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Abstract

This thesis presents the research undertaken by the author within the field of intelligent traction motor control for Hybrid Electric Vehicle (HEV) and Electric Vehicle (EV) applications.

A robust Fuzzy Logic (FL) based traction motor field-orientated control scheme is developed which can control multiple motor topologies and HEV/EV powertrain architectures without the need for re-tuning. This control scheme can aid in the development of an HEV/EV and for continuous control of the traction motor/s in the final production vehicle.

An overcurrent-tolerant traction motor sizing strategy is developed to gauge if a prospective motor’s torque and thermal characteristics can fulfil a vehicle’s target dynamic and electrical objectives during the early development stages of an HEV/EV. An industrial case study is presented.

An on-line reduced switching multilevel inverter control scheme is investigated which increases the inverter’s efficiency while maintaining acceptable levels of output waveform harmonic distortion.

A FL based vehicle stability control system is developed that improves the controllability and stability of an HEV/EV during an emergency braking manoeuvre. This system requires minimal vehicle parameters to be used within the control system, is insensitive to variable vehicle parameters and can be tuned to meet a vehicle’s target dynamic objectives.
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Chapter One

Introduction

This thesis outlines the research conducted by the author surrounding intelligent traction motor control methods for Hybrid Electric Vehicle (HEV) and Electric Vehicle (EV) applications. These control systems aim to simplify the development of an HEV/EV, increase the energy efficiency of the traction motor/inverter and improve the vehicle’s safety. This is achieved by investigating various control technologies for the traction motors, Direct Current (DC) to Alternating Current (AC) inverters – also known as DC-AC inverters - and Vehicle Stability Control (VSC) systems. This chapter presents the purpose for this research in Section 1.1, vehicle development trends and challenges in Section 1.2, the research objectives in Section 1.3 and the thesis structure in Section 1.5.

1.1 Purpose of the Research

The main purposes for the research conducted in this thesis include; Environmental protection on a global and local platform; reducing tensions surrounding the dwindling energy and fuel supply crisis; and improving vehicle safety during emergency braking scenarios.

1.1.1 Environmental Protection

Climate change threatens the future of our survival on this planet. Mankind’s impact from the burning of fossil fuels and the production of greenhouse gasses is undeniably the main perpetrator to the rising irreversible global climate [1, 2].

“No challenge poses a greater threat to our future and future generations than a change in climate”

- Barack Obama, 2015
Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) is the leading greenhouse gas contributing to climate change [3]. The breakdown of CO₂ emissions by sector in Figure 1.1 shows that 18% of the total CO₂ emissions produced globally comes from the burning of fossil fuels within an Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) in the road transportation sector alone [4, 5]. In addition, an ICE produces large quantities of other greenhouse gases such as Methane (CH₄) and Nitrous Oxides (NOₓ) [6]. Forecasts of the total emissions produced from the transport sector are predicted to increase over the next few decades [7, 8]. The greenhouse gases produced by an HEV/EV are a fraction of those generated by a purely ICE powered vehicle [9].

**Figure 1.1** Global CO₂ emissions from fuel combustions by sector in 2015 [5]

Particulate matter emissions produced by an ICE pose the greatest threat to human health within urban environments [10]. In the UK alone, nearly 29,000 deaths are attributed to exposure with fine particulate matter each year [11]. Vehicle emissions in urban areas account for nearly 30% of the NOₓ and 54% of the Carbon Monoxide (CO) emissions produced globally [12]. NOₓ emissions are converted into photochemical smog when exposed to ultraviolet light, extended exposure to this causes eye irritation and deteriorates respiratory functions [13, 14].
Both HEVs and EVs use electric traction motors to drive the vehicle (see Section 2.1). Optimising the traction motor and powertrain components enable the motor to operate in the high efficiency regions for longer and dissipate less energy as heat. For HEVs, this can lead to an increase in fuel economy and possibly a reduction in output emissions [15, 16]. For both Plug-in HEVs (and pure EVs, this would enable the vehicle to drive longer distances between recharging and consequently reduce the burden upon the electrical grid - reducing the emissions from the Electricity and Heat generation sector (see Figure 1.1) [17, 18]. Tools that aid in the development of an HEV/EV by correctly sizing a traction motor can influence the total emissions produced by the vehicle. Development of an HEV/EV can be difficult, time consuming and expensive [17, 18]. Intelligent traction motor control techniques that can be applied to multiple motors and vehicles would enable a vehicle manufacturer to easily optimise their HEV/EV design to improve efficiency and reduce emissions. The more tools available to vehicle manufacturers that reduce the development time and cost might increase the number of HEV/EVs produced and therefore reduce the overall global emissions produced by the transportation sector.

1.1.2 Energy and Fuel Scenario

The current World Energy Outlook forecasts higher and an ever-growing need for more energy and fuel over the next few decades [19]. The New Policies Scenario is expected to require an additional 20% increase in energy and a 32% increase in oil over the Sustainability Development Scenario. Figure 1.2 shows that from the total energy demand, nearly 50% of the global energy consumption by end-user is expected to come from the transportation sector [20].

An HEV consumes less fuel than a purely ICE powered vehicle, an EV consumes none (directly). As popularity with these vehicles increase, the burden on the current fuel stocks used
within the transport sector reduces. However, it is thought that a full EV society would merely shift the energy demand onto the power generation sector. Therefore, an equal effort in the move towards renewable energy is also required to fully exploit the benefits HEV/EVs and alleviate the fuel and energy crisis.

![Figure 1.2 Passenger transportation energy consumption estimates up to the year 2040 between (a) Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries and (b) Non-OECD countries, scale in quadrillion Btu [22]](image)

As with Section 1.1.1, if the efficiency of these vehicles can be improved by optimally sizing the powertrain components and efficiently controlling the traction motors, then it may elevate some of the foreseen energy and fuel demand as HEVs will have increased fuel economy and EVs will be able to drive for longer between charging.

### 1.1.3 Vehicle Safety

Road traffic incidents are the result of; excessive speed, driving in poor weather conditions, driver error or distracted drivers and component failure. There were nearly 2,000 deaths on UK roads in 2017 and a further 28,000 serious injuries, of which 57% of total casualties involved passenger vehicles [21]. In 2016, excessive speed in harsh conditions accounted for nearly 24% of fatal incidents [22].
Safety is one of the highest priorities in vehicle design. HEV/EVs have exceptional dynamic performance and stability control because the electric traction motor/s offer high frequency and instant torque modulation, simple feedback to the control system and easy estimation of the current driving conditions [23, 24, 25]. Intelligent control over the traction motor/s therefore allow an HEV/EV to have a shorter breaking distances and superior steering controllability over an ICE counterpart [26, 27, 28]. These improved safety features ensure that there is a greater chance that a driver would be able to remain in control of their vehicle during an emergency manoeuvre and reducing the total number accidents and fatalities.

1.2 Vehicle Development Trends and Challenges

It is generally considered by the general public and researchers within the automotive industry that the HEV/EV is the next technological paradigm for the transport sector for personnel, public and fleet vehicles [29, 30]. Figure 1.3 shows that an estimated 55% of all new car sales are expected to be electrified by 2040, this accounts for 33% of the total global fleet [31]. The growth in HEV/EVs has been attributed to both the public’s concern over the issues (discussed in Section 1.1), but also due to planned legislation requiring vehicle manufactures to move towards an EV future [32].

The reason for the growing popularity of electrified vehicles is that they consume less fuel and emit lower emissions when compared to pure ICE powered vehicles [33]. The current challenges in reaching an all-electric vehicle market from the consumers’ point of view include; limited driving range [34], long charging times, the upfront cost and lifetime of the battery packs [35, 36].
Other technological issues include; the impact on the electrical grid [37], material acquirement for batteries [38] and battery recyclability [39, 40]. These issues are being addressed through research and development in their respective fields. No single solution solves all the current challenges, but it requires the collective effort in all areas of science and engineering [41, 42]. This thesis aims to contribute to the current trend in HEV/EV development and tackle some of the major challenges facing their development, the key objectives undertaken as explained in Section 1.3.

