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Abstract—This paper presents an algorithm that permits the calculation of interception maneuvers for quadrocopters. The translational degrees of freedom of the quadrocopter are decoupled. Pontryagin’s minimum principle is used to show that the interception maneuver that minimizes the time to rest after the interception is identical to the time-optimal maneuver that drives the vehicle to the position at which it comes to rest after the interception. This fact is leveraged to apply previously developed, computationally efficient methods for the computation of interception maneuvers. The resulting trajectory generation algorithm is computationally lightweight, permitting its use as an implicit feedback law by replanning the trajectory at each controller update. The validity and performance of the approach is demonstrated experimentally by intercepting balls mid-flight. The real-time trajectory generation permits to take into account changes in the predicted ball flight path at each controller update.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quadrocopters have been widely adopted as experimental platforms for research in flying robotics (see, for example, the testbeds [15], [20]). Reasons for the popularity of these vehicles include the ability to hover, mechanical simplicity and robustness, and their exceptional maneuverability due to typically high thrust-to-weight ratios combined with the off-center mounting of the propellers.

From a controls perspective, a recent focus has been the planning and following of trajectories that exploit the dynamical capabilities of these vehicles. Results include algorithms that plan trajectories from classes of motion primitives, such as lines [14] or polynomials [4], [7], while others solve an optimal control problem for approximate or full vehicle dynamics (e.g. for minimum snap [19] or minimum time [12]).

In this paper, we consider the problem of using a quadrocopter for the purpose of interception. The general interception problem has been studied in an optimal control context for several decades (see, for example, [5] and references therein). Variations of the problem have also been studied in robotics (e.g. for robotic arms [1] and ground robots [22]). For quadrotor applications, interception problems have been treated in a number of scenarios, including ball juggling, whose interception was more strongly constrained to occur at a specified velocity and attitude [21]. In [3], a ball flight path was intercepted on a given plane by setting the controller reference position to the interception point.

The method we present herein permits the computation of interception maneuvers for quadrocopters in real time. These maneuvers are optimal in that they minimize the time to rest after the interception event, when decoupled dynamics are assumed. This paper shows that the resulting maneuver structure is identical to the time-optimal maneuver that brings the vehicle to the position at which it comes to rest after the interception. This allows us to apply the efficient trajectory planning algorithm that was introduced in [11]. Because the entire trajectory (consisting of the interception and to-rest motion thereafter) is planned, it is easy to verify additional constraints such as, for example, maximum allowable positions.

The trajectory generation algorithm is computationally light weight, permitting us to recompute trajectories in real time at update rates on the order of tens to hundreds of replannings per second. This also permits us to use the trajectory generation as an implicit feedback law by applying the control inputs of the first section of the planned trajectory (similar to model predictive control [8]) at each controller update. Furthermore, trajectories can be planned from arbitrary initial states, and the generated trajectory is guaranteed to be feasible with respect to the dynamic and input constraints of the vehicle.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: In Section II, we introduce the dynamic model of the quadrocopter used in the trajectory generation. In Section III, we provide a brief overview of the previously presented trajectory generation algorithm for time-optimal maneuvers to a specified position. Section IV presents the interception problem and includes the derivation of optimality conditions for interception trajectories. In Section V, we discuss the implementation of an algorithm computing such interception maneuvers. Section VI describes the experimental setup we use to intercept balls mid-flight and presents experimental results, while Section VII draws conclusions, highlighting directions for future research.

II. VEHICLE DYNAMICS

The quadrocopter is described by six degrees of freedom: Its translational position $(x, y, z)$ in the inertial frame $O$ and its attitude $V$, defined by the rotation matrix \( \mathbf{R} \).

The four control inputs of the vehicle are the desired rotational rates about the vehicle body axes $(\omega_x, \omega_y, \omega_z)$, and the mass-normalized collective thrust, $\alpha$, as shown in Figure 1.

It is assumed that the three rotational rates $\omega_x, \omega_y, \omega_z$ can be changed arbitrarily fast. This is motivated by the large rotational accelerations quadrocopters can achieve due to their ability to produce high torques and their low rotational
or delay. This is motivated by a high-bandwidth on-board controller.

minimum and a maximum thrust tracking controllers. The collective thrust is limited by a range of the gyroscopes, or limitations of the body rate limited (such limitations can be caused, for example, by rotational rate dynamics.

