

Position Controller for a Flapping-Wing Drone Using UWB

Guillermo Gonzalez^{*,‡}, Guido C. H. E. de Croon^{*,§}, Diana Olejnik^{*,¶},
Matěj Karásek^{†,||}

^{*}*Faculty of Aerospace, Delft University of Technology, Kluyverweg 1, Delft 2629HS, Netherlands*

[†]*Flapper Drones B.V., Kluyverweg 1, Delft 2629HS, Netherlands*

This paper proposes an integral approach for accurate ultra-wideband indoor position control of flapping-wing micro-air vehicles. Three aspects are considered to achieve a reliable and accurate position controller. The first aspect is a velocity/attitude flapping-wing model for drag compensation. The model is compared with real flight data and shown to be applicable for more than one type of flapping-wing drone. The second improvement regards a voltage-dependent thrust control. Lastly, a characterisation of ground effects in flapping-wing flight is obtained from hovering experiments. The proposed controller improves position control by a factor ~ 1.5 , reaching a mean absolute error of 10 cm for the position in x and y , and 4.9 cm for the position in z .

Keywords: Flapping-wing drone; ultra-wideband; position controller; drag compensation; thrust control.

US

1. Introduction

The fact that drones are becoming increasingly popular is intimately related with the development of more sophisticated automation resources. In the case of drones, weight, processing speed, and energy consumption are critical aspects to accomplish fully autonomous flights. Hence, elements, such as motors, micro-processors, memory units and batteries, need to be continuously improved to meet these requirements. These conditions have fostered the development of flapping-wing micro-air vehicles (FWMAV). This type of UAV is inspired on the flight of birds and insects, and has become attractive in the field of small-scale micro-air vehicles, since it provides both the ability of hovering and flying into any direction. After the foundational work from Ellington [1] and Dickinson [2], many experiments have been carried out in order to get an optimal physical design of FWMAVs, as well as robust controllers for stable flight.

Regarding position feedback, the most well-known option is an indoor positioning system (IPS). Some of the technologies used for IPS are Wi-fi, Radio Frequency Identification (RFID), and infrared (IR) motion tracking systems. Wi-fi and RFID can be found for tracking mobile devices, but not specifically for drones [3]. IR is used for indoor tracking of drones (e.g. VICON/OptiTrack), but it is an expensive option and its accuracy can be affected by lighting conditions [4].

Another option for IPS is ultra-wideband (UWB) which was already defined in 2006, but just recently started to gain popularity. UWB is able to transmit in nano-second scale periods. Thus, it allows excellent timing for signal arriving, which translates to centimeter level accuracy. Its low spectral density reduces the interference from other RF devices. Nevertheless, it also has some drawbacks, like high computational and memory capacity of the controller and its vulnerability to multi-path effect when signals bounce with the physical boundaries of the environment [5].

Inertial navigation systems (INS) are usually added in indoor environments to complement IPS. Usually, INS systems employ micro-electro mechanical systems (MEMS) or inertial measurement units (IMU). Furthermore, data fusion is also applied for better accuracy, by means of a Kalman filter. Hence, many combinations of integrated systems have

Received 17 January 2022; Accepted 30 April 2022; Published 15 June 2022. This paper was recommended for publication in its revised form by editorial board member, Jose Martinez-Carranza.

Email Addresses: [‡]guillermogoar@gmail.com, [§]g.c.h.e.decroon@tudelft.nl, [¶]d.a.olejnik@tudelft.nl, ^{||}matej@flapper-drones.com

^{*}Corresponding author.

been proposed. For example a GPS/UWB/MEMS navigation system [6], an INS/UWB system based on a fuzzy adaptive Kalman filter [7], and a GPS/IMU navigation system for fault correction [8]. Although most of these implementations provide a basis for designing an autonomous position controller, it is important to keep in mind they are specifically designed either for fixed-wing or quadrotor UAVs. In the case of flapping-wing drones, some extra constraints shall be considered like the physical limitations in terms of payload and energy consumption, or the noise influence in IMU measurements due to high-frequency mechanical vibration [9]. To overcome these circumstances, the existing solutions must be adapted, leaving a potential research development for position controllers of FWMAVs.

One of the challenges of working with FWMAVs comes from the aerodynamics of the system. A reliable model of the dynamics can significantly increase the performance and accuracy. Nevertheless, most aerodynamic models for flapping-wings require extensive system identification techniques for numerous parameters, whose values only remain valid for a specific drone. A widespread alternative is the use of quasi-steady models where force coefficients are obtained either from experimental data or from theoretical principles [10]. The control strategy proposed in this paper follows a simpler solution where the model is obtained by directly averaging aerodynamic parameters as functions in terms of the body velocities. Although the method may be considered just a rough approximation compared to quasi-steady models, it tends to be more practical since just a few parameters are required. When validating averaging parameters with real flight data, several authors address the issues of unsteady flight due to mechanical vibrations [11,12]. However, just some models follow an approach based on drag compensation. Within the few cases where drag compensation models are implemented, most of them are linear models, which are only valid for a limited range of velocities [9,13].