1.3 Research Objectives and Approach

The original research objective of this thesis was to investigate intelligent control systems for an HEV/EV. This was separated into the following objectives as follows:

1) To understand the key technical milestones and the current state of the art literature for traction motor modelling, power delivery and intelligent control techniques for HEV/EV applications.
2) To develop tools which simplify the control system of a traction motor system in order to speed up and reduce the development cost of an HEV/EV.

3) To develop tools which optimise the powertrain components of an HEV/EV in order to increase the energy efficiency, reduce fuel consumption and reduce output emissions.

4) To investigate and develop energy efficient methods of powering a traction motor for HEV/EV applications.

5) To develop methods of controlling an HEV/EV’s traction motor based powertrain to improve the vehicle’s safety during an emergency manoeuvre.

The general approach to the research conducted in this thesis will follow a similar pattern; First, simulate the control system using pre-existing established control methods. Secondly, develop new control techniques based on the gaps in the current literature. Thirdly, verify the new control technique’s ability for hardware implementation. Finally, evaluate and compare the new control method to the pre-existing method. This research approach will be achieved largely through detailed simulation studies in MATLAB/Simulink utilising CarSim vehicle models and an intensive series of Processor-in-the-loop (PIL) verification experiments. This is explained in more detail in Section 3.1.

1.4 Key Contributions

The main contributions and novel ideas investigated within this thesis include:

1. A new traction motor Field-Orientated Control (FOC) scheme that can control multiple motor topologies and HEV/EV powertrain architectures without the need for re-tuning. A further investigation into controller robustness under the effects of variable motor parameters is conducted, this type of investigation is rarely done in literature and has never been done for HEV/EV applications.
2. A new empirical data based traction motor model is developed and its application as a traction motor sizing tool is shown. The effects of early stage traction motor sizing on the final vehicle’s powertrain design, energy usage and fuel economy is then explored with a real-world case study.

3. An on-line reduced switching inverter control scheme is developed which increases the inverter’s efficiency without compromising on the output waveform harmonic distortion. The performance of the inverter control scheme is then investigated over a wide range of traction motor operating regions, unlike other investigations which only investigate a few operating points.

4. A Vehicle Stability Control (VSC) system that improves the controllability and stability of an HEV/EV during emergency braking manoeuvres is developed that requires minimal vehicle parameters within the control system, is insensitive to variable vehicle parameters and is tuneable to meet a vehicle’s target dynamic objectives. Whereas other researchers only investigate the a few simple braking manoeuvres, this VSC system is analysed over numerous real-world emergency braking scenarios with a further investigation into the likelihood of if the vehicle could be controlled by real drivers.

1.5 Thesis Outline

Chapter Two reviews the current state of the art control techniques relevant to the research undertaken in this thesis. The limitations and real-world challenges associated with traction motor modelling and control for HEV/EV applications are investigated first. The various control systems and objectives of DC-AC inverters are then explored. Finally, the VSC systems which control the wheel slip and yaw dynamics of an HEV/EV are reviewed.
Chapter Three introduces the general vehicle dynamics, traction motors and inverters modelling and control techniques which are conventionally used in vehicle simulations. An explanation as to how and when they are used in this thesis is given. The experimental PIL procedure adopted within this thesis is then described which is used to verify the control system’s readiness to move onto full hardware validation.

Chapter Four develops a Fuzzy Logic (FL) based Field-Orientated Control (FOC) scheme to control any HEV/EV powertrain architecture and multiple motor topologies without the need for re-tuning. A detailed comparison between the simulated FL based FOC scheme and a conventional Proportional-Integral (PI) controller based FOC scheme is given with a further investigation into the controller’s robustness.

Chapter Five develops a new HEV/EV traction motor sizing strategy whereby an overcurrent-tolerant prediction model is used to estimate the dynamic and thermal characteristics of a motor operating in the overcurrent region. A case study is explored where this sizing strategy is used to convert an aeroplane pushback vehicle into a series HEV. The feasibility of two possible HEV configurations are then explored further.

Chapter Six develops an on-line Reduced Intermediate Switching Space Vector Pulse Width Modulation (RIS-SVPWM) scheme for multilevel HEV/EV DC-AC inverters. The RIS-SVPWM scheme identifies the switching patterns of the voltage vectors enclosing the reference voltage on-line and controls the switching devices of the inverter with minimal switching. A detailed comparison between the switching count and harmonic quality of the waveforms generated by the RIS-SVPWM scheme against a previous on-line scheme is then given.

Chapter Seven develops a FL based VSC system that has been developed in this thesis which improves the controllability and stability of an HEV/EV during combined emergency braking
and steering manoeuvres. A detailed comparison between the simulated FL based VSC system, a conventional Anti-Lock Braking System and an advanced wheel slip controller is given.

Chapter Eight summarises the major points from the research conducted in this thesis. A critical analysis of this research is given and with recommendations for future work.
Chapter Two  

Literature Review

This chapter presents a comprehensive review of the key literature which examines the theoretical concepts, state of the art technology and research trends surrounding; traction motor modelling and control, methods of powering the traction motor and intelligent motor control techniques that improve vehicle safety. Firstly, a broader view of HEV/EV powertrain architectures are discussed in Section 2.1 before moving onto various traction motor characteristics, modelling and control theories in Section 2.2. Popular DC-AC inverter topology and control theories are then presented in Section 2.3. Finally, state of the art Vehicle Stability Control (VSC) systems for HEV/EVs are investigated in Section 2.4. At the end of Section 2.1 - Section 2.4, the research gaps from the literature reviewed will be stated. Section 2.5 will summarise these gaps and present a set of specific research objectives to be investigated in the remainder of this thesis.

2.1 The HEV and EV

The Electric Vehicle (EV) dates back to the mid-1800s, they were rudimentary in comparison to the vehicles of today and their effectiveness in comparison to horse drawn carriages was still under debate [43, 44]. The Hybrid Electric Vehicle (HEV) later utilised an Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) to charge the battery pack and provide additional power when travelling up gradients [45]. The HEV/EVs of today are more refined than their predecessors and because their potential driving range increases are approaching comparable values of a pure ICE vehicles they are becoming more appealing to customers.
2.1.1 HEV Powertrain Architectures

An HEV stores energy on-board in more than one form, most notably as hydrocarbon-based fuel and electricity stored within an Energy Storage System (ESS). An Additional Power Unit (APU) provides power to the vehicle’s DC-bus to charge the ESS and/or power the traction motors. Conventional HEV APU systems consists of an ICE, but more research for future HEVs to use fuel cells as an APU is being conducted as they generate no harmful emissions and no noise [46, 47, 48].

Depending on the powertrain architecture, an HEV is able to provide torque to the driven wheels using a traction motor alone and/or be coupled to the ICE to provide additional power. The traction motors are connected to the vehicle’s DC-bus which is powered by a battery pack. An ultracapacitor bank may be used if the battery pack cannot provide the peak output power alone [49, 50]. Plug-in HEVs (P-HEV) have grown in popularity because they are able to charge the ESS from an external source [31]. HEV powertrains will normally fall within one of the three following architectures shown in Figure 2.1 [51, 52, 53, 54]:

1) Series HEV – Shown in Figure 2.1(a), this architecture is closely related to a pure EV where only the traction motor/s provide the driving torque to wheels. The ICE is not mechanically connected to the wheels but instead spins the rotor of a generator to charge the ESS. This architecture has the highest efficiency because the ICE runs at its most efficient point, but the vehicle’s dynamic performance is limited to the performance of the traction motor/s.