Experimental results showing the quadrotor dynamics with three triple integrators: 

\[
\frac{\dot{x}}{g} = 0 \leq \frac{\ddot{v}_x}{0}, \frac{\ddot{v}_y}{0}, \frac{\ddot{v}_z}{0}, \frac{\omega_t}{\max}, \frac{-\omega_t}{\max}, \frac{0}{0}.
\]

A. Equations of Motion

The translational acceleration of the vehicle is dictated by its attitude and the collective thrust control input. In the inertial frame, the translational acceleration is

\[
\ddot{R} = \omega R = 0
\]

where g denotes the gravitational acceleration.

The change of vehicle attitude is related to the rotational control inputs through [16]

\[
\frac{\dot{x}}{\dot{y}} = \frac{\ddot{v}_x}{\ddot{v}_y} + \frac{0}{0}, \frac{\omega_z}{\omega_x}, \frac{\omega_y}{\omega_x}, \frac{0}{0}, \frac{-g}{-g}
\]

and planning the trajectory in the jerks \((v_x(t), v_y(t), v_z(t))\).

The control inputs along a trajectory \((x(t), y(t), z(t))\) are

\[
f(t) := \frac{\dot{v}_x(t)}{\ddot{v}_y(t)} + \frac{0}{0}, \frac{\ddot{v}_z(t)}{g}, \frac{\ddot{f}(t)}{||f(t)||}
\]

\[
a(t) = \frac{\ddot{v}_x(t)}{||f(t)||}
\]

\[
[\omega_t(t) = \frac{\omega_z(t)}{\max}, \frac{-\omega_t(t)}{\max}, \frac{0}{0}]
\]

For a trajectory to be feasible, the resulting control inputs \(a, \omega_x, \text{ and } \omega_y\) must lie within their allowable sets. In order to satisfy the thrust constraint (1), constant acceleration bounds for each degree of freedom are introduced. Furthermore, it was shown that it is difficult to choose allowable jerk values such that the rotational rate control inputs (8) do not exceed the vehicle body rate limitations. It is however straightforward to compute the rotational rates along a planned trajectory. If these exceed limitations, it was shown that a feasible trajectory can always be found by reducing the allowable jerk values.

A trajectory to the target position can be computed for each degree of freedom of the approximate dynamics (4), with given acceleration and jerk constraints. Time-optimal trajectories from arbitrary initial conditions to a target position (to be reached at rest) were presented. Using Pontryagin’s minimum principle, it follows that the switching function is of parabolic shape with additional intervals at the zero crossings in which it remains zero. The optimal control input \(v^*\) is bang-singular, consisting of at most five distinct regions:

- \([0 t_1]: v^* = \pm v_{\max}\)
- \([t_1 t_2]: v^* = 0\)
- \([t_2 t_3]: v^* = \mp v_{\max}\)
- \([t_3 t_4]: v^* = 0\)
- \([t_4 t_f]: v^* = \pm v_{\max}\)

where \(v_{\max}\) denotes the maximum allowable jerk. In this solution, the intervals \([t_1 t_2]\) and \([t_3 t_4]\) represent singular arcs, in which the control input is determined by the acceleration remaining constant on its boundary. The initial control input of the five times \(t_1 \ldots t_f\) fully define the maneuver.

The performance of this trajectory generation algorithm has been demonstrated in a number of experiments [11]. It was shown that it can be used as an implicit feedback law by re-planning a trajectory for each controller update. The computational load caused by this is minor, with computation taking no longer than 0.2 ms on a conventional desktop computer.

We will now adapt the trajectory generation algorithm, not to reach a target position as quickly as possible, but to cross a specified position at a specified time.
IV. THE INTERCEPTION MANEUVER

While the time-optimal to-rest maneuvers presented above are very useful in many applications, situations may arise in which a specified position must be reached more quickly than it is possible to reach at rest. Using the same coordinate decoupling (4) as before, we will now derive trajectories for a given interception point \((\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z})\), which must be reached at a specified interception time \(\hat{t}\).