Similar to most MAVs, FWMAVs are also prone to short flights due to the limited size of the batteries they are able to carry. Thus, it is common that voltage will significantly change during flight, affecting as well the required throttle level for hovering [14]. This condition poses a challenge in height control, for both reaching and keeping a specific position along the z-axis.

Another issue affecting height control is the ground effect. This phenomenon particularly occurs when the drone is flying close to the ground [15]. An extra thrust is generated because the wind currents underneath the drone bounce against the ground, causing the drone to behave like sitting on a cushion of air [16]. Thus, an extra lift is generated, causing the output thrust to be higher than the input thrust.

This paper addresses the three aforementioned challenges of FWMAVs. Sections 2–4 provide the background

for the implementation. Section 5 describes how averaging parameters are applied for drag compensation. Section 6 discusses the issues of changing voltage and ground effects. Lastly, Sec. 7 shows the results on how the transient response is improved in any of the three axes: forward (x-axis), sideways (y-axis) and vertical (z-axis).

2. Experimental Setup

Since the work on this project relies mainly on feedback through UWB, the experimental setting should be a grid where UWB receivers are strategically located in the vertices and the transceiver is mounted on the FWMAV. This way, the drone flies inside the volume of a cube bounded by the position of the anchors. A similar set-up is used in [17], where the eight anchors on the corners optimize the possibility for the drone to have line-of-sight at least with one anchor. Such a grid was set-up at the Cyberzoo (shown in Fig. 1), the flight arena of the TU Delft Faculty of Aerospace, which is known as the main facility of the university for performing tests on drones, and has a size of $10\text{ m} \times 10\text{ m} \times 7\text{ m}$. A reliable choice for UWB sensor is the Decawave DWM1000, as it has proven to give successful results for UAV tracking [18]. The UWB sensors are used as the anchors of the IPS and are set to work using a time difference of arrival (TDOA) algorithm [19].




Fig. 1. Cyberzoo structure where the UWB anchors are placed (top) and detail of UWB anchor mounted on the structure (bottom).




Fig. 2. Flapper drone with IR markers and UWB sensor.

In order to have a reference for the UWB measurements, a motion tracking system is used for measurements of position and rotation. It consists of 12 OptiTrack Prime 17 W motion tracking cameras (set to resolution 1664 px $\times$ 1088 px, 50 fps) and has proven to deliver accurate results for MAV test flights [20]. When working with the motion tracking system, the drone was equipped with four retro-reflective markers placed on the landing gear of the drone, and the UWB sensor was placed at the top to optimize direct line of sight (Fig. 2).

About the flapping-wing drone, referred in this paper as Flapper, is a design from the company Flapper-drones [21]. It is a 102 g tailless FWMMAV with a wingspan of 49 cm, able to keep flapping frequencies up to 12 Hz when hovering. The on-board processing hardware consists of a Crazyflie Bolt autopilot board, including an IMU with 3-axis accelerometer/gyroscope (BMI088). The data link between the autopilot and the ground station is done with a Crazyradio PA (also from Bitcraze), which is a USB radio dongle based on nRF24LU1+ from Nordic Semiconductor. The system can be powered with a 300-mAh two-cell 7.4 V LiPo battery, reaching a flight time between 4 min and 6 min, depending on the internal resistance of the battery.

3. Control Loop

For autonomous flight, the flapping-wing drone uses a cascaded PID-controller. The controller consists of three loops. The output provides the control signals for the motors involved in the flight dynamics of the drone: two brush-less motors in charge of the flapping frequency for thrust and roll, one servo-motor that modifies the angle of the dihedral for pitch, and another servo-motor that changes the deflection of the wings for yaw.

Regarding the structure of the cascaded loops, the innermost loop is in charge of attitude rate and runs at 500 Hz. The intermediate loop also runs at 500 Hz and is in charge

of attitude control. The outer loop is the position/velocity control, which runs at 100 Hz and can take either position or velocity commands. This outer loop can operate as a single loop in body frame where the desired position is given as a set point and the output goes into the attitude control loop. When used as a double loop, the control signal of the position loop goes into a velocity PID controller before going into the attitude loop. The double loop also allows to work with position and velocity either on body frame or inertial frame. For all the research presented here, it is used as a double loop in inertial frame. Thus, it is easier to define the set points for a flight routine within the UWB-positioning system.