2) Parallel HEV – The traction motor and ICE are mechanically coupled by a gearbox which allows them to provide torque to the driven wheel together or independently from one another as shown in Figure 2.1(b). Typically, the traction motor is used at low speeds or low torque applications and the ICE takes over once a threshold has been reached. The ICE can provide mechanical power to the motor which will act as a generator to charge the ESS.
Figure 2.1 HEV powertrain architecture, (a) Series-HEV, (b) Parallel-HEV, (c) Power Split-HEV
3) Power-Split HEV – This behaves similarly to a parallel HEV, but with the inclusion of a dedicated generator the vehicle is also able to act as a series-HEV as shown in Figure 2.1(c). This is a popular powertrain architecture for HEVs because even with the additional costs it allows the greatest control freedom between the two powertrain systems. This was most notably popularised through the Toyota Prius [55, 56].

2.1.2 EV Powertrain Architectures

An EV only uses electric traction motor/s to provide torque to the driven wheels. They do not contain an on-board APU so the ESS must be charged from an external source. The driving range of an EV is limited to the energy stored within the ESS alone (excluding any regenerative braking abilities). There are numerous powertrain architectures for an EV, the following shown in Figure 2.2 are the most common [57, 58]:

1) A single motor with a single/multi speed gearbox as shown in Figure 2.2(a). The power flow of this vehicle is similar to a conventional vehicle utilising a single ICE. The ESS powers the traction motors which provides torque to the driven wheels alone.

2) Dual traction motors with separate gearboxes as shown in Figure 2.2(b). This system allows for greater freedom when choosing between Front-Wheel Drive (FWD), Rear-Wheel Drive (RWD) and All-Wheel Drive. This architecture is adopted by the Tesla Model S P100D which uses a small motor on the front axle while cruising at low speed, and a high-power motor on the rear axle for quick acceleration [59].

3) The use of multiple independent motors as shown in Figure 2.2(c) is able to regulate the torque at any of the driven wheels without the need for complex torque splitting differentials with full freedom of where to apply torque.
Figure 2.2 EV Powertrain Architecture, (a) Single motor with single/multi speed gearbox, (b) Dual motors with single speed transmissions, (c) Four independent in-wheel motors with single speed gearboxes
2.2 Traction Motors for HEV/EV Applications

2.2.1 Background into Electric Motors

Nikola Tesla’s ground-breaking presentation to the American Institute of Electrical Engineers in 1888 introduced his patented Alternating Current (AC) electric motors. He presented three motor topologies; the synchronous motor, the synchronous Reluctance Motor (RM) and the Induction Motor (IM) which became the starting point for future AC motor drives [60]. In 1889, Mikhail Dolivo-Dobrovolsky added a third phase to an IM to reduce the inherent torque ripple problems of Tesla’s two-phase motors [61]. Then only three years after Tesla’s original paper, General Electric and Westinghouse collaborated on developing an IM for mass production using a squirrel cage rotor in 1891 [62]. Cahill published the complete theory of Permanent Magnet Synchronous Motors (PMSM) in 1962 by attaching permanent magnets to the squirrel cage of an IM [63].

Charles Steinmetz wrote several publications about how equivalent analytical circuits are an effective tool for representing and analysing AC motors [64]. Robert Park’s and Edith Clarke’s voltage transformations significantly simplified the analysis of AC motors [65, 66]. This allowed the three-phase system to be separated into individual torque and magnetic flux producing current components.

2.2.2 Traction Motor Topology Characteristics

DC motors were a popular choice for transportation applications in the early 20th century because they are relatively simple in construction and produce high torque at low speeds [67]. However, due to their dependence on carbon commutators they were unreliable, generated high friction at high speeds, had a low specific power density and their relatively large volume saw them being overtaken by the AC traction motor.
One factor which determines a motors eligibility for HEV/EVs applications is the output torque ripple from the rotor shaft. This ripple can be generated either by mechanical imbalances (due to uneven wear of rotor shaft bearings, etc.), poor motor design or excessive current distortion (Total Harmonic Distortion $\geq 5\%$). A general rule for motor design and control systems is that a torque ripple magnitude $\leq 1\%$ of the motor’s rated torque is desirable for most applications including HEV/EVs [68].

Currently, the four common traction motor topologies for HEV/EV applications include the IM, Surface-PMSM (S-PMSM), Interior-PMSM (I-PMSM) and the RM. The cross sectional view of these motors are shown in Figure 2.3 and are characterised as follows [69, 70, 71, 72]:

1) IM – As shown in Figure 2.3(a), the IM has no magnets but instead induces its own magnetic flux within the windings of the rotor on the basis of Lorentz’s law. Their simple construction makes them inexpensive, rugged, and reliable. These qualities make them an ideal candidate for HEV/EV traction motors. In addition, they have good dynamic performance and a wide speed range. However, they are susceptible to rotor winding failure due to overheating which means they have a relatively lower efficiency and require the most amount of cooling.

Figure 2.3 Traction motor constructional topologies cross-section view, (a) IM, (b) S-PMSM, (c) I-PMSM, (d) RM
2) S-PMSM – This motor uses permanent magnets attached to the outside of the rotor as shown in Figure 2.3(b). Because the permanent magnets produce a constant magnetic flux, no current is required to be induced in the rotor (as with an IM), and therefore have higher efficiency and require less cooling. However, the permanent magnets are brittle, sensitive to temperature changes and because the magnets are on the outside of the rotor, they are vulnerable to demagnetization and create a large air gap between the rotor and stator.

3) I-PMSM – Similarly to the S-PMSM, this motor also uses permanent magnets attached to the rotor, but they are now buried inside as shown in Figure 2.3(c). When placed inside the rotor, the magnets retain themselves without additional fixings, are less prone to demagnetization and reduce the air gap between the rotor and stator. As with the S-PMSM the magnets are expensive and their orientation within the rotor requires careful attention since they induce reluctance torque. The cross-sectional shape of the magnets within the rotor allows for different torque-speed characteristics. These have been the most popular choice for traction motors in modern HEV/EVs [67].

4) RM – These motors have no rotor windings or permanent magnets as shown in Figure 2.3(d). Instead, they use reluctance torque to spin the rotor using a carefully designed rotor core. The large rotor mass makes this motor less susceptible to failure due to overheating. However, they are not currently used for traction applications because they suffer from undesirably large torque ripple, poor noise quality, excessive vibration, low power density and require dedicated inverter circuits [73].
2.2.3 Traction Motor Modelling Techniques

Analytical models provide a good trade-off between computational effort and accurate characterisation of an AC motor, these are often used during the development stages of an HEV/EV [70, 71, 74, 75]. These models represent the motor as equivalent electrical circuits constructed from smaller components (resistors, inductors and voltages) whose currents determine the torque and magnetic flux of the motor. Per-phase analytical models provide useful information about the motor’s dynamic performance and power requirements during steady-state conditions, but cannot be used with more advanced control methods (see Section 2.2.4) [76]. Magnetic circuit analysis or Finite-Element Analysis of the motor are extremely detailed and accurate representations of the physical motor, but due to their high computational requirements they are usually confined to AC motor development and not used for HEV/EV simulations [67].

Simple empirical data based torque-speed curves and efficiency maps characterise the traction motor/s of an HEV/EV when a low simulation time is preferred over model accuracy [77, 78]. This is done at the cost of losing some motor control analysis, but fewer motor parameters are required. This approach is used for preliminary vehicle design analysis or where the primary objective of the research is not heavily reliant on the motor’s current control (e.g. vehicle stability control).

