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This paper presents the autonomous micro aerial vehicle pilot, a new autopilot platform weighing 6.25 g and measuring 11.3 cm², specifically designed for use on micro/miniature aerial vehicle mobile sensing platforms. An overview of the hardware, firmware, ground station, and validation testing used to demonstrate this autopilot as a viable research instrument for atmospheric thermodynamic sensing on micro/miniature aerial vehicles is presented. The autonomous micro aerial vehicle pilot incorporates a 16 bit 140 MHz processor, global positioning system, dual radios, inertial measurement unit, pressure sensor, humidity sensor, and temperature sensor. Through these components, the autonomous micro aerial vehicle pilot is capable of full-state feedback, vehicle state estimation, localization, and wireless networking. Notable features of this autopilot are its dual-radio configuration, providing redundancy and adaptability in communication, and the detachable sensor breakout design that allows for increased flexibility in sensor placement on a vehicle. Full-state feedback of the autopilot platform was validated through a series of bench tests. This includes a unique technique for dynamic inertial measurement unit validation performed using the present group’s model positioning system as well as comparing estimated pressure values with known values at multiple heights and global positioning system values with a known path. System-wide validation was performed through flight tests on a micro/miniature aerial vehicle airframe.

I. Introduction

Micro/miniature aerial vehicles (MAVs) are becoming increasingly popular in civil, military, and scientific fields. MAVs can be used for a variety of purposes, such as navigating compact spaces like those found in urban environments, search and rescue, and disaster assessment. As a result, research communities are constantly experimenting and pushing the bounds of MAV capabilities. Our research group is an example of such, having worked extensively with MAVs to develop cooperative control [1,2], multi-hop communications and sensor networking [3,4], dynamic data-driven application systems [5], and extreme weather monitoring applications [4].

Our group’s previous autopilot, the Colorado PIC (CUPIC) [6], developed at the University of Colorado at Boulder and shown in Fig. 1, served as the core platform of our autonomous research activities until 2014. The CUPIC was designed, based on the capabilities available a decade ago, to be a simple autopilot equipped with a limited number of sensors while still allowing system observability for a MAV under severe weight, size, processing, and sensor capability restrictions [7]. In our group, the CUPIC was predominately flown on a 0.94-m span delta wing aircraft (shown in Fig. 2) and used to test swarm control [1] and sensor networking [3]. During the seven years since the CUPIC’s last update, a number of technological advances have been made in the areas of embedded systems and microelectromechanical system (MEMS) sensors. Accordingly, we decided it was necessary to upgrade from the CUPIC’s large body (6.4 × 2.9 cm with a mass of 19 g) and out-of-date hardware. In this process, we also achieved an equivalent full-state feedback capability for MAV control.

Currently, our group is working in scenarios such as plume detection [1,8,9], atmospheric flow sensing [10], and hurricane tracking [4]. These new research areas benefit most from the use of collaborative MAV swarms, which can enable sensor coverage over large airspaces. As such, the autopilots driving these MAVs should have the capabilities that most benefit a swarm. This includes very lightweight yet adept hardware that is capable of full-state feedback, allowing for state-feedback control (a capability unavailable in our CUPIC autopilot), along with a flexible sensor payload that is easily updated with new sensors. Furthermore, these environments may also require sensor coverage across kilometers of land, such as when tracking multiple plumes in an area. As such, a single swarm may be expected to split into multiple teams of vehicles, which may be separated from each other by significant distances. Thus, a highly customizable form of communication is required on each autopilot, so that communication within a team and within a swarm can be facilitated in a way that is both flexible and low-resource. This communication should allow for both redundancy and adaptability in bandwidth, so that potential radio failure can be accounted for and so that data payloads containing anything from three-digit humidity values to video feeds can be accommodated.

We propose a novel dual-radio autopilot, which allows for power-efficient communication to both near and far targets along with increased data bandwidths and built-in redundancy. This autopilot is also equipped with an easily upgradeable sensor breakout package to facilitate uncomplicated sensor swapping along with the hardware to enable full-state feedback, all in a package weighing slightly more than a U.S. quarter. In the following discussion, we compare capabilities of our system to other autopilots available.

The design of a MAV autopilot is commonly constrained by a number of specifications. Primarily, these autopilots are expected to be lightweight and small. The current MAV autopilot designs weigh no more than 40–50 g nor exceed 60 cm² (based on values from [11,12]). A suite of sensors capable of providing means for altitude estimation, attitude estimation, localization, and remote control are also expected.

When developing and researching a MAV autopilot, selecting the proper hardware is vital. Currently, there are already a number of commercial and open-source, off-the-shelf autopilot platforms available for use on low-weight MAVs. Commercial platforms can often provide capable hardware in a streamlined package. Micropilot’s MP2128 (see footnote §) and Piccolo’s Nano (see footnote §) are two common examples. Both
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1Data available online at http://store.micropilot.com/product-p/a-2128-helip2.htm [retrieved March 2017].
2Data available online at http://www.cloudcaptech.com/products/detail/piccolo-nano [retrieved March 2017].
are lightweight (the MP2128 is 28 g, whereas the Nano is 29 g) and provide a processor, radio, and methods for attitude and altitude estimation. These autopilots are rigorously tested, straightforward to setup, and well suited for standard autopilot needs. However, because of commercial autopilot’s proprietary nature, low-level modification can be quite difficult. The user may often have restricted access to the processor, obstructing software development. This is coupled with the problem that the majority of commercial autopilots run on closed hardware. Closed hardware is commonly difficult to modify and provides limited support for adding external components. These restrictions are less than ideal for research and development purposes.