Another remark is the trimming values for servos in charge of pitch, roll and yaw. This procedure must be done in order to get the proper behavior from the controller. For trimming, one should fly the drone manually until it hovers at a steady position. The trim values are the pitch, roll and yaw commands given to keep the drone hovering. The values are specific for each flapping-wing drone, as they change depending on manufacturing factors. Thus, it is important to properly set the appropriate trimming values before going further with any flight test.

4. State Estimation

The state estimation is done by means of an Extended Kalman Filter (EKF) which fuses the measurements of the IMU and the UWB positioning system. The model of the EKF is the same as the one proposed by [19, 22], which considers a nine-dimensional state vector defined as

$$S = [x_E \ v_B \ d]^T, \quad (1)$$

where x_E is the position vector in global frame, v_B is the velocity vector in body frame and d is an attitude error vector, where the error is defined as the difference between the last measured attitude and the current attitude. The purpose for using attitude errors instead of the conventional Euler angles is to simplify the state prediction equations because it only considers the increments in roll, pitch and yaw. A more detailed explanation on the implementation of the filter is given in [22].

The main advantage of fusing UWB with IMU through the Kalman filter is the attitude correction to account for the drift in pitch and roll caused by sensor noise and bias. This difference can be clearly observed in Fig. 3, where the Flapper was left standing up, completely static. Observe how the Kalman filter resets correctly the roll and pitch to zero when UWB measurements are coming in. On the other side, a complementary filter, which relies only on IMU data, will converge to a certain drift and thus propagates it through time.

One last adjustment done to the EKF aims to diminish the detrimental effects on position estimation caused by




Fig. 3. Roll and pitch estimation of the drone at static position using Kalman (left) and complementary (right) filter.

multi-path UWB signals. Specially when going close to the ground, the position estimates tend to drift for more than 20 cm. A way to account for the wrong measurements when flying close to the ground is to use a variable sensor noise value R_{uwb} for measurements from UWB, rather than a constant value. Consequently, the sensor noise is defined as

$$R_{\text{uwb}} = \lambda(\hat{z})\sigma_{\text{uwb}}^2, \quad (2)$$

where $\lambda(\hat{z})$ is a factor-dependent on the estimated height $\hat{z}$, in meters. For the implementation, $\lambda = 0.5$, for $z \geq 1$; $\lambda = 1.5 - \hat{z}$, for $0.5 < \hat{z} < 1$; and $\lambda = 1$, for $z \leq 0.5$. The effect of variable sensor noise in position estimation was tested by placing the drone static on the ground, at the origin (0,0,0) of the UWB IPS. The plots from Fig. 4 show the estimated position (est) in contrast to the real position (cmd). Both values were sampled at 50 Hz, during 8 s. Using






Fig. 4. Effects in position estimation before using variable sensor noise (left) and after implementing it (right).



(a) Paths obtained with complementary filter



(b) Paths obtained with Kalman filter

Fig. 5. Comparison of estimated path (UWB) and real path (Optitrack) against the commanded path (reference).

the variable sensor noise R_{uwb} significantly increases the accuracy in estimation approximately by 0.2 m in the three axes.

Once the variable sensor noise term was implemented into the EKF, several flight paths were tested (linear, square, rhombus and hexagonal paths). The measurements from UWB using a TDOA algorithm proved to be reliable enough for position estimation. The implementation of the EKF together with the variable sensor noise term yielded an improvement of 33% in the mean absolute error for position estimation, as observed in Fig. 5. The accuracy of the EKF remained between 8 cm and 10 cm for all tested paths, when compared to the measurements from the Optitrack system.


5. Drag Compensation

The first technique for yielding a better control strategy for FWMVs was to obtain a model for drag compensation. Since the drag is typically neglected in aerodynamic models, there tends to be an offset between the commanded velocity and the velocity output by the controller. Usually, a feed forward term is used to compensate for these drag effects. Following the structure of the controller in Sec. 3, the velocity loops provide the input for the attitude loop. Thus, feed forward is modeled as a function of velocity:

$$\theta_{FF} = f(v_{xE}), \quad (3)$$

$$\varphi_{FF} = f(v_{yE}), \quad (4)$$

where Eq. (3) is the feed forward term for pitch and Eq. (4) is for roll. In order to derive such a model, a system identification experiment is proposed based on the supplementary materials from [23], where step inputs in roll and pitch are given to the flapping-wing drone and then the transient response is recorded. Figure 6 shows how a given pitch step input of 12° generates a transient response in velocity which eventually converges to a steady-state value. This same experiment is performed for both pitch and roll

Fig. 6. Pitch step input of 12° and its corresponding transient response in V_x .

using angles of 12° , 22° , 33° , 45° and 52° . The experiments are done using manual flight via a Frsky RC-controller where the pitch and roll step inputs are pre-programmed. The tracking data is recorded with the Optitrack system mentioned in Sec. 2.

