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Abstract—The accretion of ice layers on wings and control surfaces modifies the shape of the aircraft and, consequently, alters performance and controllability of the vehicle. In this paper we propose a multiple models adaptive estimation framework to detect icing affecting unmanned aerial vehicles using the following sensors: pitot tube (airspeed sensor), GPS, compass and IMU. A case-study is provided as support and validation of theoretical results.

I. INTRODUCTION

Mechanical systems are usually exposed to possible malfunctions or anomalies; these may either be caused by faults occurring in actuators, effectors, sensors and other system components, or be structural, i.e. related to some modification of the nominal system dynamics. The problem of fault detection/identification and fault tolerant control has been widely investigated in recent years [1]; one of the major challenges to be faced in this topic is the correct identification of the fault behavior, in order to apply accommodation policies with the aim of recovering system performances or, at least, ensuring safe operational conditions.

Among structural faults, icing is a major issue for unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs). The phenomenon of ice accretion on aircraft wings and control surfaces is a well recognized problem in aerospace engineering: when ice layers build up, they increase energy consumption and induce a safety risk, with the worst case scenario that the aircraft crashes [2] [3] [4]. Large airplanes are commonly equipped with efficient anti-icing and de-icing devices; however, these are unsuitable for small unmanned aircrafts, due to their simple architecture and limited payload. Ice formations on aerodynamic surfaces during flight are typically caused by the impact of supercooled water droplets (SWD). When a water droplet is cooled, it does not freeze until it reaches very low temperatures; however, the droplets will instantly freeze in the case of interaction with external agents, like aircrafts, releasing their own latent and accreting ice [5]. Both rate and amount of ice depend on the shape of the surface, its roughness, traveling speed, temperature and droplet size.

Large SWD lead to the accretion of clear-ice, having a smooth and clear structure; it is usually characterized by horn-like formations on the wing leading edge [6] and it is the most dangerous type of icing. Rime ice, an opaque and rougher formation, is instead caused by the impact of small SWD. The modified shape of an aerodynamic surface due to ice changes lift, drag and pitch moment characteristics of the surface itself. For instance, an airfoil subject to horn-like ice formations may result in a lift coefficient reduction up to 40%, while the drag may be increased as much as 200%. A decrease in lift requires more engine power and implies a premature airfoil stall angle.

Very recently some advanced de-icing devices for UAV have been proposed based on carbon nanotubes technology [7] [8]; the wing surface can be painted with layers of coating material, which can be heated up very quickly using electricity. However, in order to guarantee the efficiency of the mechanism, it is very important to rely on icing detection and identification schemes with fast and accurate responses. Several approaches have been proposed for icing detection in aircrafts and unmanned aerial vehicles, namely actuator fault detection methods [9] [10] [11]. Kalman filtering [12] or comparison methods for sensor failure diagnosis [13] [14].

In this paper we adopt a multiple-model (MM) approach [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20] [21]. Defining a bank of possible models, corresponding to distinct admissible values of the icing factor, the proposed algorithm guarantees the identification of the closest model to the true system as well as the estimation of the icing severity factor. The main advantages of the MM framework are cost-efficiency, robustness, parallel structure and fast transient response. The paper is structured as follows. The UAV model and the basic setup are given in Section II, while the MM framework is introduced in Section III. The main results are presented in Section IV. Finally, Section V is dedicated to the validation of the proposed results by means of numerical simulations.