Open-source autopilot platforms are less restrictive compared to their commercial counterparts, often providing easy access to both the hardware and software for the user to modify. The Lisa/S [11], one of the lightest and smallest autopilots available, is a good example. The Lisa/S contains an ARM processor, GPS, and state estimation hardware. It primarily runs the open-source paparazzi software [13] but is easily reprogrammed to run whatever the user chooses. Schematics are also provided for the Lisa/S, detailing the specifics of its open-source hardware to enable user modification. Another open-source option available is the well-rounded PixHawk development board [14]. The PixHawk runs on an STM processor and includes an MPU-6000 accelerometer and gyroscope, along with the LSM303D accelerometer and magnetometer. The ArduPilot firmware [15] is commonly used to drive the PixHawk, but again, the user is capable of making any software or hardware changes they want, aided by the provided hardware schematics [16].

Despite their advantages, open-source autopilots are still imperfect. Open-source systems often do not include all the hardware required for a fully capable autopilot in mobile sensing applications. This can range from missing a GPS, an inertial measurement unit (IMU), or a radio. The UDB5 [17], a robust autopilot development platform, only comes equipped with a processor and IMU. The user must then add other components to the UDB5, such as a GPS or altimeter, if they wish to gain localization or altitude information.

Commercial and open-source autopilots are often quite adept and even capable enough for advanced autopilot needs on larger aircrafts. However, both types of autopilots still have challenges associated with their use on lightweight, swarm MAVs. Many of these autopilots are simply too heavy. The MP2128, the lightest commercial autopilot at 28 g, is prohibitive on a MAV airframe with a payload 25 g, such as the new generation of short wing aerodynamics modeling platform (SWAMP) MAVs developed and used by our group (see Fig. 3). Even when autopilots are appropriately lightweight, they may have had to make unhelpful sacrifices in the name of size, such as the previously mentioned 3.8 g Lisa/S, which is incapable of multinode networking and which precludes the inclusion of additional sensors.

Another common problem with these autopilots is that their sensors, like the IMU or altimeter, are adhered to a single relatively large board. The user may wish to place a certain sensor on another part of the vehicle for accuracy or flow access reasons. An example is that, although the main
The AMP may need to be kept in the fuselage, as for our smaller SWAMP MAVs, the IMU would need to be adhered closer to the center of mass of the vehicle to aid in state calculations, which may be located outside of the fuselage. Finally, commercial and open-source autopilots generally include either a single radio or require that the user attach a radio themselves. It is especially rare for any included radio to enable wireless networking (such as the XBee radio), which allows the autopilot to act as a node in a larger mesh network, facilitating interautopilot communication. For distributed MAVs, where redundant, flexible communication is critical, systems that seem to treat the radio as an afterthought can be nonconducive.

The autopilot presented in this paper is an attempt to address these issues. Designing our own autopilot allowed us to include all the functionality required to perform in swarm scenarios as well as meet the constraints of our group’s smallest vehicle, the SWAMP MAV (shown in Fig. 3). Because of the small size of the SWAMP MAV, its payload is limited to a maximum of 25 g [including the battery, motor, servos, radio, and electronic speed controller (ESC)]. Because of this, the autopilot would need to be very lightweight. Hardware approaching this weight limit would not be acceptable because this would preclude the addition of extra components. The autopilot system would also need to be low power because energy storage is desired for propulsion. Sensor parsing, control, and telemetry are all computationally expensive operations; therefore, the autopilot would need to be powerful enough to handle these requirements, with processing power to spare for future functionality. In addition, this system must be able to function as a development tool, in order for new or upgraded capabilities to be tested without requiring a hardware revision.

With these specifications and motivations in mind, we created the autonomous MAV pilot (AMP). The AMP is a small, lightweight platform (11.3 cm × 6.25 cm) that is designed for research and development and provides extended capabilities in the forms of communication, sensor flexibility, and wireless networking. It includes two radios, the XBee and Cypress radio frequency (CYRF) system on a chip, as well as the InvenSense MPU9250 IMU. The AMP is composed of two boards: the main board and the sensor breakout, positioning environmental sensors on the main board and the autopilot’s electronic components on the sensor breakout.

The main board handles all incoming and outgoing signals and performs any required operations through the dsPIC processor. These components will be described in more detail throughout the remainder of this section.

A. Main Board
The main board acts as the central hub for the AMP, connecting all the various elements of communication, sensing, and control together. The main board handles all incoming and outgoing signals and performs any required operations through the dsPIC processor.