Figure 7 is given as an example of the transient response in velocity obtained for all the step-inputs in pitch and roll. Due to limitations on the size of the flight arena, only for the small angles (below 45°) it is possible to reach the steady-state velocities. For higher angles, a common technique to reach the steady-state velocities is to perform wind-tunnel experiments [24].

In this case, an alternative method is used where a non-linear regression model is obtained for the smaller angles and then it is used to extrapolate the data at higher angles. From Fig. 7, it can be appreciated that the transient response approximates to the behavior of a first-order system. Hence, the equation for the transient response is modeled as an exponential function of the following form:

$$v(t) = a - be^{-ct+d}. \quad (5)$$

The parameters a , b , c and d from Eq. (5) have to be initialized with certain values, depending on the shape of the




Fig. 7. Velocities attained at different pitch and roll step inputs.

curve obtained from the measured data points. The final steady-state values obtained from the extrapolation model strongly depend on how many data points are considered for the regression model. Hence, Table 1 shows the absolute error between the last measured velocity for each angle, and the respective value calculated from the extrapolation model. For the angles of 30° or less, this velocity approximates to the steady-state velocity. For angles of 45° or

above, the last measured velocity is used as ground truth equilibrium velocity, although it is still part of the transient response.

As expected, results from Table 1 show on the angles of accurate ground truth (12° , 22° and 33°) that the overall accuracy of the extrapolation model, for both pitch and roll, increases as more data points are taken for the regression. Individually, for each angle, accuracy remains approximately the same with 50% of the data points or more. For illustration purposes, Fig. 8 shows the predicted steady-state velocity for each angle when taking 70% of the data points for the regression model. Nevertheless, the real steady-state values used were the ones obtained taking all of the data points since those ones result in the lowest error.

Once the steady-state velocity for each angle is available, the pitch-velocity and roll-velocity models can be obtained. Given the mapping of the steady-state velocity/attitude pairs, different regression models were tested to approximate the relationship the models (linear, quadratic and exponential). Since the maximum roll and pitch angle is 90° for an FWMAV, it is expected that the velocity will converge to a maximum value as the angle approaches 90° . Thus, the model is approximated as the exponential function in Eq. (6). Linear or quadratic models could be used as well, but they would only be valid within specific ranges since they do not converge to a constant value.

$$v(\theta) = a + be^{-c\theta}. \quad (6)$$

Using the obtained steady-state velocity, a nonlinear regression model is obtained using Eq. (6). For both pitch and roll, the parameters are initialized as: $a = -90$, $b = 90$ and $c = 0.3$. Moreover, to test the applicability of the exponential

Table 1. Extrapolation errors taking different amounts of data for regression model (*Indicates that for those angles the final velocity is not considered as ground truth, hence these errors are overestimated).

Final velocity error at different pitch angles [m/s]					
Data taken for regression	12°	22°	33°	$45^\circ*$	$52^\circ*$
10%	0.124	0.0752	0.1842	0.2641	0.276
30%	0.0318	0.0459	0.0347	0.1899	0.1259
50%	0.0166	0.0636	0.015	0.2048	0.0038
70%	0.0183	0.0632	0.0282	0.1379	0.0402
90%	0.0142	0.0561	0.0289	0.0857	0.0185
Final velocity error at different roll angles [m/s]					
Data taken for regression	12°	22°	33°	$47^\circ*$	$52^\circ*$
10%	0.1007	0.1479	0.0391	0.2972	0.3028
30%	0.10	0.1216	0.0452	0.2303	0.2366
50%	0.0262	0.1427	0.0325	0.0499	0.0849
70%	0.0234	0.0802	0.0378	0.0486	0.095
90%	0.0268	0.0247	0.0261	0.0266	0.0757




Fig. 8. Extrapolation models for pitch (top) and roll (bottom) at different velocities.

model, the same described procedure was applied to the data sets from [23] regarding the Delfly Nimble (a 33 cm-wingspan FWMAV of the same type). Then the nonlinear regression model is applied initializing the parameters with exactly the same values. Figure 9 shows how the exponential curves of the Flapper and the Delfly properly approximate to the given data points for both roll and pitch.

6. Height Control

Having a reliable height control strategy is essential to guarantee successful autonomous flight. Mainly it is used to keep the drone flying at a certain altitude and for hovering. Nevertheless, it also plays a major role in landing, which is known to be as the most challenging phase of flight for any aircraft. Height control is intimately related with thrust. Therefore, two approaches for improving thrust command were considered, first one is a voltage-dependent




Fig. 9. Pitch/velocity (top) and roll/velocity (bottom) models obtained from extrapolated data.

thrust model, and second one is an analysis of the ground effects.