II. UAV MODEL

The longitudinal equations of rigid body motion of an aircraft are

\[
\begin{aligned}
& m(\dot{u} + qw - rv) = -mg\sin \theta - D \cos \alpha + L \sin \alpha + T \\
& \dot{q} I_{yy} - pr(I_{zz} - I_{xx}) + (p^2 - r^2) I_{xx} = M_A + M_T \\
& m(\dot{w} + pv - qu) = mg \cos \theta - D \sin \alpha - L \cos \alpha \\
\end{aligned}
\]

where \((u, v, w)\) are the velocities in the directions \((x, y, z)\) w.r.t. the body-fixed frame, \(\theta\) is the pitch angle, \((p, q, r)\) are, respectively, the roll, pitch and yaw rates; \(I_{ij}\) are the coefficients of the inertia matrix, \(m\) is the mass of the aircraft, \(\alpha\) is the angle of attack, \(D\) is the drag coefficient,
L is the lift coefficient, T is the thrust force and \( M_A, M_T \) are, respectively, the aerodynamical and thrust moments for the pitch. The above nonlinear model can be simplified by linearization with respect to some trim conditions; setting \( c_{\alpha} := \cos\alpha_0 \), the steady-state longitudinal linear dynamics is then given by [22]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{\nu} \\
\dot{c} \\
\dot{q} \\
\dot{\theta}
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
X_\nu & X_{\nu,c}\alpha & X_q & -g \cos\theta_0 \\
Z_{\nu,c}\alpha & Z_{\alpha} & Z_{\alpha,c}\alpha & -g \sin\theta_0/V_0 \\
0 & 0 & M_q & 0 \\
M_{\alpha} & M_{\alpha,c} & M_{\theta} & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\nu \\
c \\
q \\
\theta
\end{bmatrix} +
\begin{bmatrix}
X_{\delta h} \\
X_{\delta e} \\
0 \\
M_{\delta h} \\
M_{\delta e}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\delta_{th} \\
\delta_{th} \\
0 \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix} = A_0 x + B_0 u.
\]

The state variables \( x \) to be considered are the horizontal airspeed \( \nu \), the angle-of-attack \( \alpha \), the pitch rate \( q \) and the pitch angle \( \theta \). The symbols \( \alpha_0, \theta_0 \) and \( V_0 \) stand for some suitable trimmed values of angles and airspeed, respectively. The inputs \( u = (\delta_{th}, \delta_{ec}) \) entering the system are the engine throttle \( \delta_{th} \) and the elevator deflection \( \delta_{ec} \). The nominal parameters entering the system matrices can be expressed as follows

\[
X_\ell = \mu_{X_\ell}\tilde{\alpha}C_{X_\ell}, \quad Z_\ell = \mu_{Z_\ell}\tilde{\alpha}C_{Z_\ell}, \quad M_\ell = \frac{\mu_{M_\ell}\tilde{\alpha}C_{M_\ell}}{I_{yy}},
\]

with \( \ell \in \{\nu, \alpha, q, \delta_{th}, \delta_{ec}\} \) and where \( \tilde{\alpha} = 1/2\rho V_0^2 \) is the trimmed dynamic pressure (\( \rho \) being the air density) and the factors \( \mu_i \) depend on the wing spanned area \( S \) and on the airfoil chord \( \tilde{c} \). The non-dimensional coefficients \( C_{X_\ell}, C_{Z_\ell}, C_{M_\ell} \) are usually referred to as stability and control derivatives. The wind force can be modeled as an additive input vector given by

\[
W_0 w = \begin{bmatrix}
-\cos\theta_0 & -\sin\theta_0 \\
-\sin\theta_0/V_0 & \cos\theta_0/V_0 \\
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
w^x \\
w^z
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( w^x \) and \( w^z \) are the wind forces in the horizontal and vertical direction, respectively. Assuming that the UAV is equipped with an airspeed measurement device (pitot tube), compass, GPS and inertial sensors, all state variable are supposed to be available and hence the output matrix of the system is \( C_0 = I_{4 \times 4} \); however, the measurements can be affected by noise and hence the output equation is given by

\[
y(t) = x(t) + \omega(t),
\]

where \( \omega(t) \) is unknown but bounded.