The main board is 3.25 × 3 cm and includes the following components (see Figs. 5a and 5b): 1) Microchip dsPIC33EP512GM306 digital signal controller (DSC), 2) the Bosch BMP180 pressure/temperature sensor, 3) the Sensiron SHT25 humidity/temperature sensor, 4) the InvenSense MPU9250 nine-axis IMU, 5) the Linx 10Hz TM global navigation satellite system (GNSS) GPS receiver [18], 6) the Digi Series 1 XBee-PRO radio, 7) the Cypress CYRF6936 radio, 8) an 8 MHz crystal, 9) a 12 MHz crystal, 10) a 3.3 V regulator, 11) a programming port, 12) a point-to-point communication. Both radios can be used to broadcast to the same node simultaneously, increasing data bandwidth. The presented autopilot also divides its components between a large main board and a smaller sensor breakout, positioning environmental sensors on the main board and the autopilot’s electronic components on the sensor breakout.

The AMP must be kept in the fuselage, as for our smaller SWAMP MAVs, the IMU would need to be adhered closer to the center of mass of the vehicle to aid in state calculations, which may be located outside of the fuselage. Finally, commercial and open-source autopilots generally include either a single radio or require that the user add a radio themselves. It is especially rare for any included radio to enable wireless networking (such as the XBee radio), which allows the autopilot to act as a node in a larger mesh network, facilitating interautopilot communication. For distributed MAVs, where redundant, flexible communication is critical, systems that seem to treat the radio as an afterthought can be nonconducive.

The autopilot presented in this paper is an attempt to address these issues. Designing our own autopilot allowed us to include all the functionality required to perform in swarm scenarios as well as meet the constraints of our group’s smallest vehicle, the SWAMP MAV (shown in Fig. 3). Because of the small size of the SWAMP MAV, its payload is limited to a maximum of 25 g [including the battery, motor, servos, radio, and electronic speed controller (ESC)]. Because of this, the autopilot would need to be very lightweight. Hardware approaching this weight limit would not be acceptable because this would preclude the addition of extra components. The autopilot system would also need to be low power because energy storage is desired for propulsion. Sensor parsing, control, and telemetry are all computationally expensive operations; therefore, the autopilot would need to be powerful enough to handle these requirements, with processing power to spare for future functionality. In addition, this system must be able to function as a development tool, in order for new or upgraded capabilities to be tested without requiring a hardware revision.

With these specifications and motivations in mind, we created the autonomous MAV pilot (AMP). The AMP is a small, lightweight platform (11.3 cm × 6.25 cm) that is designed for research and development and provides extended capabilities in the forms of communication, sensor flexibility, and wireless networking. It includes two radios, the XBee and Cypress radio frequency (CYRF) system on a chip, as well as the InvenSense MPU9250 IMU. The AMP is composed of two boards: the main board and the sensor breakout board.

Table 1: Comparison of the AMP to a selection of other autopilots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>AMP</th>
<th>CUPIC</th>
<th>Lisa/S</th>
<th>UDB5</th>
<th>Pixhawk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size, cm²</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight, g</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processor</td>
<td>140 MHz dsPIC33EP</td>
<td>40 MHz PIC18</td>
<td>72 MHz ARM Cortex-M3</td>
<td>80 MHz dsPIC33F</td>
<td>168 MHz STM32F427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ram, KB</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash</td>
<td>512 KB</td>
<td>128 KB</td>
<td>512 KB</td>
<td>256 KB</td>
<td>2 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerometer</td>
<td>Three-axis MPU9250</td>
<td>Three-axis MPU9250</td>
<td>Three-axis MPU6000</td>
<td>Three-axis MPU6000</td>
<td>Three-axis LSM303D/MPU6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyroscope</td>
<td>Three-axis MPU9250</td>
<td>One-axis ADXRS</td>
<td>Three-axis MPU6000</td>
<td>Three-axis MPU6000</td>
<td>Three-axis LSM303D/MPU6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetometer</td>
<td>Three-axis MPU9250</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Three-axis HMC5883L</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>Three-axis LSM303D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altimeter</td>
<td>BMP180 barometer</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>MS5611 barometer</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>MS5611 barometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>LINX TM GNSS</td>
<td>Fastrax Ixtra</td>
<td>U-Blox Max-7Q</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-range radio</td>
<td>CYRF6936</td>
<td>XBee Pro</td>
<td>CYRF6936</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-range radio</td>
<td>XBee Pro</td>
<td>XBee Pro</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sensors</td>
<td>SHT25 humidity sensor</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multinode networking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensor breakout</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Main Board
The main board acts as the central hub for the AMP, connecting all the various elements of communication, sensing, and control together. The main board handles all incoming and outgoing signals and performs any required operations through the dsPIC processor.