2.2.4 Advanced Traction Motor Control Schemes

Field-Oriented Control (FOC) is a popular motor control method because it allows for independent control over a motor’s torque (q-axis $i_{qs}$) and magnetic flux (d-axis $i_{ds}$) producing current components [79, 80, 81]. During the late 60’s, Blaschke and Hasse proposed the Indirect-FOC and Direct-FOC schemes as a way of controlling IMs and PMSMs respectively.
The general theory of both FOC schemes are similar to one another, but I-FOC has to estimate the position of the IM’s rotor flux wave because it cannot be measured easily or accurately. When compared to the preceding scalar V/Hz motor control, FOC increases the torque responsiveness, improves the overall efficiency by avoiding oversaturation of the magnetic material and improves field-weakening performance at high speeds [84, 85, 86, 87]. However, FOC requires multiple independent controllers for the motor’s speed and current components that must be carefully tuned, multiple voltage and current sensors, a rotor speed sensor (if sensorless FOC is not used) and an independent Pulse Width Modulation (PWM) scheme to generate inverter switching patterns.

Direct Torque Control (DTC) in a similar way to FOC tries to minimise the error between the dq-current axes. DTC uses a look-up table to directly control the inverter’s switching patterns and achieve the target voltage vector [84]. This negates the need for current controllers and an external PWM module. Generally, DTC offers a greater torque responsiveness over FOC, but generates high current/torque ripples, produces variable-switching behaviour, high noise and offers poor control at low speed [85].

Model Predictive Control (MPC) is another popular control technique for AC motors [86, 87]. An optimisation problem is used to find the optimal inverter switching sequence to meet an objective cost function using a model of the motor within the control scheme. MPC has shown to be more responsive than FOC and more control freedom than DTC [88]. A major drawback of MPC is the large computational effort required to simulate all the possible scenarios for each action [89]. This confined MPC to slow varying processes such as chemical plant and industry process applications for many years [90]. However, with improved modern processors the use of MPC for real-time applications such as motor control schemes have grown in popularity. The accuracy of MPC is greatly affected by model parameters and signal noise.
in the feedback loops. These effects can be minimised with improved parameter estimators and filters, but the added computational complexity rises further [91]. The resemblance of MPC based current control to hysteresis current controllers in DTC can require variable inverter switching frequency and can promote higher torque ripple [92]. To reduce the computational burden of MPC, the model used within the control algorithm can be simplified. This then produces a trade-off between controller accuracy and computational effort [93, 94, 95, 96].

MPC for motor control operates either as Predictive Torque Control [97, 98] or Predictive Current Control [99]. Predictive Torque Control aims to minimise the error between the electromagnetic torque and the magnitude of the motor flux by generating appropriate target axis currents. Predictive Current Control aims to minimise the dq-current error by selecting suitable inverter voltage vectors [98]. The computational effort of Predictive Current Control grows exponentially with inverter size as the total number of available switching states grows [100]. Samaranayake [101] reduced the degradation of a traction motor by minimising the power losses. The MPC scheme by Schubert [102] was used to optimise the trade-off between torque and flux producing current control to improve motor efficiency and torque responsiveness, this provides good performance during start-up operations.

2.2.5 Optimised FOC Strategies

Because the magnets of an I-PMSM are buried within the rotor, the magnetic circuit of the motor becomes disturbed and a d-axis reluctance torque is generated. Jahns [103] developed the Maximum-Torque-Per-Amp (MTPA) control for an I-PMSM to exploit the motor’s d-axis reluctance torque to produce useful work. Jahns later extended the MTPA theory into the constant-power speed region of the I-PMSM to cover the motor’s entire torque-speed range [104]. MTPA allows smaller permanent magnets to be used, increases the power density and
efficiency of the motor and improves the torque responsiveness. Morimoto [105] applied the MTPA theory to both S-PMSMs and I-PMSMs while abiding to current and voltage constraints. Morimoto [106] also explains how the supply voltages must be compensated to account for the cross-coupling between the dq-axis.

A similar MTPA theory was developed by Kim [107] for an IM. Maximum Efficiency Per-Amp control theory by Lemmens [108] searches for the smallest d-axis current which generates the lowest iron and inverter switching losses for the same target torque output using a gradient based optimisation problem. Sergaki [109] showed how the efficiency of an IM increases by reducing the d-axis current when the motor is under light load and use a larger q-axis current instead to produce more useful work.

2.2.6 Real World Motor Control

The physical properties of a motor (electric resistance of the rotor/stator windings, inductance and magnetic flux) vary with temperature [110]. FOC requires accurate representations of these parameters in order to operate optimally and the control parameters representing these properties should also change to reflect their physical counterparts [111].

Matsuo [112] developed an on-line gain scheduling scheme to improve the FOC performance of an IM susceptible to variable rotor resistance. Bose [113] showed how to compensate the B-EMF voltage to account for changes in the permanent magnet’s magnetic flux strength. Holtz [114] and Marino [115] developed on-line rotor flux estimation methods to identify the parameters of an IM for direct use within the FOC scheme. Lemmens [108] also provides a temperature control scheme to limit the current without affecting the Maximum Efficiency Per-Amp control of the motor and prolonging the lifetime of the motor. However, this control scheme yields undesirable torque/current ripple and produces audible noise from
running the inverter at a low switching frequency. These publications highlight some of the
difficulties that arise from the variable motor parameters and how the control scheme should be
modified to ensure optimal control. However, these methods require highly detailed and time-
consuming experimentation for each particular motor under investigation.

2.2.7 Controller Types for FOC

Sliding Mode Controllers (SMC) for FOC offer quick responsiveness and great robustness
with a well-designed sliding surface. SMC speed [116] and current [117] controllers have
superior control over Proportional-Integral (PI) counterparts. However, SMCs suffer from
implementation issues due to the chattering nature of the controllers at steady-state if not
properly accounted for with adaptive smoothing functions [118, 119]. Also, designing a good
sliding surface is not an intuitive process when dealing with complex non-linear systems.

Neural Networks for motor speed and current control are computationally efficient and
robust once they are trained [120, 121]. However, these controllers would again require re-
tuning and re-training between systems. An artificial neural network speed controller trained
via a GA showed superior speed tracking and torque responsiveness over a conventional PI
speed controller [122]. The neural network developed by Lftisi [123] is trained on-line for the
speed control of an IM with the aim of mimicking an optimally tuned PI controller. This negates
the need for time consuming off-line manual PI controller tuning or neural network training,
but the effect of variable motor parameters and the on-line training time is not discussed.

FOC schemes commonly use PI controllers to regulate the speed of a vehicle/motor, the
independent current components and the magnetic flux because they are simple to use, require
little computational effort and operate with minimal steady-state error if tuned correctly [124,
If tuned incorrectly then these controllers may produce unstable or non-optimal vehicle/motor control.

A Fuzzy Logic Controller (FLC) offers an accurate representation of how a vehicle’s speed would be controlled by a real driver and therefore a better estimation of how the physical vehicle would perform in the real world. A FLC also offers greater robustness over a PI controller because it is insensitive to variable motor parameters, similar controller designs have appeared for numerous publications using vastly different motors [126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131].

2.2.8 PI vs Fuzzy Logic for FOC

2.2.8.1 Speed Control using FOC

Numerous heuristic optimisation techniques [85] have been developed in response to PI controller gain tuning including; Particle Swarm Optimisation (PSO) [132, 133], Genetic Algorithms (GA) [125, 134] and Backtracking Search Optimisation [135]. Each of these optimisation methods improve the control performance of the PI controllers without an intensive manual iterative tuning process but require re-tuning for different FOC systems and may still suffer from variable motor parameters.