A. Icing effect model

The accretion of clear ice on the aircraft surfaces modifies stability and control derivatives according to the following linear model [23]

\[
C_{\ell t}^\ast = (1 + \eta K_t)C_{\ell t}, \quad \ell = X, Z, M
\]

with \( \ell \in \{\nu, \alpha, q, \delta_{th}, \delta_{ec}\} \) and where \( \eta \) is the icing severity factor and the coefficient \( K_t \) depends on aircraft specifications [4]; the clean condition corresponds to \( \eta = 0 \), while the all iced condition occurs for \( \eta = \eta_{\text{max}} \), where \( \eta_{\text{max}} \) can be determined by the peak in the drag force [3]. It is worth noticing that the coefficients \( K_t \) turn out to be negative, so that model (3) corresponds to downscaling of control and stability derivatives.

As a consequence, the overall effect of icing can be modeled as an additive disturbance term \( \delta \eta \), where \( \eta \) is a scalar unknown quantity and the vector \( \delta \eta \) is assigned by

\[
\delta \eta = \begin{bmatrix}
K_{X_\ell} & K_{X_\ell,c} & X_\alpha & X_q & 0 \\
K_{Z_\ell} & K_{Z_\ell,a} & K_{\nu} & K_{\nu,a} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\eta \\
\eta \\
\eta
\end{bmatrix} +
\begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\delta_{th} \\
\delta_{th} \\
0
\end{bmatrix} = A_\delta x + B_\delta u.
\]

It is worth to note that icing may also alter the airspeed measurements, both directly and indirectly; in particular, ice formations inside the pitot tubes are not unlikely. Moreover, recalling that the angle of attack \( \alpha \) is not directly measured but it is computed through airspeed [24], it follows that also its estimation may be subject to errors in the case of icing. We consider an additive model for the icing effect on the output, i.e. we suppose the output matrix to be given by \( C_0 + \eta C_\sigma \), where \( C_\sigma = [\sigma_\nu \sigma_\alpha 0 0]^T \) is a known vector and \( \eta \) is the fault severity factor.

Remark 2.1: It can be noticed that the accretion of ice on airspeed sensors could be likely faster than on the aircraft surfaces, and that the effects are possibly more severe; this may result in the need of considering two distinct icing severity factors, namely body icing factor \( \eta^b \) and sensor icing factor \( \eta^s \).

The following block diagram illustrates all possible interactions of the icing with the UAV system.
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are, respectively, bounded input and output noise terms. The system matrices $A_\kappa, B_\kappa, C_\kappa, L_\kappa$ contain unknown constant parameters denoted by the vector $\kappa$.

Consider a finite set of candidate parameter values $k := \{ \kappa_1, \kappa_2, ..., \kappa_N \}$; a multiple-model adaptive estimator (MMAE) can be designed according to

$$\hat{x}_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i^t \hat{x}_{t|\kappa_i},$$

$$\hat{y}_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i^t \hat{y}_{t|\kappa_i},$$

$$\hat{k}_t = k_i^*, \quad i^* := \arg \max_{i \in \{1, ..., N\}} p_i^t$$

where $\hat{x}_t, \hat{y}_t$ and $\hat{k}_t$ are the estimates of the state, the output and the parameter vector at time $t$ and $p_i^t$ are dynamic weights to be defined. Each estimated state $\hat{x}_{t|\kappa_i}$ corresponds to the $i^{th}$ Krener minimax observer [25]

$$\hat{x}_{t+1|\kappa_i} = A_{\kappa_i} \hat{x}_{t|\kappa_i} + B_{\kappa_i} u_t + H_{\kappa_i} (y_t - C_{\kappa_i} \hat{x}_{t|\kappa_i}),$$

$$\hat{y}_t = C_{\kappa_i} \hat{x}_t,$$

$$H_{\kappa_i} = A_{\kappa_i} \Sigma_{\kappa_i} C_{\kappa_i}^T [C_{\kappa_i} \Sigma_{\kappa_i} C_{\kappa_i}^T + \Omega]^{-1},$$