Because the interception constraint is not sufficient to uniquely define the trajectory, we further require the planned trajectories to bring the vehicle to rest as quickly as possible after the interception. This choice provides two advantages:

- The problem statement now includes not only the motion to intercept the position at the right time, but also the motion to bring the vehicle back to rest after the interception. This is desirable because it permits easy verification of constraints such as a maximum desirable displacement.
- The choice of the time to rest as a cost function forces the vehicle remaining at rest until the interception time (i.e. \(\hat{t}\)) will be satisfied by this time-optimal motion followed by a state constraint at the right time, but also the motion to intercept the position at the right time, but also the motion to bring the vehicle back to rest after the interception. This is desirable because it permits easy verification of constraints such as a maximum desirable displacement.

The problem statement now includes not only the motion to intercept the position at the right time, but also the motion to bring the vehicle back to rest after the interception. This is desirable because it permits easy verification of constraints such as a maximum desirable displacement.

We will now formally state the trajectory generation problem described above, allowing the optimality conditions to be applied in order to find solutions to it.

A. Problem statement

We describe the problem for a single degree of freedom, assuming that we decouple the dynamics according to equation (4). We denote the degree of freedom \(q\), and state the optimal control problem as follows: Let \(s = (s_1, s_2, s_3) = (q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q})\) be the state. The objective is to minimize \(t_f\) subject to the system dynamics

\[
\dot{s}_1 = s_2, \quad \dot{s}_2 = s_3, \quad \dot{s}_3 = v, \quad (9, 10, 11)
\]

and the initial, interception, and final state constraints

\[
s(t = 0) = s_0, \quad s_1(t = \hat{t}) = \hat{q}, \quad s_2(t = t_f) = s_3(t = t_f) = 0, \quad (12, 13, 14)
\]

where \(\hat{t}\) is the interception time and \(\hat{q}\) is the interception position. Furthermore, the input and state constraints

\[
|v| \leq v_{\text{max}}, \quad \hat{q}_{\text{min}} \leq s_3 \leq \hat{q}_{\text{max}}, \quad (15, 16)
\]

must be satisfied.

We begin by noting that the algorithm presented in Section III already solves the above problem if it is possible to reach \(\hat{q}\) such that \(t_f\) is smaller than \(\hat{t}\). Because the computed trajectory reaches \(\hat{q}\) at rest, the interception constraint (13) will be satisfied by this time-optimal motion followed by the vehicle remaining at rest until the interception time (i.e. \(v^* = 0\) for \(t_f < \hat{t} \leq \hat{t}\)). From here on, we will assume that \(\hat{t}\) is smaller than \(t_f\), and will now derive the optimality conditions and resulting structure of optimal maneuvers.

B. Necessary Optimality Conditions

Analogous to the derivations for the original trajectory generation algorithm, we apply the minimum principle (see, for example, [2]) to derive necessary conditions for optimal input trajectories. The state constraints (16) are handled using a direct adjoining approach [10], in which the Hamiltonian function is augmented by the state constraints. With the cost given to be the final time, the Hamiltonian is then

\[
H(s, v, \lambda, \eta) = 1 + \lambda_1 s_2 + \lambda_2 s_3 + \lambda_3 v + \eta_1 (-\hat{q}_{\text{min}} + s_3) + \eta_2 (\hat{q}_{\text{max}} - s_3), \quad (17)
\]

where \(\lambda\) are the adjoint variables and \(\eta\) are state constraint multipliers that fulfill the constraints

\[
\eta \geq 0, \quad \eta_1 = 0 \text{ if } s_3 > \hat{q}_{\text{min}}, \quad \eta_2 = 0 \text{ if } s_3 < \hat{q}_{\text{max}}, \quad (18, 19, 20)
\]

The adjoint variables evolve over time according to

\[
\dot{\lambda} = -\nabla_v H(s, v, \lambda, \eta), \quad (21)
\]

from which it follows that

\[
\lambda_1 = 0, \quad \lambda_2 = \lambda_1, \quad \lambda_3 = \lambda_2 + \eta_1 - \eta_2, \quad (22, 23, 24)
\]