The main board is 3.25 × 3 cm and includes the following components (see Figs. 5a and 5b): 1) Microchip dsPIC33EP512GM306 digital signal controller (DSC), 2) the Bosch BMP180 pressure/temperature sensor, 3) the Sensiron SHT25 humidity/temperature sensor, 4) the InvenSense MPU9250 nine-axis IMU, 5) the Linx 10Hz TM global navigation satellite system (GNSS) GPS receiver [18], 6) the Digi Series 1 XBee-PRO radio, 7) the Cypress CYRF6936 radio, 8) an 8 MHz crystal, 9) a 12 MHz crystal, 10) a 3.3 V regulator, 11) a programming port, 12) a point-to-point communication. Both radios can be used to broadcast to the same node simultaneously, increasing data bandwidth. The presented autopilot also divides its components between a large main board and a smaller sensor breakout, positioning environmental sensors on the main board and the autopilot’s electronic components on the sensor breakout.

These components will be described in more detail throughout the remainder of this section.

II. Hardware
The AMP’s hardware (see Fig. 4) is designed to collect and parse data from a variety of sensors and receivers, make control decisions, and transmit all pertinent information to a ground station, all with computational power and functionality to spare for future capabilities. The AMP is composed of two boards: the main board and the sensor breakout board.

The AMP’s main components include 1) the Microchip dsPIC33EP512GM306 digital signal controller (DSC), 2) the Bosch BMP180 pressure/temperature sensor, 3) the Sensiron SHT25 humidity/temperature sensor, 4) the InvenSense MPU9250 nine-axis IMU, 5) the Linx 10Hz TM global navigation satellite system (GNSS) GPS receiver [18], 6) the Digi Series 1 XBee-PRO radio, 7) the Cypress CYRF6936 radio, 8) an 8 MHz crystal, 9) a 12 MHz crystal, 10) a 3.3 V regulator, 11) a programming port, 12) a point to point communication. Both radios can be used to broadcast to the same node simultaneously, increasing data bandwidth. The presented autopilot also divides its components between a large main board and a smaller sensor breakout, positioning environmental sensors on the breakout so as to ease sensor upgradability and increase sensor mounting options. Finally, the autopilot platform includes all the components necessary to enable full-state feedback “out-of-the-box”, including a GPS, IMU, pressure, humidity, and temperature sensors.

A comparison of the autonomous micro aerial vehicle pilot (AMP) to other autopilots available on the market is presented in Table 1.

This manuscript is organized as follows. First, the specifications of the hardware used on the AMP are described in Sec. II. The firmware and code used on the AMP are described in Sec. III. This section discusses the architecture of the code as well as the drivers for the AMP’s individual components and communication capabilities. Section IV describes the abilities of the ground station paired with the AMP board. Section V describes the calibration of the AMP’s sensors and Sec. VI describes the tests used to validate the accuracy of the AMP’s components. In Sec. VII, the results of flight testing using the AMP board are presented and discussed. Last, the conclusion is presented in Sec. VIII.
A development port is included in the main board, connecting a number of dsPIC peripherals to user accessible pins, as seen in Fig. 5b. This port allows the AMP to be used as a rapid development tool, providing access to the interintegrated circuit (I2C) and serial peripheral interface (SPI) communication, pulse-width modulation (PWM) output, or analog-to-digital conversion (ADC) features of the dsPIC. As a result, future components, such as new or upgraded sensors, can be added without requiring a new revision of the printed circuit board.

The main board also carries the responsibility of voltage regulation. The AMP can support a supply voltage range of 5–15 V. This source can be either from an attached ESC or through dedicated voltage pins.

### B. Sensor Breakout Board

The sensor breakout board is designed to house the majority of MEMS sensors used by the AMP. The sensor breakout board is 1.4 × 1.1 cm and includes the following components (see Figs. 5c and 5d): 1) BMP180 pressure/temperature sensor, 2) SHT25 humidity/temperature sensor, and 3) MPU9250 nine-axis IMU.
Limiting the sensor placement to the sensor breakout board provides a number of benefits. Because the pressure and humidity sensors are sensitive to ambient temperature, separating them from the main board allows interference from major heat producing components (such as the 3.3 V regulator, XBee, or GPS) to be kept to a minimum. The small size of the sensor breakout also creates more options with regard to placement of the board on or within the body of a vehicle, as compared to the larger main board. Four mounting holes included on the sensor breakout (as seen in Figs. 5c and 5d) allow the board to be easily affixed to the vehicle. These features allow the sensor breakout board to be placed so that any environmental requirements for the included sensors can be met. For example, the SHT25 requires exposure to the airflow of which the humidity is to be tested. Thus, the sensor breakout board can be affixed to the exterior of a vehicle to meet this requirement. Further, having a sensor board separate from the main board simplifies future sensor expansion. Assuming any new sensors communicate over the I2C protocol, the sensor breakout board can be updated with a variety of sensor configurations without requiring any revisions to the main board.

C. Processor

The AMP’s dsPIC33EP512GM306 processor, referred to as the dsPIC, was chosen after a careful review of processors available on the market. When first choosing a processor, the selection was narrowed down to the three categories commonly used in embedded systems: 1) microcontrollers, 2) digital signal processors (DSPs), and 3) digital signal controllers. The benefits and limitations of each category are discussed next.