with $\Sigma_{\kappa_i}$ assigned by the discrete algebraic Riccati equation

$$-\Sigma_{\kappa_i} + A_{\kappa_i}^T \Sigma_{\kappa_i} A_{\kappa_i} + L_{\kappa_i} \Xi L_{\kappa_i}^T - A_{\kappa_i}^T \Sigma_{\kappa_i} C_{\kappa_i}^T [C_{\kappa_i} \Sigma_{\kappa_i} C_{\kappa_i}^T + \Omega]^{-1} C_{\kappa_i} \Sigma_{\kappa_i} A_{\kappa_i} = 0,$$

where $\Xi$ and $\Omega$ are symmetric positive definite matrices, and the pairs $(A_{\kappa_i}, L_{\kappa_i})$ and $(A_{\kappa_i}, C_{\kappa_i})$ are controllable and observable, respectively.

The dynamic weights $p_i^t$ are generated by the recursion

$$p_i^{t+1} = \frac{\beta_i e^{-\sigma_i^t}}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_j^t e^{-\sigma_j^t}},$$

where $\beta_i$ is a positive constant coefficient and $\sigma_i^t$ is a continuous function called error measuring function, mapping measurable plant signals to nonnegative values. These objects can be defined as follows:

$$\beta_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{||S_{\kappa_i}||}}, \quad \sigma_i^t = \frac{1}{2} ||y_t - \hat{y}_{t|\kappa_i}||_{S_{\kappa_i}^{-1}},$$

with $||x||_Q = (x^T Q x)^{1/2}$ and where the positive definite matrix $S_{\kappa_i}$ is given by

$$S_{\kappa_i} = C_{\kappa_i} \Sigma_{\kappa_i} C_{\kappa_i}^T + \Omega.$$

The dynamic weights are positive and they constitute a partition of unity. These properties are formally stated in the next theorem.

**Theorem 3.1:** Suppose that the initial conditions $p_0^i$ satisfy $p_0^i \in (0,1) \quad \forall i = 1, ..., N$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_0^i = 1$. Then each $p_i^t$ is nonnegative, bounded and contained in the interval $[0,1]$ \ $\forall t \geq 0$. Furthermore

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i^t = 1 \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Moreover, if a distinguishability condition is met, the dynamic weights satisfies an helpful convergence property.

**Theorem 3.2:** Let $i^* \in \{ 1, 2, ..., N \}$ be an index of a parameter vector in $k$ and set $I := \{ 1, 2, ..., N \} \setminus i^*$. Suppose that there exist positive constants $n_1, t_1, \epsilon$ and $\epsilon_1$ such that for all $t \geq t_1$ and $n \geq n_1$ the following conditions hold:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=t}^{t+n-1} (\sigma_i^\tau + \epsilon) < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\tau=t}^{t+n-1} \min_{j \in I} \sigma_j^\tau,$$

$$\log \max_{j \in I} \beta_j - \log \beta_{i^*} < \epsilon_1, \quad \text{with} \ \epsilon_1 < \epsilon.$$ 

Then the dynamic weights $p_i^t$ satisfy

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} p_i^t = 1, \quad \lim_{t \to \infty} p_i^t = 0 \ \forall j \in I.$$

The proofs of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 can be found in [18]. Let us stress that, although the theorem formulation is given in terms of a limit, the convergence rate of weights is typically very fast; moreover we point out that persistence of excitation may be a suitable condition to enhance distinguishability.

**IV. Icing Detection and Identification**

Let us consider the following discretized linear model derived from (1)-(2) by setting a sampling period $\tau_c > 0$ and assuming inputs and disturbances to be constant on each sampled interval:

$$x_{t+1} = A_0 x_t + B_0 u_t + W_0 w_t,$$

$$y_t = C_0 x_t + \omega_t,$$

where $A_0 = e^{A_0 \tau_c}$, $B_0 = \int_0^{\tau_c} e^{A_0 (\tau_c-s)} B_0 ds$, $W_0 = \int_0^{\tau_c} e^{A_0 (\tau_c-s)} W_0 ds$, $C_0 = C_0$.