6.1. Voltage-thrust model

Thrust is part of the position and velocity control of the drone, it also involves a PID controller which takes a commanded throttle and delivers an output signal for the motors. The signal from the controller is summed with a feed forward term known as base thrust, which is the thrust required to keep the drone hovering at a certain altitude. In most cases, the base thrust is a constant value, but there is evidence that the required base thrust tends to increase as the battery voltage drops off [14]. In order to observe this behavior, a series of experiments were done where the drone started flying with a fully-charged battery and then let it hover until the battery got discharged. all values were sampled at 50 Hz and mapped, as depicted in Fig. 10.

Throttle is used instead of thrust because this is the signal that is directly input into the motors. In this case,




Fig. 10. Throttle and voltage mapping with tendency lines for different regression models.

throttle is a dimensionless value where 30,000 sets the motors to the lowest speed and 60,000 indicates full speed. The data points are then filtered and used to create a regression model. The improvement when increasing the order of the regression model is not significant. First, second and third-order models yield $R^2 \approx 0.756$. Albeit there is noisy data involved, it is not considered for the regression model since it is already known that the noise comes mainly from the feedback of the controller and the IMU measurements.

Once the model is implemented, the base thrust turns into a variable base thrust whose value will tend to increase the longer the drone keeps flying. To evaluate the model, a series of experiments were conducted using four different thrust controllers: a P and PI height controller, using both the constant and variable base thrust. For each controller, the flight was analyzed in five different directions: *X*-motion, *Y*-motion, *Z*-motion, *XZ*-motion and *YZ*-motion. For each motion, a flight test was done consisting on five repetitions of step-input commands in the given motion, in order to get an average behavior. Hence, Table 2 summarises the standard deviation and the mean absolute error between the transient response and the commanded height for each

motion and controller. Note from the table that for most of the motions, using a PI will result in lower error than a P controller, regardless of the variable or constant base thrust. For most conditions, variable PI reaches the lowest mean absolute error and standard deviation, showing the utility of varying thrust model. Although there is no much difference of the mean error between the PI using constant or variable thrust, the standard deviation of the variable thrust is always smaller. Indicating that the performance when using variable thrust will remain consistent even though the battery voltage drops.

Figure 11 depicts the averaged transient response in height for each controller, for the cases of *X*-motion and *XZ*-motion. The reduction of steady-state error caused by the integral gain is clear in the *X*-motion, where the drone should keep flying at the same height when moving from one position to another. The *XZ*-motion shows a case in which variable thrust model performs less well. In motions where a change in height occurs, performance is more similar between P and PI controllers. From one side, the integral gain tends to increase the settling time compared to the P controller, but at the same time the oscillations of the PI response reduce the error to minimum whenever it crosses the commanded value.

6.2. Ground effect

For the second approach in height control, the target was to investigate whether the ground effect has a large effect when flying low. According to [15], the range of height in which ground effects usually occur is $3d > h > d$, where d is the diameter of propellers in quadrotors. Similarly, for a FWMV, the range would be proportional to the wingspan (0.5 m). Hence, the experiments to model the ground effect consisted on keeping the drone hovering at different heights between 0.33 m and 1.2 m for over a minute. The lowest height tested was 0.33 m above the ground, since this was the lowest height at which the drone can be kept hovering autonomously due to the location of the UWB anchors. In this section, the height is considered to be the distance between the landing gear and the ground. For each different height, a mean thrust and mean voltage are obtained. Using

Table 2. Errors and standard deviations for each controller (best result for each condition is bold-cased).

Controller	<i>X</i> -motion		<i>Y</i> -motion		<i>Z</i> -motion		<i>XZ</i> -motion		<i>YZ</i> -motion		Overall	
	Mean	Std. dev.	Mean	Std. dev.	Mean	Std. dev.	Mean	Std. dev.	Mean	Std. dev.	Mean	Std. dev.
Constant P	0.109	0.08	0.098	0.075	0.077	0.117	0.035	0.166	0.043	0.143	0.072	0.116
Constant PI	0.061	0.159	0.048	0.093	0.06	0.075	0.047	0.09	0.047	0.1175	0.053	0.107
Variable P	0.114	0.069	0.086	0.079	0.065	0.069	0.057	0.116	0.046	0.1038	0.074	0.09
Variable PI	0.049	0.107	0.025	0.083	0.06	0.056	0.05	0.092	0.037	0.061	0.044	0.08




Fig. 11. Extrapolation models for pitch (left) and roll (right) at different velocities.