Microcontrollers are processors outfitted with a wide variety of peripherals as well as sizable amounts of program memory and RAM. As such, microcontrollers are often treated as computers on a chip. Microcontrollers are used for a variety of functions, but most commonly for control applications. However, they often rely on hardware designed for simple mathematical calculations. Because of this, microcontrollers are not suited for a system expected to run computationally demanding programs, such as the AMP.

DSPs are processors with an architecture optimized for signal/data processing. DSPs are commonly used for applications such as image processing or audio compression and are designed to perform complex mathematical operations quickly and efficiently. Nonetheless, many DSPs can lack useful peripherals, such as PWM or ADC modules, and often incorporate less onboard memory compared to microcontrollers. Because of this, DSPs are usually considered unsuitable for control applications and thus were not chosen for use on the AMP.

DSCs combine aspects from both microcontrollers and DSPs. DSCs offer many of the control oriented aspects of microcontrollers, such as fast interrupt handling, a variety of peripherals, and a considerable supply of onboard memory. Similarly, DSCs also provide the data processing capabilities of a DSP through large accumulators and barrel shifters [19]. Because of this computational power and versatility, the DSC category of processor was chosen for use on the AMP.

From the available DSCs on the market, we chose Microchip’s dsPIC line for its range of models, performance specifications, and strong documentation. From there, we selected the dsPIC33EP512GM306 for its large memory, processor speed, and available peripherals.

The dsPIC processor is highly capable despite not having the power of a full-fledged DSP. For example, the dsPIC is capable of processing vision requirements for applications such as determining optic flow or edge detection [20–22]. The processor can also handle a user’s high-level filtering needs, such as for an extended Kalman filter with rates of 100 Hz and over [22–24]. With this processor, our group has had experience running a feedforward, lead, proportional-integral, and two proportional-derivative controllers in parallel at 100 Hz without encroaching on processor time needed for other functions.

Specifications for the dsPIC are listed in Table 2.

D. Inertial Measurement Unit

The IMU is another important component to consider when building an autopilot. The IMU is used to calculate the roll, pitch, and yaw of the vehicle, allowing the control system to determine orientation in reference to a fixed earth frame. A nine-axis IMU was preferred because it allows for more accurate flight dynamics. Because of its proficient specifications, Invensense’s MPU9250 was chosen. The MPU9250 is a nine-axis IMU, composed of a three-axis gyroscope, accelerometer, and magnetometer in a small 3 × 3 × 1 mm package.

E. Global Positioning System

GPS is used to provide geographic coordinates for the AMP, via latitude and longitude information. Chosen for its low current draw of 20 mA, the AMP uses the Linx TM GNSS as its GPS receiver. Horizontal accuracy for the Linx is listed as ±2.5 m, whereas vertical accuracy can be anywhere from ±4 to ±10 m.

F. XBee Radio

For communication with the AMP, Digi’s XBee radio was chosen, specifically the Series 1 PRO model. This radio features a line-of-sight range of up to 1.5 km and communicates over a universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter (UART) connection. One of the primary benefits of using XBees is their support for wireless networking between multiple radios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating voltage</td>
<td>3.3 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pins</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>16 bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash memory</td>
<td>512 KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAM</td>
<td>48 KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU speed</td>
<td>140 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWM outputs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timers</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UART modules</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPI modules</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2C modules</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. CYRF6936 Radio
For communicating with and operating the vehicle, we included Cypress’ 2.4 GHz CYRF6936 radio. This radio features a wireless range of 100 m and an operating current of only 21 mA.

H. Pressure Sensor
The BMP180 is a digital, atmospheric pressure sensor. The BMP180 was chosen because it is capable of providing altitude measurements accurate up to ±1 m with a resolution of 17 cm. The BMP180 also includes a temperature sensor used for pressure calibration.

I. Humidity Sensor
The SHT25 digital humidity sensor is also included on the AMP. The SHT25 is capable of providing humidity information with an accuracy of ±1.8% relative humidity (RH) along with a current consumption of only 30 μA. A temperature sensor is also included within the SHT25 package for humidity calibration.

III. Firmware
The AMP is programmed in C, using Microchip’s MPLAB integrated development environment [25]. Microchip’s PICKIT 3 [26] and ICD 3 [27] programmers are used to program the dsPIC.

A. Architecture
The firmware architecture of the AMP is designed to treat each sensor as independently as possible, in an effort to keep the system modular. Inputs and outputs of components are handled using function calls, keeping code overlap to a minimum. Because of this, the firmware is easily revised as hardware changes are made.

B. Component Drivers
The AMP system generates more than 30 variables that need to be saved and tracked. These include vital autopilot variables that fall into one of three categories: 1) global position (latitude and longitude and course over ground); 2) local position (tri-axis accelerometer, tri-axis gyroscope, tri-axis magnetometer, altitude, and yaw, pitch, and roll); and 3) control (control surface deflections and timestamp).

C. Communication
The AMP on the AMP is used for downlinking data and receiving commands and is paired with another XBee connected to the ground station. The XBee communicates via UART at 115,200 baud and functions in either one of two modes: transparent or application programming interface (API) mode. In transparent mode, anything sent to one XBee is immediately transmitted to the paired XBee. In API mode, a metadata frame must be built around the data to be sent and a checksum calculated and appended; otherwise, the message will be rejected by the XBee and discarded.