Assuming the icing severity factor to be slowly-variant, referring to (4), the icing conditions on the system can be expressed by the following matrices

$$\tilde{A}_{ice}(\eta) = e^{(A_0 + \eta A_K) \tau_c},$$

$$\tilde{B}_{ice}(\eta) = \int_0^{\tau_c} e^{(A_0 + \eta A_K) (\tau_c-s)} (B_0 + \eta B_K) ds,$$

$$\tilde{W}_{ice}(\eta) = \int_0^{\tau_c} e^{(A_0 + \eta A_K) (\tau_c-s)} W_0 ds,$$

$$\tilde{C}_{ice}(\eta) = C_0 + \eta C_\sigma$$

Let us assume the horizontal wind force $w_t$ to be estimated through airspeed and GPS measurements, and for sake of clarity, set

$$\tilde{W}_{ice}(\eta) = [\tilde{X}_{ice}(\eta) \tilde{Z}_{ice}(\eta)].$$

Select a set of parameter values $N = \{ \eta_1, ..., \eta_N \}$ with $\eta_1^0 < \eta_{i+1}^0$, $\eta_1^0 = 0$ and $\eta_N^0 \leq \eta_{max}$. In view of Remark 2.1, a vector

$$\eta_i = (\eta_i^0, \eta_i^\kappa), \quad i = 1, ..., N$$

can be defined in order to consider different effects of icing on airfoils and sensors:

$$\eta_1 := (\eta_1^0, \eta_1^\kappa), \quad \eta_{N+1} := (\eta_N^0, \eta_N^\kappa)$$

$$\eta_{N+1} := (\eta_N^0, \eta_N^\kappa), \quad \eta_2 := (\eta_1^0, \eta_1^\kappa)$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\eta_{N-N^*} := (\eta_1^0, \eta_1^\kappa), \quad \eta_N := (\eta_N^0, \eta_N^\kappa)$$
where $N$ can be easily computed as

$$N = N^* \cdot N^*.$$  

Due to (12)-(15) and (16), one can define a bank of possible system models:

$$S_i = \{A_{i}, B_{i}, C_{i}, X_{i}, Z_{i}\}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N$$  

with

$$A_{i} = \hat{A}_{i} \psi_{i}^{T}, \quad B_{i} = \hat{B}_{i} \psi_{i}^{T},$$
$$X_{i} = \hat{X}_{i} \psi_{i}^{T}, \quad Z_{i} = \hat{Z}_{i} \psi_{i}^{T}$$

(18)

We point out that $S_i$ corresponds to the nominal system, while $S_N$ represents a model of the plant with total icing conditions.

**Remark 4.1:** The introduction of additional criterions to exclude the most unlikely events, allows us to reduce the number of models and the computational complexity.

In this way we can adopt the MMAE formulation and consider the family of minimax observers

$$\hat{x}_{t+1}|_{\eta} = A_{\eta} \hat{x}_{t}|_{\eta} + B_{\eta} u_t + X_{\eta} w_t^{\eta} + H_{\eta} (y_t - \hat{y}_t|_{\eta})$$

$$\hat{y}_t|_{\eta} = C_{\eta} \hat{x}_t|_{\eta}$$

$$H_{\eta} = A_{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\eta} \Sigma_{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\eta}^T + \Omega^{-1},$$

where the matrix $\Sigma_{\eta}$ is the positive stabilizing solution of the discrete algebraic Riccati equation

$$-\Sigma_{\eta} + A_{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\eta} A_{\eta} + Z_{\eta} \Xi \Xi^T A_{\eta}^T \Sigma_{\eta} A_{\eta} = 0,$$

with positive definite symmetric matrices $\Omega, \Xi$ to be computed based on the bounds on the output noise $\omega_t$ and on the vertical wind disturbance $w_t^{\eta}$, respectively. The overall estimated state $\hat{x}_t$, estimated output $\hat{y}_t$ and estimated icing factor $\hat{\eta}_t$ are obtained from the MMAE as the combinations (6)-(8), where the dynamic weights $p_t$ are defined and updated according to (9).