Fig. 12. Thrust ratio for each height.

the thrust-voltage relationship found previously, the corrected thrust can be obtained. The ratio between the corrected thrust and the mean thrust is specific for each different height, as depicted in Fig. 12. Note that for each data point, an upper and lower bound is also provided based on the standard deviation of the thrust and battery voltage. According to [25], the relationship between thrust ratio and height can be modeled as

$$\frac{T_{\text{input}}}{T_{\text{output}}} = 1 - \lambda \left(\frac{1}{h - a} \right)^2. \quad (7)$$

After mapping the thrust ratio with their respective height, a nonlinear regression model using equation Eq. (7) is applied. Such model approximates the coefficients $\lambda = 0.00093$ and $a = 0.4213$. In Fig. 12, the regression model stays within the bounds of each data point. At the tested heights the ground effect still has relatively little influence on the thrust ratio. The thrust ratio only decreases to 92% at the lowest height of 0.33 m. Thus, the ground effect is little up to 0.33 m. Lower heights are not considered

relevant, because, due to the disposition the UWB anchors, the drone is unlikely to fly lower except during take-off and landing. Nevertheless, the fit shows a sharp drop-off below 0.33 m. Whether this is correct will have to be confirmed with future experiments.

7. Experimental Validation

Once all the modifications were done, two versions of the controller were tested for validation. The first version is referred as “raw” version, which is the working implementation with the default EKF and PID controller mentioned in Sec. 3, without the proposed enhancements. The second version is referred as the “modified” version, and is the implementation with the adaptations mentioned in Secs. 4–6.

The validation consists of analyzing the transient responses in position and velocity when the position step-inputs were given in x , y , and z . For a wider perspective on the stability of the controller, the amplitude of the step input was changed from 1 m to 2 m. Thus, any difference in the aggressiveness of the response can be detected as well. For each motion and step-input, a series of five repetitions were done and averaged to obtain the general behavior of the transient response. Table 3 presents how the mean absolute error, for both position and velocity, decreases when using the modified controller instead of the raw controller. In general, errors are approximately 1.5 times lower after the modifications.

Additionally, Fig. 13 presents the obtained transient responses for both position and velocity. For the sake of simplicity, only the transient responses of velocity in x and y to the step input of 2 m are given, as the increase in performance in those two is the largest, according to Table 3. The effect of drag compensation is observed mainly in the velocity plots, where the modified version is able to reach the maximum commanded values. The standard deviation is

Table 3. Mean absolute errors of validation experiments (best performance for each case is bold-cased).

Mean absolute error for position step input 1						
Version	X-motion		Y-motion		Z-motion	
	Raw	Modified	Raw	Modified	Raw	Modified
Position [m]	0.1706	0.105	0.1898	0.1048	0.0496	0.043
Velocity [m/s]	0.3945	0.1297	0.3001	0.1199	0.1001	0.0892
Mean absolute error for position step input 2						
Version	X-motion		Y-motion		Z-motion	
	Raw	Modified	Raw	Modified	Raw	Modified
Position [m]	0.3316	0.1978	0.2989	0.2055	0.1245	0.1097
Velocity [m/s]	0.6330	0.2859	0.4583	0.1802	0.2476	0.1613




Fig. 13. Transient responses on position and velocity with a step input of amplitude 2.



(a) Absolute error in Velocity X (b) Absolute error in Velocity Y

Fig. 14. Comparison of velocity error during transient response to a step input of amplitude 2.

shaded to illustrate consistency in the response of the modified version, compared to the raw version.

Lastly, Fig. 14 illustrates how the absolute error obtained in the transient response of the modified version is smaller and more consistent than the one of the raw version. The error is defined as the absolute difference between the output value and the corresponding commanded value. The plotted error corresponds to the transient response when the step input of amplitude 2 is given at $t = 1$ s. Note that almost throughout the whole response the error of the modified version is lower than the one of the raw version. Moreover, most of the peaks of the modified version are roughly 75% smaller than the ones from the raw version.

8. Conclusions

The achievement from this work was defining a strategy to enhance position control for FWMAs. From the estimation perspective, the strategy uses an extended Kalman filter to fuse UWB and IMU data, and it also incorporates a variable sensor noise term. Altogether, state estimation achieves accuracy between 8 cm and 10 cm error. From the control side, three specific aspects are considered.

First, a velocity/attitude nonlinear model, which showed to be valid for two different kinds of FWMAs. Thus, proving that it can be adapted, as long as there is experimental data from which the steady-state velocity can be extrapolated for a certain angle. Moreover, the model was validated using real flight data and proved its efficacy for drag compensation as part of the feed-forward term in the velocity control loop.

Second, the lower standard deviation of voltage-dependent thrust, compared to constant thrust, demonstrates a more consistent performance through time. A more notorious contrast can be obtained if the FWMa flies for longer periods.