One inherent characteristic of PI controllers is that they tend to overshoot their control objective if improperly tuned, this is unrealistic and not desirable for vehicle control applications. For example, a PI speed controller that overshoots the target velocity will have to apply the brakes in order to reduce the vehicle’s speed. In the real world, a driver would reduce the accelerator pedal ahead of the approaching target velocity. This has been investigated by numerous researchers who have compared the performance of PI vehicle/motor speed controllers against FLCs [136, 137, 138].
An adaptive Fuzzy Logic (FL) controller by Zeb [139] used to control the speed of an IM was shown to not only have greater robustness over a PI speed controller, but to also reduce the steady-state error by on-line updating the input and output gains via an optimisation algorithm. Hybrid PI-FLC speed controllers also reduce some of the overshooting and robustness difficulties that arise from pure PI speed controllers for FOC [140, 141, 142, 143, 144]. These use a PI system to tune the input and output gains of a FLC and combine some of the robustness of a FLC with the small steady-state error of a Proportional-Integral-Differential (PID) controller. Alonge [145] presented a PI-FLC system to control a motor’s speed, command flux and dq-axis current components. This has good variable tracking performance, but Alonge offered no robustness analysis with variable motor parameters. A PI-FLC speed controller by Masiala [146] uses a PI controller to change the input/output gains, membership function and rule base of a Takagi-Sugeno type FLC. The PID elements of these hybrid controllers still require an iterative tuning process for each independent system being controlled. The FL-PID speed controller presented by Rohan [147] uses a FLC to change the proportional and integral gains of a PI controller and reduces the overshoooting characteristics. However, this does not use any current control so the performance of this system cannot be fully validated.

2.2.8.2 Current Control using FOC

The output from a PI or FL speed controller in an FOC system is either a target output torque or a target q-axis current. If a FL speed controller is used in conjunction with a PI q-axis current controller, the benefits of the FL speed controller may not be as effective if the motor’s torque overshoots its target value or if the current controller is susceptible to parameter changes. FLCs also show superior current control over PI counterparts for both the q-axis $i_{qs}$ [148] and d-axis $i_{ds}$ [149, 150, 151] currents. Lubin [148] compares independent FL speed and $i_{qs}$ current...
controllers to a PI based FOC system. The highly robust FLCs proved to be insensitive to variable parameter changes when the rotor resistance was intentionally altered, whereas the PID controllers tuned for the original motor system became unstable and had a sluggish response.

Typically, the target flux producing d-axis current in an IM is not as dynamic as the torque producing q-axis current, it remains constant up to the motor’s rated speed and gradually reduces as the motor speed increases in the constant power region. It might be seen that the d-axis current does not require the same attention as the q-axis current and a PI controller is sufficient for most circumstances. But as explained previously in Section 2.2.6, varying parameters may affect the motor’s ability to produce flux and the d-axis current tracking may suffer. In an I-PMSM, the d-axis current’s reluctance torque requires the regulator be more active. FOC schemes that incorporate FL d-axis current controllers have improved robustness as with the FL q-axis current controllers [149, 150, 151].

2.2.9 Research Gaps in the Field of Traction Motor Modelling and Control

FOC is now thought to be a mature branch of motor control. Generally, the scope of intelligent motor control is moving in the direction of sensorless-FOC to estimate the rotor/flux position without rotary encoders, fault detection mechanisms and control of future motor topologies such as switched and synchronous reluctance motors for HEV/EV applications. However, from the literature reviewed in Section 2.2, the author recognises the following gaps in the literature which aim to be resolved within this thesis:

1) The high robustness of FLCs and their insensitivity to variable motor or vehicle parameters makes them ideal for vehicle control applications. However, it has not been shown how a single FOC system (using FLCs or any other controller type) can be used to control multiple
different motor topologies, powertrain architectures or with variable motor parameters for HEV/EV applications.

2) Only a small handful of the literature examined in this section acknowledges the effects of variable motor parameters and their effect on the control algorithm. This should be taken into account for every control system designed as it will drastically lower the performance of the system.

3) All the FOC algorithms and analytical traction motor models reviewed in this section require detailed motor parameters that are only obtainable from an intensive series of experiments. When multiple motors are under investigation, the time and cost required to conduct multiple experiments on each motor in order to find all the required parameters becomes impractical. However, the author is yet to find an empirical motor model that considers the constraints of operating within the overcurrent region as a simpler and more cost-effective alternative for traction motor sizing during the early development stage of an HEV/EV.

2.3 DC-AC Inverters for Traction Motors

A DC-AC inverter modulates a DC voltage into multiple stepped DC voltage levels so that the fundamental harmonic of the output resembles an AC waveform. An inverter is classified according to its construction and the number of output voltage levels that it can generate. Multilevel inverters can output more than two voltage levels per phase. Richard Baker and Lawrence Bannister developed a multilevel Cascaded H-Bridge (CHB) inverter by stringing together multiple H-Bridge inverters and multiple DC sources [152, 153, 154]. Nabae [155] developed a 3-level (3L) Neutral-Point Clamped (NPC) inverter which required only a single DC source to generate multiple voltage levels. Nabae also showed how a multilevel inverter
increases the combined efficiency of the inverter and motor as well as reduces high frequency harmonics over the 2-Level (2L) predecessors.

2.3.1 Inverter Topologies for HEV/EVs

The inverters used in HEV/EVs convert the DC voltage of the battery pack to 3-phase AC power for the traction motor. Both NPC and CHB inverters are common topologies used in HEV/EVs [156, 157, 158, 159, 160]. The schematic diagrams for a 5-Level (5L) NPC and CHB inverters are shown in Figure 2.4(a)-(b) respectively. The NPC inverter uses a single large DC voltage battery, whereas the CHB inverter uses multiple smaller DC battery packs.

Numerous surveys investigate the control, topology and general applications of multilevel inverters [161, 162, 163] with their application in HEV/EV traction drives. The largest benefits
Multilevel inverters have over 2-level inverters include; lower rate of change in output voltages, lower harmonic distortion, smaller common-mode voltages and can operate at lower switching frequencies. Multilevel inverter surveys directed at HEV/EV applications compare Voltage source inverters (NPC and CHB) along with current source inverters and Z-Source inverters [164, 165]. The benefits and shortcomings for each inverter type are given with how the vehicle’s performance, efficiency and price is affected. Particularly, Malinowski’s [166] survey on multilevel CHB inverters explains how they are more suitable for HEV/EVs because they utilise the numerous individual DC cells within the vehicle effectively.

2.3.2 Inverter Modulation Methods

The simplest method of controlling the switching devices of an inverter is 6-step waveform control [167]. This outputs the maximum phase-pole voltage for 180° for each phase, and then the maximum negative phase-pole voltage for the remaining 180°. This is replicated for the three phase voltages but shifted 120° out of phase as shown in Figure 2.5. This produces 6 distinct phase-neutral voltage levels and generates the maximum fundamental AC waveform possible for an inverter.

Figure 2.6 displays how carrier-based Sine Pulse Width Modulation (SPWM) uses a reference target AC voltage waveform (dotted blue line in Figure 2.6) overlaid by a set of triangular carrier waveforms (green lines in Figure 2.6) for a 3-Level (3L) inverter. The switching devices of the inverter change whenever these waveforms cross. The stepped output pole voltage (red line in Figure 2.6) has a fundamental harmonic that is similar to the target reference voltage waveform. The maximum fundamental voltage using SPWM is only 78.55% of what is generated using 6-step control. SPWM can be adopted into multilevel PWM, phase-
shifted PWM and include harmonic injection by changing the carrier waveforms or the AC reference voltage [168].

**Figure 2.5** 3 phase waveforms from an inverter operating using 6-step operation

SVPWM is a popular control method for voltage source inverters as it improves the harmonic quality of the output waveforms, has good DC-link utilisation and is simple to implement [169]. The target input voltage waveforms $v_a$, $v_b$ and $v_c$ are transformed into $v_\alpha$ and $v_\beta$ on an $\alpha - \beta$ axis. The magnitude of $v_\alpha$ and $v_\beta$ creates a rotating reference voltage $V_{\text{ref}}$. Examples of 5L, 3-level (3L) and 2L Space Vector Modulation (SVM) diagrams are shown in
Figure 2.7. Any point within the outer hexagonal SVM diagram is enclosed by a triangular sector. Every triangular vertex represents a voltage vector with unique $\alpha - \beta$ co-ordinates.