Let us fix an arbitrary icing severity factor $\tilde{\eta} = (\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\eta}) \in [0, \eta_{\max}] \times [0, \eta_{\max}]$, and consider the corresponding perturbed plant

$$x_{t+1} = \hat{A}_{\eta} x_t \tilde{\eta} + \hat{B}_{\eta} u_t \tilde{\eta} + \hat{X}_{\eta} \hat{w} \tilde{\eta} + \hat{Z}_{\eta} \hat{w} \tilde{\eta}$$

$$y_t = \tilde{C}_{\eta} x_t \tilde{\eta}$$

(19)

**Proposition 4.1:** Let $\tilde{\eta}, \tilde{\eta} \in \{\eta_{\min}, \eta_{\max} - 1\}$ be such that $\tilde{\eta} \in \{\eta_{\min}, \eta_{\max} + 1\}$ and $\tilde{\eta} \in \{\eta_{\min}, \eta_{\max} + 1\}$. Assume in addition that the distinguishability conditions (10)-(11) are fulfilled. Then the overall estimated state $\hat{x}_t$ converges to the state $\hat{x}_{t}|_{\eta}$ of the model $S_i$, the closest to the true system $x_t$ in the following sense:

$$p_t^* \to 1, \quad p_t^* \to 0 \ \forall j \neq \tilde{e}^*$$

(20)

where the index $\ell^*$ is characterized by the conditions

either $\eta_{\ell^*} = \eta_{\min}$, or $\eta_{\ell^*} = \eta_{\max} + 1$

either $\eta_{\ell^*} = \eta_{\tilde{e}^*}$, or $\eta_{\ell^*} = \eta_{\tilde{e}^*} + 1$.

In particular, there exists $T_{\tilde{\eta}} > 0$ such that the pointwise set inclusions $\tilde{\eta}_{\ell^*} \in \{\eta_{\min}, \eta_{\max} + 1\}, \tilde{\eta}_{\ell^*} \in \{\eta_{\min}, \eta_{\max} + 1\}$ hold true for any $t \geq T_{\tilde{\eta}}$.

**Proof:** The statement follows straightforwardly from Theorem 3.2, provided that the list of claimed values $N$ does not lead to indistinguishability scenarios.

**Remark 4.2:** We notice that, by construction, the procedure (18) yields distinct matrices for any different choice of parameters $\eta^b, \eta^v$, and therefore indistinguishability may only occur if the system output turns out to be equally distanced from two given models. However, for any fixed bank of MM, the largest set of icing values leading to such symmetry condition is a null-measure set.

Proposition 4.1 provides a method for extracting an estimation of the icing severity factor: the accuracy of the estimation depends on the number of multiple models being considered. However, the icing severity factor $\eta$ is typically a time-variant quantity and therefore a method able to adapt to possible switches of $\eta$ is desirable. To this end, the update procedure (9) has to be modified in order to prevent the occurrence of the saturated scenario

$$p_t^b = 1, \quad p_t^v = 0 \ \forall j \neq h \ \forall t > t_1.$$  

Let us consider $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, i.e. such that $\epsilon < 1/N$. For $\Delta > 0$, let us define the truncation operators

$$\text{sat}_{\Delta}(s) = \min(\Delta, \max(s, -\Delta))$$

$$\text{dead}_{\Delta}(s) = s - \text{sat}_{\Delta}(s)$$

Define the weights $p_t^i$ according to the following procedure:

$$q_{t+1}^i = \frac{\beta x_{t+1}^i p_t^i e^{-\epsilon^2}}{\sum_{j=1}^{R} q_{t+1}^j p_t^j e^{-\epsilon^2}} p_t^i,$$

$$r_{t+1}^i = \sum_{j \neq i} \text{dead}_{1-\epsilon}(q_{t+1}^j)$$

$$p_{t+1}^i = \text{sat}_{1-\epsilon}(q_{t+1}^i) + \frac{r_{t+1}^i}{\sum_{j=1}^{R} q_{t+1}^j}$$