The optimal control \(v^*\) is the control input that minimizes the Hamiltonian function:

\[
v^* = \arg \min_{v} H(s, v, \lambda, \eta) = \arg \min_{\lambda_3 v}. \quad (25)
\]

At the interception time \(\hat{t}\), the discontinuity in the first adjoint variable [5] is

\[
\lambda_1(\hat{t}^-) = \lambda_1(\hat{t}^+) + \nu, \quad (26)
\]

where \(\hat{t}^-\) and \(\hat{t}^+\) signify just before and just after \(\hat{t}\), respectively, and \(\nu\) is a constant Lagrange multiplier. The other two adjoint variables \(\lambda_2, \lambda_3\) remain continuous over the interception time. Because the final state \(s_1(t_f)\) is free, the costate constraint at the final time is [2]

\[
\lambda_1(t_f) = 0. \quad (27)
\]

It was shown in [18] that, for problems of this form, the adjoint variables \(\lambda\) are continuous when the acceleration constraint (16) becomes active or stops being active. Furthermore, \(\lambda_3 = 0\) must hold over the duration in which a state constraint is active.

The costate dynamics (22)-(24) form a double integrator with respect to \(\lambda_3\). With \(\lambda_1\) being zero from \(\hat{t}^+\) onwards, and with the intersection time condition (26), it follows that the trajectory of \(\lambda_3\) has the following shape, which is sketched in Figure 2:

- In the time interval \([0 \hat{t}^-]\), \(\lambda_3\) has a parabolic shape because \(\lambda_3 = \lambda_1\) is constant when no constraints are active.
- In the time interval \([\hat{t}^+ t_f]\), \(\lambda_3 = \lambda_1 = 0\), implying that \(\lambda_3\) has constant slope when no constraints are active.
positions occurring after the time \( t \) the shape switches from parabolic to constant slope as \( \lambda_1 \) jumps to zero. The intervals \([t_1, t_2]\) and \([t_3, t_4]\) represent singular arcs, in which one of the acceleration constraints (16) is active.

- Whenever \( \lambda_3 \) has a zero crossing, an acceleration constraint may become active, implying that \( \lambda_3 \) remains zero while the constraint is active.

C. Equivalence to time-optimal motions

It follows from the above constraints that the maneuver minimizing the to-rest duration with the interception constraint must have the same structure as the time-optimal trajectories presented in the previous section: Both consist of, at most, three regular arcs (where \( \lambda_3 \neq 0 \)) and two singular arcs (where \( \lambda_3 = 0 \)). Both trajectories are fully specified by the five times \( t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4, \) and \( t_f \) and the initial control input. For the interception trajectory, an additional constraint arises because the switching function \( \lambda_3 \) is linear after the interception time: The remaining trajectory can only contain two regular arcs and one singular arc.

Now, assume that we have computed an interception maneuver that satisfies the above optimality conditions, implying that it minimizes the to-rest duration after the interception. The maneuver terminates at some position \( q_f \) (by definition of the maneuver this position is reached at rest). Then this maneuver is identical to the time-optimal maneuver from the same initial conditions to the position \( q_f \) as described in Section III: Because both the time-optimal maneuver to \( q_f \) and the interception maneuver are fully defined by the switching times and the initial control input, and all boundary constraints are satisfied for both maneuvers, this must be the case.

Conversely, assume that we have computed a time-optimal maneuver to the position \( q_f \). Then for all intermediate positions occurring after the time \( t_2 \), this is the interception maneuver that is optimal with respect to the above optimality conditions (we must limit the intermediate positions to ones occurring after \( t_2 \) due to the constant slope of \( \lambda_3 \) permitting only one zero crossing after \( t_2 \).

The above equivalence of interception maneuvers and time-optimal maneuvers allows us to leverage the trajectory generation algorithm that we have developed for time-optimal maneuvers, as will be seen in Section V.

D. Existence of solutions

While the optimality conditions describe the structure of interception maneuvers that minimize the to-rest time after interception, it remains to verify that a maneuver satisfying the interception constraint (13) exists. Clearly, this will not always be the case: For small values of \( \hat{t} \), the available control effort will not suffice to drive the system to \( \hat{q} \) in time if \( \hat{q} \) differs significantly from the motion dictated by the initial conditions. This is a fundamental difference to the motion to a given end point discussed in Section III, where all target points could be reached.