The switching combinations that generate the same $v_\alpha$ and $v_\beta$ co-ordinates are assigned to a respective voltage vector. SVPWM calculates how long the inverter must occupy each of the three voltage vectors enclosing the reference voltage so that the average output voltage over the SVM cycle equals $V_{ref}$. The maximum fundamental voltage of an inverter using SVPWM is 90.7% of that generated using 6-step control in the inverter’s linear region of operation. Because the inverter can operate in the overmodulation region it is also able utilise full 6-step control.

Calligaro [170] and Hasan [171] reviewed various PWM strategies for multilevel inverters and compared the indices which quantify their performance including; Neutral point balancing, Total Harmonic Distortion (THD), Weighted THD (WTHD) and switching losses. Through a simulation investigation, SVPWM reduced the total switching count over SPWM and Double-Signal PWM due to one phase of the inverter phases being clamped over a single SVPWM cycle and reduced the output current THD.
2.3.3 Space Vector Pulse Width Modulation (SVPWM)

Holtz [172] extended the operating range of a 2L inverter using SVPWM to fully exploit the voltage capabilities of a DC source. Inverters had previously been confined to the circular trajectory boundaries of a Space Vector Modulation (SVM) diagram, but Holtz showed how to control the inverter all the way up to 6-step operation. The SVM regions were defined as “Continuous”, “Overmodulation mode - I”, and “Overmodulation mode – II” in relation to how the reference voltage is modified. This was later expanded upon by different authors who applied the theory to 3-level NPC inverters [173, 174, 175].

Celanovic [176] presented a general SVPWM algorithm for three phase inverters of any voltage level which was computationally efficient and suitable for real-time implementation on digital processors. Seo [177] and Zhang [178] developed simplified SVM strategies for a 3L-NPC inverter by reducing the 3L-SVM diagram into multiple 2L-SVM diagrams and enabled simpler 2L-SVM duty ratio calculations to be used.

Jiao [179] investigated the major SVM switching pattern strategies and their effect on neutral point voltage balancing, switching loss reduction, and noise reduction for 3-level NPC inverters. Prabaharan [180] reviewed different performance parameters for multilevel inverters which quantify the power output and efficiency of the different inverter topologies and control algorithms. These investigations highlight the need to give more attention to other aspects of the inverters control other than harmonic quality. In the case of an HEV/EV, the inverter should be controlled efficiently to optimise energy usage and extend the vehicles driving range [181].

Attique [182] reviewed the numerous reference frames for SVPWM and argues that the imaginary axis aligning with the 3-phase voltage waveforms of the inverter offers the simplest control and conceptual understanding over the other widely researched schemes.
Figure 2.7 Inverter Space Vector Diagrams [178, 180], (a) 5-Level, (b) 3-Level, (c) 2-Level
2.3.4 Optimising SVPWM

Optimisation objectives for SVPWM include zero-voltage reduction [183], neutral point balancing of NPC inverters [184, 185, 186, 187], waveform harmonic distortion reduction [188, 189, 190] and noise reduction [191].

Pinewski [192] converted the voltage vector on-times calculated using SVPWM into switching patterns to control the individual switching devices of a 2L inverter. The alternating-null vector duty ratios reduced the harmonic distortion of the output wave signals, reduced capacitor voltage imbalances and lowered the risk of switching device overheating when compared to other switching patterns.

A direct comparison between different SVPWM switching patterns was carried out by Pahlavani [193]. This review considered the switching losses and harmonic distortion to quantify the overall efficiency of the inverter and quality of the waveforms. It was shown that different starting-ending switching states and the order in which they change over a single SVPWM cycle has a trade-off between switching losses and the harmonic distortion.

An example of how intermediate switching is generated over two SVM cycles is shown in Figure 2.8 for phase $A$ of a 5L-NPC inverter. In Figure 2.8(a), the inverter switching states change between 0-1-2 for SVM cycle-1, then repeat in reverse 2-1-0 for SVM cycle-2. The switching states at the end of SVM cycle-1 are the same as the starting switching state for SVM cycle-2. Therefore, the inverters switching devices can remain in the same position when transitioning between the two SVM cycles and no intermediate switching required.

In Figure 2.8(b), the inverter’s switching states change between 0-1-2 for SVM cycle-3, but then decreases 3-2-1 for SVM cycle-4. Although switching devices $A3$ and $A4$ remain in the same switching position, switch $A2$ requires an intermediate switch to put the inverter into the correct position before SVM cycle-4 can begin. In addition, the complimentary switching
device A2 will also require an intermediate switch. This situation often occurs when the reference voltage vector transitions into a different voltage vector triangle and the switching states for one SVM cycle are not be available for the next SVM cycle.

McGrath [194, 195] gave a detailed comparison between a variety of PWM strategies for multilevel NPC and CHB inverters. This emphasised the importance of switching sequences for SVM to reduce the total switching count. By selecting appropriate starting-ending switching patterns (null vector), the intermediary switching losses will be reduced when the reference voltage vector transitions between enclosing SVM triangles. Again, the trade-off between lower switching losses and the harmonic distortion of the waveform was shown to be a limiting factor.

2.3.5 On-line SVPWM Methods

As the inverters voltage level nL increases, the number of enclosing vector triangles within the SVM diagram grows at a rate of $6(nL - 1)^2$ and the total number of switching states grows at a rate of $(nL)^3$. Assigning a SVM switching pattern for a particular reference voltage is difficult when there are multiple options to choose between for a single voltage vector. Storing all this information requires large look-up tables and is computationally inefficient. On-line
methods of calculating the available switching patterns remove these problems by directly calculating the switching pattern for each SVM cycle [196, 197].

Mohammed [196] and Susheela [198] separate an nL-SVM diagram into layers as a means of locating the reference voltage $V_{ref}$ and map it on a 2L-SVM diagram. Gopinath’s [197] fractal approach of identifying the triangle sub-section is mathematically simple, but the total number of iterative calculations increases rapidly with inverter size. These methods do not calculate all the available null switching patterns, nor do they allow for a different enclosing voltage vector to be used.

Neural networks have been used to calculate the on-times of the switching devices and as image processors used to identify the enclosing vector triangle [199, 200, 201, 202]. These are computationally efficient and are implemented easily using dedicated hardware. However, a pre-existing control scheme is required to train the network. This training is time consuming and the performance of the network will only match that of the training scheme.

Deng’s [203, 204] on-line SVPWM method gradually reduces the nL-SVM diagram (through nL − 1 and nL − 2 … diagrams) down to a single 2L-SVM diagram which encloses the reference voltage vector. This calculates all the possible switching patterns for one enclosing voltage vector. The linear time-complexity in proportion to the SVM voltage level is ideal because for every voltage level increase on the SVM diagram only one additional mapping sequence is required. However, this control method does not calculate the switching patterns of the alternative voltage vectors which might contain a better switching pattern to be used for a given SVM cycle.

Off-axis on-line SVPWM schemes identify the triangle sub-sector enclosing $V_{ref}$ and directly computes the time durations for the switching devices [174, 175, 205, 206, 207]. These do not use a Cartesian co-ordinate system but instead opt for one parallel to the triangular edges.
The freedom to choose the switching pattern and control objectives (lower THD, lower switch count etc.) is removed and confined to the single switching pattern generated from the calculations. Jana’s [208] on-line SVPWM scheme required minimal iterative calculations, lowered the switch count and improved the harmonic quality simultaneously. This was achieved by finding the triangle sub-sector that encloses the reference voltage in a similar manner to Gupta [174, 175] and Chamarthi [206], but instead opted to directly calculate the switching states of the enclosing voltage vectors.

2.3.6 Research Gaps in the Field of DC-AC Inverter Control

From the literature reviewed in Section 2.3, the author has the following comments about the research trend and the gaps in knowledge within the current literature:

1) The method presented by Deng [203, 204] currently has the lowest computational demand for an on-line SVPWM scheme. However, the optimisation of this control scheme is not analysed further (switch count, harmonic quality, etc.).