(21)

Consider the following scenario, corresponding to a piecewise constant behavior of the icing factor:

- There exist two sequences of distinct values \{\eta^{b, i}, \eta^{v, i}\}, \{\eta^{b, i}, \eta^{v, i}\} and a sequence of time instants $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_R$ such that

  $$\eta^{b, i} = \eta^{b, i}_{\ell_{\max}} \text{ in } [t_{j-1}, t_j)$$

  $$\eta^{v, i} = \eta^{v, i}_{\ell_{\max} + 1} \text{ in } [t_{j-1}, t_j)$$

- The number $N$ of assigned multiple models (17) is such that $N > R$ and moreover, for any $j = 1, \ldots, R$, there exist $\ell^{b, i}_j, \ell^{b, i}_j$ with

  $$\eta_{\ell^{b, i}_j} \in [\eta_{\ell^{b, i}_j}, \eta_{\ell^{b, i}_j} + 1]$$

  $$\eta_{\ell^{v, i}_j} \in [\eta_{\ell^{v, i}_j}, \eta_{\ell^{v, i}_j} + 1].$$

- For any $k = 1, \ldots, R$ let $T_k$ be the estimation time horizon associated to the icing factor $\eta_k$, as defined in Proposition 4.1. Set

  $$T_{\max} = \max_{k=1, \ldots, R} T_k$$

  (22)

**Proposition 4.2:** Assume that the length of time intervals $I_j = [t_{j-1}, t_j)$ is sufficiently large, i.e.

$$\min_{j=1, \ldots, R} |I_j| > T_{\max}$$

(23)

Then the modified weights (21) guarantee that the estimator $\hat{x}_t$ is able to adapt to the switching behavior of the parameter.
\[ \hat{\eta}_j \text{, i.e. one has that for any } j = 1, ..., R \text{ there exists } t_j \in I_j \text{ with} \\
\hat{\eta}_i^t \in \{\eta_i, \eta_i+1\} \text{ for } t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}), \\
\hat{\eta}_i^t \in \{\eta_i, \eta_i+1\} \text{ for } t \in [t_j, t_{j+1}), \]
this corresponding to
\[ \lim_{t \to t_j} I_j^t = 1 - \epsilon, \quad \lim_{t \to t_{j+1}} I_j^t = \epsilon/(N - 1) \forall h \neq I_j \]
where, similarly to (20), \( I_j^t \) is assigned by
\[
either \eta_i^h = \eta_i^t \text{ or } \eta_i^t = \eta_i^t+1 \\
either \eta_i^s = \eta_i^t \text{ or } \eta_i^t = \eta_i^t+1.
\]

**Proof:** It sufficient to apply recursively the scheme given in Proposition 4.1: thanks to (22)-(23), the convergence is guaranteed on any subinterval \( I_j, \ j = 1, ..., R, \) with
\[ \tau_j \leq t_{j+1} + T_{\text{max}}. \]
Moreover, since the update algorithm (21) is introduced in order to prevent saturation, there is no need to re-initialize the weights \( p_i^t \) when switchings between subintervals \( I_j \) occur.

