
\[
S_g = v + \lambda r ,
\]
which implies the exponential convergence of distance error $r$ and velocity error $v$. Knowing that $|a_M| = \frac{N}{m}$, $a_{R\perp} = (a_{R \perp} \cdot t) t$, and $a_{R\parallel} = a_{R} - a_{R\perp}$, we have
\[
a_{R\parallel} = t \left( \sqrt{\left( \frac{N}{m} \right)^2 - |a_{R\perp}|^2} \right) .
\]
Hence, the desired acceleration command is
\[
a_d = a_{R\perp} + a_{R\parallel} ,
\]
and is delivered to the autopilot system described in next section.

3. AUTOPilot DESIGN AND ANALYSIS OF INTEGRATED G/A SYSTEM

The autopilot systems and the analysis of integrated G/A system are discussed in this section. An autopilot system is a mechanism which receives the acceleration commands from GLs and controls the actuators to stabilize the airframe while performing those commands. In this paper, the autopilot system is divided into three parts for design as in Fig.1, but the actuator dynamics is excluded from our topics. Fig.3 shows the architecture of the rocket, where TVC is a mechanism realized by a moveable tail nozzle, and

DCS is an additional auxiliary propellant system mounted on lateral of the airframe. Both TVC and DCS have the advantage of maneuvering ability in both endo- and exo-atmosphere, whereas control surfaces work only in endoatmosphere. With this reason and a motivation to design a whole-phase-single-strategy controller, we choose an airframe without control surface, which dominates the aerodynamic force. By this, the designed whole-phase-single-strategy controller will be more compatible with the circumstance where less aerodynamic influence on the airframe in both endo- and exo-atmosphere is expected. Based on physics laws, the kinematic equations of the airframe are composed of those of both TVC and DCS, that is
\[
F^\text{prop}_b = F^\text{TVC}_b + F^\text{DCS}_b = \begin{bmatrix} N \cos \theta \\ N \sin \theta \cos \phi + F^D_y \end{bmatrix} \\
\tau^\text{prop}_b = \tau^\text{TVC}_b + \tau^\text{DCS}_b
\]
\[
= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ N l^\text{TVC} \sin \theta \sin \phi + l^\text{DCS} F^D_y \end{bmatrix}.
\]

Translate Acceleration CMDs into Attitude CMDs

The “Transform” part in Fig.1 transforms the acceleration commands from a GL into the attitude commands. In Fig.4, the vector of the desired acceleration command $a_d$ generated from (16) is produced by the constant main propellant TVC, and the directions of $y_b$ and $z_b$ are the “don’t care” factors for this cylindrical, non-aerodynamically maneuvering airframe. To interpret the attitude commands, we firstly set a reference coordinate frame, and then find the relationship between the reference coordinate frame and the acceleration

Fig. 3. (a) Rocket Configuration (b) TVC Moving Angles

Fig. 4. Desire Quaternion
command vector. According to the Euler’s rotation theory, there exists a vector \( \dot{e} \) and an angle \( \phi \) such that \( x_i \) will coincide with \( x_0 \) after undergoing an rotation of the angle \( \phi \) by the vector \( \dot{e} \). The vector \( \dot{e} \) and the angle \( \phi \) can be obtained by:

\[
\dot{e} = \frac{x_i \times x_0}{|x_i \times x_0|} = \frac{x_i \times q_d}{|x_i \times q_d|} \tag{19}
\]

\[
\phi = \cos^{-1}\left( \frac{x_i \times x_0}{|x_i \times x_0|} \right) = \cos^{-1}\left( \frac{x_i \times q_d}{|x_i \times q_d|} \right) \tag{20}
\]

which can be used to represent the desired attitude command in quaternion representation as described in the following subject.

Translate Attitude CMDs to Torque CMDs

The “Controller” part in Fig.1 generated the torque commands for the desired attitude commands. The attitude is expressed by quaternion \( q \) and angular velocity \( \omega \) (\( q_e, \omega_e \)) are defined as the errors between desired values (\( q_d, \omega_d \)) and current values (\( q, \omega \)) as follows:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
q_e1 \\
q_e2 \\
q_e3 \\
q_e4
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
q_d1 - q_d4 \\
q_d4 - q_d3 \\
q_d2 - q_d1 \\
q_d1 - q_d2
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
q_1 \\
q_2 \\
q_3 \\
q_4
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\dot{\omega}_e = \omega - \omega_d, \tag{21}
\]

where the quaternion is defined as:

\[
q = \begin{bmatrix}
q_1 \\
q_2 \\
q_3 \\
q_4
\end{bmatrix} = [q_1 \ q_2 \ q_3 \ q_4]^T = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{e} \sin(\phi/2) \\ 0 \cos(\phi/2) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{22}
\]

where the unit vector \( \hat{e} = [e_1 \ e_2 \ e_3]^T \) and angle \( \phi \) are the Euler Axis and Angle exactly. By (22), \( q_d \) can be computed from (19) and (20), and in turn yield the desired angular velocity by the kinematic equation of quaternion:

\[
\omega_d = 2 \begin{bmatrix}
q_d4 & q_d3 - q_d2 - q_d1 \\
-q_d3 & q_d4 \\
-q_d2 & q_d1 - q_d4 \\
q_d1 & q_d2 - q_d3
\end{bmatrix} \dot{q}_d \tag{23}
\]

To generate the torque commands that eliminate the attitude errors \( q_e \) and \( \omega_e \), a controller design based on sliding mode control theory is proposed. Define the sliding surface variable as

\[
S_a = Pq_e + \omega_e, \tag{24}
\]

where \( P \) is a \( 3 \times 3 \) P.D. matrix, whereas \( S_a, q_e, \omega_e \) are \( 3 \times 1 \) vectors. Choose the Lyapunov function candidate as

\[
V_a(S_a) = \frac{1}{2} S_a^T J S_a, \tag{25}
\]

where \( J \) is the inertia matrix of the airframe. Taking the time derivative of \( V_a \), we have:

\[
\dot{V}_a = S_a^T \left( \frac{1}{2} J S_a + J P \dot{q}_e + J \dot{\omega} - J \omega_d \right) \tag{26}
\]

Applying the kinematic equation of quaternion

\[
\dot{q}_e = \frac{1}{2} q_e \times \omega_e + \frac{1}{2} q_e \omega_e \tag{27}
\]

and the Euler’s equation

\[
J \dot{\omega} = \tau_b - J \dot{\omega} - Q(J \omega) \tag{28}
\]

we then have:

\[
\dot{V}_a = S_a^T \left( \frac{1}{2} J S_a + J P \left( \frac{1}{2} q_e \times \omega_e + \frac{1}{2} q_e \omega_e \right) \right) + \tau_b - J \dot{\omega} - \omega \times (J \omega) - J \omega_d + d_a, \tag{29}
\]

where the torque command \( \tau_b \) is the control input of this error tracking system, and the disturbance \( d_a^{(3x1)} \) is also taken into consideration as in GL, including aerodynamics, actuator dynamics, parasitic dynamics, etc. Assume that there exists an upper bound \( d_a^{max} \) on the disturbance \( d_a \), i.e. \( |d_{ai}| \leq d_{ai}^{max}, i=1,2,3 \), and design the control law:

\[
\tau_{D_b} = - \frac{1}{2} J S_a - J P \left( \frac{1}{2} q_e \times \omega_e + \frac{1}{2} q_e \omega_e \right) + J \dot{\omega} + \omega \times (J \omega) + J \omega_d - (d_a^{max} + \eta_a) \operatorname{sgn}(S_a), \tag{30}
\]

where \( \eta_a^{(3x1)} > 0 \) is an adjustable vector variable, and \( \operatorname{sgn}(S_a) = [\operatorname{sgn}(S_{a1}), \operatorname{sgn}(S_{a2}), \operatorname{sgn}(S_{a3})]^T \). With the designed control law, we get:

\[
\dot{V}_a = S_a^T d_a - S_a^T d_a^{max} \operatorname{sgn}(S_a) - S_a^T \eta_a \operatorname{sgn}(S_a) \leq -\eta_a^T |S_a| \tag{31}
\]

Accordingly, the system trajectories will reach the sliding surface \( S_a = 0 \) in finite time less than max, \( \frac{S_{a1}(t_0)}{\eta_{a1}} \), remain on it, and then are constrained by the sliding surface itself, namely

\[
S_a = P q_e + \omega_e = 0 \tag{32}
\]

Now, we shall verify that \( \omega_e \) and \( q_e \) will converge to zero when the above condition is reached. Define the Lyapunov function candidate as

\[
V(q_e) = q_e^T P q_e \tag{33}
\]

Take the time derivative of \( V_q \) and use (32):

\[
\dot{V}_q = q_{e4} q_{e4}^T \omega_e = -q_{e4} q_{e4}^T P q_e \tag{34}
\]