IV. Ground Station
The ground station paired with the AMP consists of a Matlab program and an XBee Pro radio connected via USB. The various capabilities of the ground station are listed next.

A. Real-Time Data Display
During a flight, the ground station allows the user to display any variables sent down from the AMP in real time, as seen in Fig. 6. This includes the control and communication status of the vehicle (e.g., GPS lock) as well as any errors reported by the autopilot. Current GPS latitude and longitude are also displayed, with an optional Google maps overlay. Last, this display can be used to track multiple vehicles in the air, plotting separate vehicle variables on the same overlay.

The Linx GPS communicates over UART at 57,600 bps, or 57,600 baud, and pushes GPS messages at a rate of 10 Hz. When a message from the GPS arrives, an interrupt is triggered, and the message is parsed. A checksum is appended to the end of each GPS message, which is used for detecting any errors that may have been introduced to the message while it was transmitted.

The XBee on the AMP is used for downlinking data and receiving commands and is paired with another XBee connected to the ground station. The XBee communicates via UART at 115,200 baud and functions in either one of two modes: transparent or application programming interface (API) mode. In transparent mode, anything sent to one XBee is immediately transmitted to the paired XBee. In API mode, a metadata frame must be built around the data to be sent and a checksum calculated and appended; otherwise, the message will be rejected by the XBee and discarded.
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B. Control

The ground station allows the user to uplink a variety of control commands to the autopilot. This is especially useful when tuning a controller. In this way, the user may transmit a tuning value, observe the resulting control status variables, and then respond accordingly. Thus, the controller values for a new aircraft platform can quickly be determined, especially relevant for a multivehicle autopilot such as the AMP.

C. Waypoint Navigation

The ground station is capable of setting multiple waypoints for the autopilot, making it easy to create a flight plan.

D. Data Logging

All data received by the ground station are automatically logged in a binary file. The binary file can then be parsed and graphed for postflight study. This allows the user to, for example, pinpoint the moment of a flight failure and determine its cause.

E. Data Replay

Data logged by the ground station can also be replayed in real time, displaying the information as though the flight was taking place. This can be used to simplify the debugging of a controller or to aid in presenting a flight.

V. Sensor Calibration

Both our IMU and pressure sensor are calibrated to help ensure a stable flight. Pressure values are offset against ground pressure before a flight and are processed by a low-pass filter to help reduce noise. IMU values are individually calibrated and filtered before being used in attitude estimation.

Our magnetometer requires calibration to adjust for scale factor and any potential hard iron offsets caused by the environment using a method based on [29]. When starting this calibration, the magnetometer is rotated along all axes, and samples for the max and min values of each axis are saved. If the magnetometer is biased, then when these data are plotted, it will likely take the shape of an off-axis ellipsoid. The distances between the max and min values of each axis are then averaged, and this average value is used as the new length for each axis, forming a sphere. The center of this sphere is then shifted to the origin, correcting any offset error.

For our gyroscope and accelerometer, the plane is held flat and steady on startup so that any detected offsets can be corrected. Afterward, the data from each sensor are processed by an eighth-order, low-pass finite impulse response filter with a 10 Hz corner frequency to reduce noise.

Last, our IMU values are processed by a Mahoney filter, which is used for estimating attitude and bias [30]. This filter was preferred over an extended Kalman filter due to its low processing requirements because this is more suitable for MAVs with limited processing capabilities.
VI. Sensor Validation

To validate the accuracy of the AMP’s components, each sensor was initially given individualized tests to assess the accuracy of its readings before an integrated test of the entire AMP system was performed. The components tested include the gyroscope, accelerometer, magnetometer, pressure sensor, humidity sensor, and GPS.

A. MPU9250 Gyroscope

A validation test of the MPU9250’s gyroscope was conducted using our group’s model positioning system (MPS), the DYNAMO [31]. The DYNAMO, designed and built in our group, is a precise positioning system that is able to maneuver the vehicle in four degrees of freedom (roll, pitch, yaw, and plunge) inside a wind tunnel. This equipment has been used to accurately measure stability derivatives and loading on our MAV (see [32,33]). The positioning abilities of the DYNAMO are displayed in Table 3 (plunge values are taken with respect to the test section floor assuming a model parallel with the floor), and a model of the DYNAMO can be seen in Fig. 7.

The AMP was mounted to the DYNAMO (see Fig. 8), where it was swept through oscillatory profiles of roll at an amplitude of ±0.006 deg and frequency of 2 Hz (the DYNAMO itself has an angular velocity accuracy of ±2.5 deg/s at 2 Hz). The gyroscope was set to a full-scale range of ±1000 deg/s. The peak angular velocities of the gyroscope across 40 oscillations were then averaged, and a standard deviation was calculated. This test was repeated for each of the gyroscope’s axes, and the results can be viewed in Table 4. These values are within the ±0.006 deg/s tolerances listed for the MPU9250.