2) Jana [208] argues how Cartesian on-line SVPWM methods are more complex, require a greater number of iterative calculations and need more storage to hold switching patterns that have been calculated offline. However, the author of this thesis argues that the numerous logic-based identification methods for finding the enclosing triangle sub-sector, the correct equations to calculate the switching states and switching patterns required for off-axis on-line SVPWM methods can prove to be as computationally inefficient.

3) The general scope of multilevel inverter control seems to be increasingly growing with the invention of more modular and hybrid inverter topologies. As new topologies are created, their corresponding control systems are developed alongside and advance in a similar
progression to NPC and CHB inverters through reduced switching, improved harmonic quality, lower noise, etc.

4) There is only a small handful of inverter control and topology reviews for HEV/EV applications. Nearly all the inverter control schemes investigated within this literature are applicable to isolated inverter-motor applications. While most identify the harmonic quality of the waveforms delivered to the motor, they only consider single points of operation. This is usually taken to be at the end of the linear modulation region and only for a few full or part load applications. For inverter control strategies applicable to HEV/EVs, the full operating regions of the inverter and motor should be considered.

2.4 Vehicle Stability Control for HEV/EVs

2.4.1 Vehicle Stability Control Techniques

The terms oversteer and understeer were first defined for steady-state and transient conditions by Bergman [209] of the Ford Motor Company in the 1960’s. The ability to quantify these variables enabled researchers and vehicle manufacturers to improve future vehicle design and investigate active control methods. Diagrammatical views of vehicles with oversteer or understeering characteristics are shown in Figure 2.9 in comparison to a vehicle following the ideal target trajectory.

The mid-90s saw the beginning of Yaw Moment Control (YMC) when Bosch developed the yaw stability controller [210, 211]. This controller pulsed the brakes on the appropriate wheels to achieve an extra moment about the vehicle’s yaw axis during an emergency steering manoeuvre. Shibahata [212], Motoyama [213] and Ikushima [214] were some of the first researchers to investigate YMC and implementation methods to distribute tractive/braking forces to the wheels of a vehicle. Shibahata [212] developed a new method for analysing YMC
by introducing a parameter derived from the vehicle’s side-slip referenced the vehicles centre of gravity. These methods show how YMC transitions from emergency manoeuvres to improving the yaw control in every day driving and increase cornering performance.

![Figure 2.9 Oversteer, Understeer and Target yaw rate trajectory graphical view](image)

**Figure 2.9** Oversteer, Understeer and Target yaw rate trajectory graphical view

The geometry and velocity components of a tyre are shown in Figure 2.10. The wheel slip ratio $\sigma_{wh}$ compares the velocity of the tyre’s outer surface at a radius $R$ with rotational velocity $\omega_{wh}$ at the road-tyre interface against the longitudinal velocity at the centre of the tyre $u_{wth}$ shown in Figure 2.10(a). The velocity components of the tyre in Figure 2.10(b) distorts the tyre’s contact patch at the road-tyre interface in (shown in Figure 2.10(c)) by side slip angle $\alpha_{wh}$.

![Figure 2.10 Diagrammatical view of the tyre dynamics, (a) Wheel slip ratio, (b) Wheel side-slip angle and velocity components, (c) Tyre contact patch distortion](image)

**Figure 2.10** Diagrammatical view of the tyre dynamics, (a) Wheel slip ratio, (b) Wheel side-slip angle and velocity components, (c) Tyre contact patch distortion
Anti-lock Braking Systems (ABS) aim to maximise the Coefficient of Friction (COF) at the road-wheel interface to increase the braking force and reduce the stopping distance. It is shown in Figure 2.11 that the peak longitudinal COF $\mu_x$ is generated at a particular wheel slip $\sigma_{wh}$, but the actual slip varies for different tyre-road conditions and the tyre’s side slip angle $\alpha_{wh}$. As $\alpha_{wh}$ increases, the lateral COF $\mu_y$ also increases and produces a larger lateral tyre force which aids in steering.

![Figure 2.11 COF curves for one tyre and road combination over different wheel slip and sideslip angles, (a) $\mu_x$ curves, (b) $\mu_y$ curves [277]](image)

ABS appeared in the early 1950’s within the aviation industry [215]. The high cost of these systems prevented them from crossing into the automotive industry until later that decade. Early adaptations of ABS were purely mechanical, a system of interconnected flywheels and springs would open hydraulic valves and release the brake fluid pressure if the wheel locked up.
Madison [216] patented the first automotive anti-skid system which used electronic sensors and actuators in 1969. Independent ABS control of all four wheels did not arrive until the early 80’s where authors such as Satoh [217], Newton [218] and Main [219] showed how ABS improved steering control during emergency braking.

Under the same principles as ABS, Traction Control Systems (TCS) limit wheel slip to improve tractive force and maintain vehicle stability. Buick introduced the Max-Trac system [220] in the early 1970’s to control the engine power according to electronic wheel speed sensors to prevent excessive wheel slip.

2.4.2 Vehicle Yaw Rate Control Methods

2.4.2.1 Implementing Yaw Rate Control

There are two popular methods for implementing YMC for road vehicles; varying the braking/tractive forces on either side of the vehicle, also known as Torque Vectoring (TV); and compensation steering angle.

Mokhiamar [221] compared the effect of TV with Front-Wheel Steer (FWS), Rear-Wheel Steer (RWS) and Four-Wheel Steer (4WS). The simulation study showed that a vehicle with TV+RSW has lower yaw rate tracking ability than a TV+FWS vehicle, but a TV+FWS+RWS vehicle has the best responsiveness and stability overall. This concluded that the 4WS vehicle has superior cornering performance over single axle steer vehicles and how the effect of FWS is greater than RWS. The key information from this publication is that the asymmetrical tractive forces alone improved the yaw rate control of these vehicles regardless of what steering system was used. A further comparison between 4WS and TV was conducted by Abe [222] who highlighted that the saturation effects of the tyre forces using steering compensation may limit
the performance in contrast to TV, but a combination of the two methods outperform both independently.

The application of TV in an EV with multiple independent traction motors has shown to be advantageous over ICE vehicles using torque splitting differentials [26, 27]. The traction motors enabled greater control of the tractive/braking force at each wheel and therefore improved the controllability and stability of the vehicle [28].

2.4.2.2 Yaw Rate Controller Types

Control of a vehicle’s yaw rate and sideslip angle has been investigated for YMC independent of one another [223, 224], but both methods are required to ensure both controllability and stability of the vehicle.

Sliding-Mode Controllers (SMC) have been a popular method for TV as they allow for smooth and stable control of the vehicle and allocation of tyre forces. Goggia [225] changed the vehicle’s driving modes (Normal and Sport) by changing the gain values of an integral sliding mode TV based YMC subject to the vehicle’s lateral acceleration. Novellis [226] and Fu [227] later improved the yaw rate and sideslip control using electric traction motors. Novellis [228] compared the performance of the SMC against a PID controller for YMC. The comparison showed that a SMC has a lower yaw rate error than the PID controllers, but suffered from undesirable chattering, an inherent SMC control problem.

Optimisation methods applied to YMC allow for multiple objectives to be monitored and controlled simultaneously [229]. Kampanakis [230], Kasinathan [231] and Wong [232] used the vehicle’s yaw rate error and side-slip as control objectives as well as the independent traction motor’s temperature. This improved the yaw performance of the vehicle without
overheating the traction motors. Zhai [233] included the regenerative energy capturing ability of the traction motors to maximise the vehicle’s driving range.

Boada [234] used the yaw rate error and sideslip angle as inputs to a FLC system to generate an ideal additional yaw moment that would minimise the input errors. Variable braking forces on the front axle generated the additional yaw moment during a detailed simulation study. Because the target speed for these simulations was intended to be constant for the duration of the manoeuvre, an opposing tractive force on the opposite side of the axle should have been included. Boada [235] and Li [236] advanced upon the FLC method by including compensation FWS and RWS respectively, both controllers and implementation methods showed improved vehicle control over [234]. Jin [237] used a genetic algorithm to tune the membership functions of a FLC using the yaw rate error and vehicle side-slip as optimisation parameters. The performance of the final FLC iteration was superior to the initial controller design.