The existence of solutions can be formalized as the position \( \hat{q} \) (with arbitrary velocity and acceleration) lying in the reachable set at time \( \hat{t} \) for the given initial conditions. Using the fact that the reachable set is convex [6], it can be shown that the positions reachable at time \( \hat{t} \) are bounded by the two trajectories for which \( t_2 = \hat{t} \) (these are trajectories that apply the maximum or minimum possible control effort for the entire duration up to \( \hat{t} \). The upper bound is reached by applying \( v^* = v_{\text{max}} \) in the interval \([0 t_1]\), and the lower bound is reached by applying \( v^* = -v_{\text{max}} \).

Note that if no solution to the interception problem is found with this strategy, then there exists no other control input that can reach the interception point at time \( \hat{t} \) [13]. This implies that, if we assume the decoupled dynamics (4), the strategy presented above provides an interception trajectory whenever the interception constraint (13) can be satisfied by the system dynamics.

V. COMPUTATION AND VERIFICATION OF INTERCEPTION MANEUVERS

In this section, we discuss how the properties of optimal interception trajectories can be used to efficiently compute interception maneuvers.

A. Computation of maneuvers

The identical structure of the interception maneuver and the time-optimal maneuver (recapitulated in Section III) permits us to compute maneuvers satisfying the interception constraint in a fashion that is very similar to the one employed for time-optimal maneuvers (see [11]): There is generally no closed-form solution for the five times \( t_1 \ldots t_f \) from the constraint equations (12)-(14) and the singular arc constraints (19)-(20). It is however straightforward to find solutions using a one-dimensional bisection algorithm. While the computation of a time-optimal maneuver is carried out by iterating over the position at the end of the maneuver until the final position constraint is satisfied, we now iterate over the position at the interception time \( \hat{t} \) in order to satisfy the interception constraint.

B. Extremal points of the trajectory

In many interception scenarios, it is important to not only satisfy the interception constraint, but to also come to rest within certain space constraints. We have not included such position constraints in the derivations in Section IV (the trajectory is already fully defined by the chosen constraints and optimality conditions, and additional constraints would complicate the trajectory structure significantly).

However, verifying such constraints once the trajectory has been planned is straightforward: The solution computed by the interception strategy presented herein results in a position trajectory that is piecewise polynomial of at most order three. This makes it simple to compute extremal points by finding
points where the velocity vanishes. Such extremal points can then be compared to space restrictions.

C. Control effort distribution between the degrees of freedom

All previous derivations were based on a single degree of freedom. In order to intercept a position in 3D, all three degrees of freedom must be able to reach their respective target position by the interception time. To control each degree of freedom’s ability to reach the target point in time, the acceleration constraints (16) can be varied. The three acceleration constraints are linked through condition (1). We parameterize the acceleration constraints as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{z}_{\text{max}} &= c_x a_{\text{max}} - g, \\
\dot{z}_{\text{min}} &= a_{\text{min}} - g, \\
\ddot{z}_{\text{max}} &= x_{\text{min}} = c_x \sqrt{a_{\text{max}}^2 - (\dot{z}_{\text{max}} + g)^2}, \\
\ddot{y}_{\text{min}} &= \sqrt{1 - c_x^2} \sqrt{a_{\text{max}}^2 - (\dot{z}_{\text{max}} + g)^2},
\end{align*}
\]

where \(c_x\) and \(c_z\) are parameters. It is straightforward to verify that for all values of \(c_x \in [0,1]\), \(c_z \in [g/a_{\text{max}}, 1]\), the acceleration constraint (1) is satisfied.

It then remains to find parameters \(c_x\) and \(c_z\) such that each degree of freedom is able to reach the interception point. We propose a two-step strategy:

1. Starting from \(c_z = 1\), find the lowest value \(c_x\) for which the vertical degree of freedom is able to both satisfy the interception constraint and not violate space restrictions, and then
2. vary \(c_x\) until both horizontal degrees of freedom reach the interception point and remain within space constraints.