B. MPU9250 Accelerometer

A validation test of the MPU9250’s accelerometer was conducted using our group’s DYNAMO MPS to sweep the IMU through oscillatory profiles of plunge at an amplitude of ±2.54 cm and frequency of 2 Hz (the DYNAMO itself has a plunge acceleration accuracy of ±0.03 m/s² at 2 Hz). The accelerometer was set to a full-scale range of ±8 g. The peak accelerations of the IMU across 40 oscillations were then averaged, and a standard deviation was calculated. This test was repeated for each of the accelerometer’s axes, and the results can be viewed in Table 5. These values are within the ±0.059 m/s² tolerances listed for the MPU9250.

### Table 3: DYNAMO system range of amplitudes for various degrees of freedom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axis</th>
<th>Minimum amplitude</th>
<th>Maximum amplitude</th>
<th>Positioning resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roll, deg</td>
<td>−180</td>
<td>+180</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaw, deg</td>
<td>−180</td>
<td>+180</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch, deg</td>
<td>−45</td>
<td>+45</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plunge, cm</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7 Model of the DYNAMO MPS [31]. The roll motor, yaw motor, pitch and plunge rod, pitch and plunge platforms, and force balance are indicated.
C. MPU9250 Magnetometer

A validation test to determine the ability of the MPU9250’s magnetometer to detect changes in angle was conducted using our group’s DYNAMO MPS (itself possessing an angular position accuracy of ±0.2 deg). The average maximum and minimum values of the three axes were first used to determine the range of the magnetic field; then, the IMU was swept through a 180 deg rotation over the length of 1 min while magnetometer values were recorded. The average and standard deviation of these values at select angles were then calculated. This test was repeated for each of the magnetometer’s axes, and the results can be viewed in Table 6.

D. Linx Global Positioning System

A test was performed to validate the Linx GPS’s latitude and longitude readings by carrying the GPS counterclockwise across the four sides of a rectangular parking garage. This test was repeated four times, and the sample data from each test were plotted with the path traveled, as shown in Fig. 9. Data were collected from the GPS at a rate of 10 Hz and were then compared to the latitude and longitude values of the path traveled using map data from Google. The average error was 1.79 m with a standard deviation of ±1.35. These values are within the ±2.5 m accuracy listed for the Linx [18]. GPS values also returned to within ±2.5 m of the starting point after a full loop of the garage.

E. BMP180 Pressure Sensor

A validation test of the BMP180’s pressure readings was performed by traversing five floors of a parking garage and collecting pressure data from the sensor on each floor for 30 s at a rate of 10 Hz. The data from each floor were then used to calculate a mean pressure and standard deviation. These values were compared against the more accurate WMR300, which lists an accuracy of ±1 hPa. A table of the collected data can be seen in Table 7. All results were within the ±2.5 hPa absolute accuracy listed for the BMP180.

F. SHT25 Humidity Sensor

To confirm the validity of the SHT25’s humidity readings, the humidity values measured by the sensor were compared against three different known humidities. These humidities were created by following the procedure outlined in [34], where a known salt solution is mixed into distilled water inside a sealed container until saturated. The salt solutions used were lithium chloride, potassium chloride, and sodium chloride, each with accuracies of ±0.31, ±0.26, and ±0.12% RH, respectively. Each salt solution was allowed to settle for 24 h after mixing. Afterward, the humidities inside each container were measured by the sensor for 30 s at a sampling rate of 10 Hz. The sampled values for each test were then averaged, and a standard deviation was taken. The results of this test can be seen in Table 8. These results were within the ±1.8% RH accuracy listed for the sensor.

---

**Table 4** MPU9250 gyroscope accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Measured X</th>
<th>X standard deviation</th>
<th>Measured Y</th>
<th>Y standard deviation</th>
<th>Measured Z</th>
<th>Z standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125.7 deg/s</td>
<td>125.1 deg/s</td>
<td>±3.7</td>
<td>124.0 deg/s</td>
<td>±6</td>
<td>124.8 deg/s</td>
<td>±2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5** MPU9250 accelerometer accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Measured X</th>
<th>X standard deviation</th>
<th>Measured Y</th>
<th>Y standard deviation</th>
<th>Measured Z</th>
<th>Z standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00 m/s²</td>
<td>2.02 m/s²</td>
<td>±0.04</td>
<td>2.08 m/s²</td>
<td>±0.06</td>
<td>1.99 m/s²</td>
<td>±0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6** MPU9250 magnetometer accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle, deg</th>
<th>Actual, mg</th>
<th>Measured X, mg</th>
<th>X standard deviation</th>
<th>Measured Y, mg</th>
<th>Y standard deviation</th>
<th>Measured Z, mg</th>
<th>Z standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>±7.8</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>±7.3</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>±7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>122.5</td>
<td>122.2</td>
<td>±8.9</td>
<td>127.88</td>
<td>±8.4</td>
<td>131.48</td>
<td>±7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>246.65</td>
<td>±7.6</td>
<td>241.83</td>
<td>±7.3</td>
<td>241.61</td>
<td>±7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>122.5</td>
<td>123.67</td>
<td>±8.2</td>
<td>125.32</td>
<td>±8.5</td>
<td>119.66</td>
<td>±8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>±7.8</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>±7.0</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>±7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Fig. 8 AMP attached to the supporting wing of the force balance. The roll motor, AMP, supporting wing, and force balance are indicated.
G. Autonomous Micro Aerial Vehicle Pilot System

In an effort to validate that the AMP’s components performed all their required functions, and thus validate the system as a whole, a number of flight tests were performed. The results of these flight tests are discussed in Sec. VII.