Substitute (32) into the kinematic equation of quaternion:

\[
q_{e4} = \frac{1}{2} q_e \cdot \omega_e = \frac{1}{2} q_e^T P q_e \geq 0, \tag{35}
\]

which implies that \( q_{e4} \) is a non-decreasing positive variable. Define the domain of rotation angle \( \phi \) to be between \( -\pi \) and \( \pi \), which implies a non-negative \( q_{e4} \), to avoid the sign ambiguity in the representation of quaternion. Thus \( q_{e4} = \cos(\frac{\phi}{2}) \geq 0 \). If we select a nonzero \( q_{e4}(t_0) \), which is determined by the designable initial conditions, we have \( 0 < q_{e4}(t_0) \leq q_{e4}(t), \forall t \geq 0 \). Substituting it into (34), we have

\[
\dot{V}_q \leq -q_{e4}(t_0) q_{e4}^T P q_e < 0, \tag{36}
\]

i.e. \( V_q(q_e) \) is P.D., and \( V_q(q_e) \) is N.D. In addition, \( V_q(q_e) \rightarrow \infty \) as \( |q_e| \rightarrow \infty \). According to the Lyapunov direct method, the equilibrium point \( q_e = 0 \) is globally asymptotically stable. Combined with (32), the asymptotical stability of \( q_e \) also implies the asymptotical stability of \( \omega_e \).
In summary, with the control law (30) the system trajectories will reach the sliding surface (32) in finite time less than 
\[ \max\left(\frac{\left|\theta_{Dc}\right|}{\eta_{Dc}}\right) \] remain on it, and it follows the asymptotic convergence of the 
attitude error \( \eta_{\phi} \) and angular velocity error \( \omega_{c} \).

**Translate Torque CMDs into Actuator CMDs**

The “Transfer” part in Fig. 1 is designed to calculate the actuator commands that can reach the desired torque commands. It is interesting to note that a TVC system generates an unpleasantly 
accompanied lateral force while it is trying to generate a rotational torque by moving the nozzle. This accompaniment, however, can be easily eliminated by the addition of the auxiliary DCS.

In other words, the cooperative strategy between 
TVC and DCS ensures a rotational torque without 
eliminated by the addition of the auxiliary DCS.
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Therefore, the simulation is made on the flight sequence from Stage I to Stage III, and the goal is to track the position, velocity and attitude of the preset trajectory profile. The preset trajectory can be characterized by a 2 order polynomial as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{r}(\tau) &= \begin{bmatrix} x(\tau) \\ y(\tau) \\ z(\tau) \end{bmatrix} = \\
\begin{bmatrix}
0.49427\tau^2 + 4.0778e^{-12}\tau \\
0.49427\tau^2 + 4.0778e^{-12}\tau \\
3.2886e^{-16}\tau^2 + 259\tau
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \tau = 0 \sim 1000 \). Because of the different mechanism in each stage, the parameters of rocket airframe are divided into 4 sets, and can be found in (Isakowitz, 1991). The initial total mass and length of whole rocket are 75,000 kg and 27.4 m, respectively, and the initial velocity of rocket is set 2.59 m/s upright. In the simulation, we simply omit the rotation and revolution of the earth.

In Fig. 5(a), we draw an arrow each 10 sec to represent the attitude of the rocket. The total flight time is 279 sec, final velocity is 6744.7 m/s and the maximum distance error is less than 9.5474 m throughout the whole launch phase, thus satisfy the requirements. Through the whole phase, two dramatic changes are occurred when the rocket makes stage separations in 112.6 sec and 188.2 sec.

In (b), (g) and (h), the peak value of errors happen at the two time instant, and those errors have converged immediately as expected. In (c), the variation of propulsion acceleration is induced by the decreasing of the fuel mass and the different propellant force in each stage. In (d), the normal acceleration of trajectory increasing as the airspeed growing but decreasing as the reducing of the radius of curvature of the preset trajectory.

In (i), the moving angle of TVC \( \theta \) reaches the constraint 15 deg. In (j), the total thrust torque is generated by the cooperation TVC and DCS.

In (k), the aerodynamics produces huge effect and induces distance errors before 112.6 sec, when the rocket is inside atmosphere and is with the maximum surface without any stage separations.

In summary, the performance of the designed rocket integrated G/A system is excellent, and the system can achieve the trajectory-following task in the presence of aerodynamics which is considered as disturbance over the design.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Being the decision parts of an rocket, GL and autopilot system are discussed in this paper. A wingless airframe based on TVC/DCS and the sliding mode theory is proposed, which makes the autopilot system an whole-phase-single-strategy robust controller. Besides, new rocket GL based on differential geometry and sliding mode theory is presented. Finally, the stability of the integrated G/A system is guaranteed by the suggested system parameters, and verified by various simulations.
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