The above method finds a three-dimensional interception trajectory that satisfies the interception constraint and possible space restrictions. It may however be beneficial to additionally specify a performance measure for the choice of \(c_x\) and \(c_z\). We intend to investigate this in further research.

The above steps complete the description of an algorithm permitting the computation of a three-dimensional interception maneuver that is feasible with respect to the dynamics and constraints of the quadrocopter.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

The interception strategy presented herein has been tested in the Flying Machine Arena, an aerial vehicle development platform at ETH Zurich [17]. To demonstrate its performance, we apply it to the problem of “hitting” a ball mid-flight with a quadrotor vehicle.

A. Experimental setup

We use modified Ascending Technologies ‘Hummingbird’ quadrocopters [9]. The vehicles are equipped with custom electronics, allowing greater control of the vehicle’s response to control inputs, sensors providing a higher dynamic range, and extended interfaces [17].

The trajectory generation algorithm is run on an off-board desktop computer at a rate of 70 Hz. For each computed trajectory, a command consisting of the three vehicle body rates and the collective thrust is sent to the vehicle through a low-latency 2.4 GHz radio link. The full state information (required for the initial conditions of the trajectory generation) is obtained from a state observer. The state observer receives precise vehicle position and attitude measurements from an infrared motion capture system at a rate of 200 Hz.

The ball that the vehicle is to hit is also tracked by the motion capture system, and its state is estimated using a Kalman filter combined with a drag coefficient estimator [21].

B. Determination of ball interception time

The interception algorithm presented above requires the interception time and position as inputs. To intercept the flight path of the ball, the interception time remains to be chosen. It is fixed as follows:

We consider the ball to be flying as soon as it crosses a threshold height. At this point, its flight path is predicted forward based on a first-principles model of its dynamics. The prediction is evaluated in discrete time steps from the current time up to the time at which the ball will fall below a certain height. The interception feasibility is verified for each of the discrete prediction points, with the additional constraint that the entire maneuver must remain within a specified volume. If the ball is interceptable, a range of possible interception times is found, the mean of which is chosen as the interception time to which the planning will occur from this point on. Figure 3 shows a ball being found, and a number of planned candidate interception trajectories. The interception time chosen by the algorithm lies in the middle of the candidate trajectories.

Note that further investigation is required to find the best way to choose the interception time. The method presented here was seen to work well in experiments, but its properties have not been analyzed thoroughly. We intend to investigate this in future work.

C. Flight results

Flight tests were carried out with the ball being thrown in varying directions. It was found that the vehicle was able...
to intercept ping-pong sized balls reliably when a feasible interception trajectory was found. A video showing a number of experiments may be found on the first authors web site.

Figure 4 shows an interception maneuver that highlights the advantage of the real-time capability of the trajectory generation algorithm: At the beginning of the maneuver, the ball state and drag estimates are subject to significant variation. Because the interception trajectory is replanned at every controller update, the moving interception point is naturally considered for each controller update. In this specific example, the interception point changes by about 55 cm over the course of 0.6 s before converging, and the vehicle successfully intercepted the ball.

VII. CONCLUSION & OUTLOOK

This paper introduced an interception trajectory generation algorithm for quadrotor vehicles. It was shown that the problem can be reformulated such that its structure is identical to the trajectory generation for time-optimal trajectories. For this class of trajectory generation problems, an efficient computational method has been developed previously and could be readily adapted. The successful implementation of this interception strategy has been verified experimentally by intercepting balls mid-flight.

In the trajectory design approach presented herein, a number of design parameters remained to be chosen, for example the control effort tradeoff between the three decoupled degrees of freedom. We are planning to investigate ways to systematically choose these such that the best possible performance is achieved.

Furthermore, we intend to investigate strategies for determining the optimal interception time for objects flying along trajectories, where optimality could be defined by criteria such as minimal vehicle velocity at interception time, the shortest time to interception, or other objectives.

An interesting extension of this work would be to include multiple interception constraints. Because the current interception method is computationally very lightweight, we believe that it should be possible to plan such multiple interception trajectories while maintaining real-time capabilities.
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