VII. Field-Testing Results

We have conducted numerous flight tests using the AMP on our delta wing airframe. Here, we report the performance of three cases. These flights served the purpose of both evaluating the autonomous capabilities of the AMP board as well as carrying out a full system check. The results of these flights are presented in Figs. 10–12.

During each flight, the delta wing was launched and flown by a pilot remotely until stable flight was achieved; then, the autopilot was enabled. The autopilot software and the sensor fusion algorithm used to calculate quaternion values for the autopilot can be found in [6,30], respectively.

The first flight test occurred on a clear day with wind gusts of up to 8 km/h. Three waypoints were uplinked to the AMP via the ground station and successfully navigated by the autopilot. Figure 10 shows a section of the flight during which the delta wing was circling the three waypoints in a counterclockwise loop. Figure 11 shows the control commands for roll and yaw plotted with the resulting Euler angles. Periodic yaw changes observable in Figs. 10b and 11b can be explained by the periodic nature of the waypoint navigation.

Table 7 BMP180 pressure accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Actual, hPa</th>
<th>Measured, hPa</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1024.3</td>
<td>1024.3</td>
<td>±0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1023.9</td>
<td>1023.9</td>
<td>±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1023.6</td>
<td>1023.5</td>
<td>±0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1023.2</td>
<td>1023.1</td>
<td>±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1022.8</td>
<td>1022.7</td>
<td>±0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 SHT humidity accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salt solution</th>
<th>Actual, % RH</th>
<th>Measured, % RH</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LiCl</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCl</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>±0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>±0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second flight test took place on a clear day with wind gusts of less than 5 km/h and was used as an opportunity to improve the tuning values for our autopilot’s roll controller. No waypoints were transmitted to the autopilot; instead, various roll commands were issued, responses were observed, and roll tuning values were adjusted as needed. Figure 12a displays a section of the flight when we were sufficiently satisfied with the tuning values.

During the third flight test, a command to loiter around an uplinked waypoint was issued to the autopilot. The autopilot then flew to and circled this point, maintaining a radius of 50 m. After a number of rotations, a new loiter waypoint was issued to the autopilot, which flew to within loiter range and proceeded to circle the point as before, maintaining a 50 m radius. This flight took place on a clear day with wind gusts of up to 8 km/h, and the resulting flight data can be seen in Fig. 12b.

Based on its performance from multiple flight tests, the capability of the AMP platform was confirmed. The AMP accomplished multiple, stable, autonomous flights with waypoint navigation in dynamic atmospheric conditions using the onboard sensor package to determine altitude, attitude, and localization. The dsPIC processor demonstrated that it was capable of managing the duties of data parsing, telemetry uplink and downlink, manual control, and autonomous control. Telemetry between the ground station and AMP board proved reliable in downlinking and uplinking data and commands. The ground station proved itself to be a competent system for interacting with, and recording data from, the AMP board.

Some limitations of the autopilot were also noted during these flights. For example, some form of obstacle detection on the AMP would be very useful, decreasing the autopilots susceptibility to collisions and helping to remove the need for an operator on the ground. The system would also benefit from an airspeed sensor so that the autopilots’ navigation in windy environments could be improved. Despite this, these flight tests demonstrated the AMP’s qualifications as a mobile sensing platform.
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VIII. Conclusions

A new, multivehicle autopilot designed for autonomous flight on MAVs to enable mobile, atmospheric sensing has been presented. At 6.25 g,

11.3 cm
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and using an atmospheric thermodynamic sensing package (pressure, humidity, and temperature sensors), dual radios, GPS, and IMU, the AMP is a highly capable autopilot system designed for use on very lightweight MAVs.

The design specifications, hardware, firmware, and ground station of the AMP were detailed. The sensors used on the AMP board were each

individually validated to assess their accuracy. Successful autonomous flights were performed on a 0.94-m-span MAV to illustrate the
effectiveness of the AMP. From the flight results, the AMP demonstrated successful autonomous waypoint navigation, using its onboard sensors

for altitude estimation, attitude estimation, and localization. Stable communication with a ground station during the flight was also confirmed

because all pertinent telemetry was captured and recorded while user commands for the autopilot were successfully uplinked. These results

presented the abilities of the AMP as an atmospheric mobile sensing platform, capable of autonomously navigating to a set destination and

transmitting all necessary sensor data.

Future work for the AMP includes research into networking strategies between AMP boards, adding components to enable obstacle detection

and wind-speed sensing, and updates to the hardware design to continue making the system as lightweight and low-power as possible.
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