**V. Simulations**

Let us consider the case study of a typical small unmanned aircraft, the Aerosonde UAV (AAI Corporation, Textron Inc.). Initial conditions for the state variables have been chosen as follows: \( v_0 = 22.9 \text{ m/s}, \ \alpha_0 = 0.1 \text{ rad}, \ q_0 = 0, \ \theta_0 = 0. \) Assuming the air density \( \rho = 1.2682 \text{ Kg/m}^3, \) geometric and aerodynamical parameters of the aircraft are given in the following table [22]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>13.5 Kg</th>
<th>Z_n</th>
<th>-0.5385 m/s²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( l_{zx} )</td>
<td>0.8244 Kg/m²</td>
<td>Z_n</td>
<td>-2.1277 s⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( I_{yz} )</td>
<td>1.35 Kg/m²</td>
<td>Z_n</td>
<td>22.95 m/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( I_{yz} )</td>
<td>1.750 Kg/m²</td>
<td>( M_{\alpha} )</td>
<td>-0.1134 (m * s)⁻²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( I_{xx} )</td>
<td>0.1204 Kg/m²</td>
<td>( M_{\alpha} )</td>
<td>-12.1204 s⁻²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S )</td>
<td>0.55 m²</td>
<td>( M_{\alpha} )</td>
<td>-0.4602 s⁻²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{c} )</td>
<td>0.1899 m</td>
<td>( X_{\eta,\alpha} )</td>
<td>59.0570 s⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_{\alpha} )</td>
<td>0.4365 s⁻¹</td>
<td>( X_{\alpha} )</td>
<td>0.4939 m/s²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_{\alpha} )</td>
<td>-0.8802 m²s⁻²</td>
<td>( X_{\alpha} )</td>
<td>4.9230 m²/s²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_{\alpha} )</td>
<td>-2.3027 m/s</td>
<td>( M_{\alpha} )</td>
<td>-15.5248 s⁻²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the coefficients listed above, the linearized longitudinal model (1) of the rigid-body aircraft system is derived. The aircraft attitude is supposed to be controlled by an autopilot, responsible to maintain the steady-state flight conditions in spite of wind disturbances. The wind speed components are assumed to be given by \( \bar{w}^x = 5.5m/s + \text{noise}, \ \bar{w}^z = 0.5m/s + \text{noise}. \) The simulated setup is the following:

- The measurements are supposed to be affected by a bounded noise term \( \omega(t), \) with \( ||\omega(t)|| \leq 0.003. \)
- The icing factor \( \eta = (\eta^b, \eta^s) \) is supposed to be linearly increasing (see Fig. 2) and is assigned by

\[ \eta^b = \begin{cases} 
0 & t \in [0, 25) \\
\text{linear} & t \in [25, 102) \\
0.13 & t > 102 
\end{cases} \]
\[ \eta^s = \begin{cases} 
0 & t \in [0, 9) \\
\text{linear} & t \in [9, 102) \\
0.17 & t > 102 
\end{cases} \]

Assuming \( \eta^b \leq \eta^s \) and restricting to the most likely scenarios only, seven multiple models have been considered, corresponding to the grid of four values \( \eta^b_1 = 0, \eta^b_2 = 0.06, \eta^b_3 = 0.12 \text{ and } \eta^b_4 = 0.18: \)
\[ \eta_1 = (0, 0), \quad \eta_2 = (0.06, 0.06), \quad \eta_3 = (0.06, 0.12), \quad \eta_4 = (0.12, 0.12), \quad \eta_5 = (0.12, 0.18), \quad \eta_6 = (0.18, 0.18). \]

The results are shown in Figs. 3-7: the norm of the true system output switches between the multiple-models as the icing severity factors increase, the weighted estimated output recovers the true system output and the correct estimation of the icing factors is achieved. The dynamic weights (21) have been implemented setting the saturation threshold \( \epsilon = 0.02. \) We notice that the proximity of two weights only occurs naturally during transients and hence distinguishability is guaranteed.
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VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper the problem of icing detection and identifi-

cation for small unmanned aerial vehicles is tackled using a multiple-model framework. Referring to the longitudinal model of the aircraft, which is assumed to be equipped with an airspeed sensor, a compass, a GPS and inertial sensors, a bank of possible system models is defined, each one corre-

The structure of the models is based on the classical Krener min-max observers, and overall state and icing factor esti-

mates are obtained as weighted combinations of the states of the models and the claimed icing values, respectively. The proposed multiple-model estimator is shown to be able to cope with changes of the unknown parameters with a very fast transient response. Numerical simulations support and validate theoretical results: the MMAE-based icing detection and identification scheme has been applied to the case study of the Aerosonde UAV.
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