Third, the ground effect experiments prove that as long as the drone's wings fly above 0.5 m from the ground, no significant additional thrust will appear. Nevertheless, to

know how much extra thrust is produced below 0.5 m, experiments should be done through manual flight.

Lastly, in order to improve performance in autonomous flight using UWB, further development can be done in the position estimation. For instance drag is not considered in the EKF for the estimation of body velocities. An option would be deriving a drag model from IMU data. Other approach would be fusing data from other sources (e.g. barometer and magnetometer data) to compensate for the noisy accelerometer measurements due to inherent mechanical vibrations from flapping-wing flight.

Acknowledgments

The realization of this paper was possible thanks to the support of the start-up Flapper Drones B.V., and the MAV-Lab from the TU Delft Faculty of Aerospace.

References

- [1] C. P. Ellington, The aerodynamics of hovering insect flight. IV. Aerodynamic mechanisms, *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B, Biol. Sci.* **305** (1122) (1984) 79–113.
- [2] M. H. Dickinson, F.-O. Lehmann and S. P. Sane, Wing rotation and the aerodynamic basis of insect flight, *Science* **284**(5422) (1999) 1954–1960.
- [3] J. J. Pomárico-Franquíz, M. Granados-Cruz and Y. S. Shmaliy, Self-localization over RFID tag grid excess channels using extended filtering techniques, *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Signal Process.* **9**(2) (2014) 229–238.
- [4] A. Alarifi, A. M. Al-Salman, M. Alsaleh, S. Alnafessah, M. A. Al-Ammar and H. S. Al-Khalifa, Ultra wideband indoor positioning technologies: Analysis and recent advances, *Sensors* **16**(5) (2016) 707.
- [5] B. Alavi and K. Pahlavan, Modeling of the TOA-based distance measurement error using UWB indoor radio measurements, *IEEE Commun. Lett.* **10**(4) (2006) 275–277.
- [6] Z. Li, G. Chang, J. Gao, J. Wang and A. Hernandez, GPS/UWB/MEMS-IMU tightly coupled navigation with improved robust kalman filter, *Adv. Space Res.* **58**(11) (2016) 2424–2434.
- [7] Q. Fan, Y. Wu, J. Hui, L. Wu, Z. Yu and L. Zhou, Integrated navigation fusion strategy of INS/UWB for indoor carrier attitude angle and position synchronous tracking, *Sci. World J.* **2014** (2014) 215303.

- [8] L. Hachemi, M. Guiatni and A. Nemra, Fault diagnosis and reconfiguration for mobile robot localization based on multi-sensors data fusion, *Unmanned Syst.* **10**(01) (2022) 69–91.
- [9] K. M. Kajak, M. Karásek, Q. P. Chu and G. C. H. E. De Croon, A minimal longitudinal dynamic model of a tailless flapping wing robot for control design, *Bioinspir. Biomim.* **14**(4) (2019) 046008.
- [10] M. R. A. Nabawy and W. J. Crowther, The role of the leading edge vortex in lift augmentation of steadily revolving wings: A change in perspective, *J. R. Soc. Interface* **14**(132) (2017) 20170159.
- [11] D. Xue, B. Song, W. Song, W. Yang, W. Xu and T. Wu, Computational simulation and free flight validation of body vibration of flapping-wing mav in forward flight, *Aerosp. Sci. Technol.* **95** (2019) 105491.
- [12] J. L. Verboom, S. Tijmons, C. De Wagter, B. Remes, R. Babuska and G. C. H. E. de Croon, Attitude and altitude estimation and control on board a flapping wing micro air vehicle, in *2015 IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation (ICRA)* (IEEE, 2015), pp. 5846–5851.
- [13] Z. E. Teoh, S. B. Fuller, P. Chirarattananon, N. O. Prez-Arancibia, J. D. Greenberg and R. J. Wood, A hovering flapping-wing microrobot with altitude control and passive upright stability, in *2012 IEEE/RSJ Int. Conf. Intelligent Robots and Systems* (IEEE, 2012), pp. 3209–3216.
- [14] D. A. Olejnik, B. P. Duisterhof, M. Karásek, K. Y. W. Scheper, T. Van Dijk and G. C. H. E. De Croon, A tailless flapping wing mav performing monocular visual servoing tasks, *Unmanned Syst.* **8**(4) (2020) 287–294.
- [15] I. C. Cheeseman and W. E. Bennett, The effect of the ground on a helicopter rotor, R & M No. 3021 (1957).
- [16] S. Aich, C. Ahuja, T. Gupta and P. Arulmozhivarman, Analysis of ground effect on multi-rotors, in *2014 Int. Conf. Electronics, Communication and Computational Engineering (ICECCE)* (IEEE, 2014), pp. 236–241.
- [17] Y. Xu, Y. S. Shmaliy, X. Chen, Y. Li and W. Ma, Robust inertial navigation system/ultra wide band integrated indoor quadrotor localization employing adaptive interacting multiple model-unbiased finite impulse response/kalman filter estimator, *Aeros. Sci. Technol.* **98** (2020) 105683.
- [18] S. van der Helm, M. Coppola, K. N. McGuire and G. C. H. E. de Croon, On-board range-based relative localization for micro air vehicles in indoor leader–follower flight, *Auton. Robots* **44**(3) (2020) 415–441.
- [19] S. Yuan, H. Wang and L. Xie, Survey on localization systems and algorithms for unmanned systems, *Unmanned Syst.* **9**(02) (2021) 129–163.
- [20] M. Karásek, M. Percin, T. Cunis, B. W. van Oudheusden, C. De Wagter, B. D. W. Remes and G. C. H. E. de Croon, Accurate position control of a flapping-wing robot enabling free-flight flow visualisation in a wind tunnel, *Int. J. Micro Air Veh.* **11** (2019) 1756829319833683.
- [21] M. Karasek, Flapper drones, <https://flapper-drones.com/wp/>, accessed 1 January 2021.
- [22] M. W. Mueller, M. Hamer and R. D'Andrea, Fusing ultra-wideband range measurements with accelerometers and rate gyroscopes for quadcopter state estimation, in *2015 IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation (ICRA)* (IEEE, 2015), pp. 1730–1736.
- [23] M. Karásek, F. T. Muijres, C. De Wagter, B. D. W. Remes and G. C. H. E. de Croon, A tailless aerial robotic flapper reveals that flies use torque coupling in rapid banked turns, *Science* **361**(6407) (2018) 1089–1094.
- [24] T. A. Shams, S. I. A. Shah, A. Javed and S. H. R. Hamdani, Airfoil selection procedure, wind tunnel experimentation and implementation of 6dof modeling on a flying wing micro aerial vehicle, *Micro-machines* **11**(6) (2020) 553.
- [25] L. Danjun, Z. Yan, S. Zongying and L. Geng, Autonomous landing of quadrotor based on ground effect modelling, in *2015 34th Chinese Control Conf. (CCC)* (IEEE, 2015), pp. 5647–5652.



Diana Alina Olejnik received her B.Sc. and M.Sc. in Control Engineering and Robotics at West Pomeranian University of Technology, Szczecin, Poland. In 2017, she started her Ph.D. studies in the Aerospace Engineering Faculty of Delft University of Technology (TU Delft). Her research in the Micro Air Vehicle lab (MAV-lab) of TU Delft is focused on bio-inspired control and design of flapping wing MAVs. Currently, she is working in close collaboration with Wageningen University and Research Centre, Experimental Zoology Group on research project supported by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), where together with other members she is developing a bio-inspired sensory-motor system for gust control of flapping wing MAVs.



Matěj Karásek received his M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees from the Czech Technical University in Prague, Czech Republic, in 2009, and Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium, in 2014, respectively. His research interests include flapping-wing propulsion, flight dynamics and control. From 2015 to 2019, he was a postdoctoral researcher, and since 2020 a guest researcher at the Delft University of Technology, working on the development of bio-inspired tail-less flapping-wing Micro Air Vehicles. He is the founder and the CEO of technological startup Flapper Drones B.V.



Guido de Croon received his M.Sc. and Ph.D. in the field of Artificial Intelligence (AI) at Maastricht University, the Netherlands. His research interest lies with computationally efficient, bio-inspired algorithms for robot autonomy, with an emphasis on computer vision. Since 2008, he has worked on algorithms for achieving autonomous flight with small and light-weight flying robots, such as the Delfly flapping wing MAV. In 2011–2012, he was a research fellow in the Advanced Concepts Team of the European Space Agency, where he studied topics such as optical flow based control algorithms for extraterrestrial landing scenarios. Currently, he is full professor at Delft University of Technology (TU Delft), the Netherlands, and scientific lead of the Micro Air Vehicle lab (MAVLab) of TU Delft.



Guillermo Gonzalez received his B.Sc. in Mechatronics Engineering at Tecnológico de Monterrey in Mexico City, with a minor in Aeronautics. In 2021, he received his M.Sc. in Aerospace Engineering at Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands, where he did his research at the Micro Air Vehicle lab (MAV-lab) focusing in autonomous control of flapping-wing drones. He has previously participated in conferences related to autonomous systems such as IMAV and ICMEAE. His research interests involve the application of advance control techniques such as system identification, reinforcement learning and adaptive nonlinear control.