Ghosh [238] attempted to use the vehicle’s yaw rate error and steering wheel angle as the inputs to a FLC for YMC instead of the vehicle’s sideslip angle because it is difficult to measure or estimate. However, this approach is in danger of stabilisation issues since no stability input was considered. Krishna [239] included the driver steering angle into the FL yaw controller on top of the vehicle yaw rate error and sideslip angle. This improved the dynamic performance over the original vehicle, but it is difficult to determine whether the improvements are due to steering wheel input as no comparison is given without it. Kim [240] used a FL yaw moment controller to maintain the yaw rate and vehicle side-slip angle in conjunction with an optimisation problem to minimise the utilisation of the electrohydraulic braking system and maximise regenerative energy recuperation.
2.4.3 Wheel Slip Controller Schemes

2.4.3.1 Wheel Slip Control for an HEV/EV

Conventional ABS controllers will pulsate the brake torque around a single target wheel slip $\sigma$ or if the wheel rapidly approaches lockup. Since the target $\sigma$ changes for various different driving-wheel-road conditions this method may not offer optimal braking performance, but it is simple to implement [241, 242, 243, 244].

Hori [25], Kuruppu [245], and Ivanov [246] all promoted the use of electric vehicles over ICE powered vehicles because of the superior tractive and braking performance only attainable from electric traction motors. The fast, accurate and predictable torque output of the electric motor/s allowed for higher frequency torque modulation [246]. Because it is easier to estimate the torque output from the traction motors than an ICE, MPC and parameter estimation methods are simpler and more accurate for use in ABS/TCS [23, 245].

Spichartz [247] compared the regenerative braking ability of EV’s using a single electric motor against four independent in-wheel motors when the ABS is engaged during braking. Because the independent in-wheel motors are not limited by the dynamics of the other wheels in the same way as a single drive EV, greater regenerative energy capturing and braking performance is obtainable.

2.4.3.2 Wheel Slip Controller Types

SMCs for ABS often take on the role of extremum seeking algorithms which search for the peak coefficient of friction, an advantage of these controllers over PI and FL controllers are that if designed correctly they negate the need for knowing the wheel slip or coefficient of friction and opt for other control parameters (e.g. wheel forces) [248, 249, 250, 251].
A FLC’s ability to handle the nonlinearities associated with tyre and vehicle dynamics has made them a popular choice for implementing ABS/TCS [241, 252, 253]. The optimal wheel slip for maximum coefficient of friction changes with different road and tyre conditions, Bauer [254] used a FLC to estimate the optimal wheel slip on varying road surfaces and a secondary system of FLCs to regulate the brake torque so the wheels match the target slip value. This method improves over other authors who choose to only operate around a constant $\sigma$ [255].

Colli’s [256, 257] FL wheel slip controller uses the gradient of the longitudinal slip curve (rate of change in friction over the rate of change in wheel slip) and the accelerator pedal movement for a vehicle’s TCS. This was achieved by estimating the coefficient of friction and measuring the instantaneous wheel slip for each independently driven wheel. This method changed the control objective of a wheel slip percentage, to the peak gradient of the curve which remains constant for all driving conditions as shown in Figure 2.11. Since this was implemented on a vehicle using electric traction motors, the road conditions are estimated easier than if an ICE vehicle was used.

A comparison between pure PI torque control and a compensated PID-FLC for a vehicle’s TCS was given by Li [258]. The torque control of the PI controller regulated the wheel-slip for both control methods, but the inclusion of the FLC to compensate the torque when the road conditions abruptly changed offered a shorter settling time and smaller oscillations around the target wheel-slip.

### 2.4.4 Vehicle Yaw Control during Braking Manoeuvres

Braking YMC (BYMC) is diagrammatically shown in Figure 2.12 (brake forces for each wheel are represented by green arrows) whereby the brakes on one side of the vehicle are given a lower brake torque, this produces asymmetrical braking forces around the vehicle’s centre of gravity and thus an additional yaw moment is generated [259].
Early attempts to improve the poor yaw control of a vehicle while braking during a turn-in manoeuvre was improved by Novel [260] and Heinzl [261] during the early 2000’s who reduced the systems down into an optimisation problem and a SMC respectively. Both systems used asymmetrical braking by changing the target wheel slip or additional brake pressures in order to generate the additional yaw moment. However, these systems are used for gradual vehicle braking and use the ABS as a limiting factor instead of controlling the brake forces at the point of maximum braking force.

![Figure 2.12](image-url) How varying asymmetrical braking forces can produce an external yaw moment, (a) Symmetrical Braking forces, (b) Asymmetrical braking forces

Cascaded [262] and parallel [263] YMC and ABS/TCS architectures are simple to implement, but the hierarchy of the layout and/or sensitivity of the control parameters may create difficulties in deciding the overruling control method. Kaiser [264] showed how an interconnected architecture of the two control methods reduced the typical layout control problems to either reduce the input torque request or output torque command.

Song [250, 265, 266] provides numerous detailed studies on the effect of YMC under steady state driving and emergency braking/steering manoeuvres. Many of these investigations
compare the performance of BYMC and compensated Steering YMC (SYMC) against a vehicle with only an ABS which achieves peak longitudinal COF on all four wheels. Song shows that both BYMC and SYMC have greater controllability and stability over the original vehicle, with SYMC performing slightly better than BYMC. A problem not addressed by Song is the increased cost associated with additional RWS and if the small increase in controllability over BYMC is justified. Systems which combine asymmetrical brake forces and active front steering for braking and steering manoeuvres have shown better yaw control and stability over systems which use these implementation methods independently.

Mirzaeinejad’s [269] optimization problem sought to minimise the yaw rate tracking error with the smallest amount of external yaw moment while maximising total braking force to ensure a short stopping distance. The design of this control algorithm however does limit its use to split-mu surfaces, it also does not directly control the wheel torque but instead applies the ideal tyre force to the road.

The yaw control system given by Mirzaei [268] uses an optimisation problem to minimise the amount of asymmetrical braking forces and slow the vehicle down as fast as possible while preventing compensated steering oversaturation. Mirzaei uses a FLC to control the weighting factors of the optimisation problem depending on the saturation properties of the tyre forces while meeting the required performance of the system.

Naderi’s [270] YMC system directly controls the wheel torque of the vehicle under various braking and steering scenarios. A SMC is used to produce the ideal braking torques on either side of the vehicle where a FL wheel slip controller scales these values to ensure the wheel does not lock-up. This is advantageous because the wheel torques are directly calculated instead of target wheel forces as with previous control algorithms. However, an experimental validation
is not provided and SMCs often suffers from a chattering around the target values when implemented in hardware.

Dogruğüven [271] investigated the regenerative ability of an EV during an emergency braking manoeuvre. A major advantage highlighted by this control scheme is the combined hydraulic and traction motor braking system. The traction motors braking torque becomes less effective at high road speeds and the hydraulic brakes must be incorporated into the control. At lower speeds, the fast torque response of the traction motors offers greater control of the torque provided to the wheels and the yaw control becomes more effective.

Dinçmen [272] advanced upon the work of Drakunov’s [248] extremum seeking algorithm by changing the single sliding-mode curve into a sliding-mode surface to incorporate the changes in the lateral coefficient of friction of the wheels. Dinçmen showed that during combined braking and cornering manoeuvres, sacrificing a small amount of longitudinal friction by reducing the target wheel slip operating point increases the tyre’s lateral force. The results showed that the vehicle may be able to avoid a collision during an emergency braking scenario because it is able to travel more laterally.

Song [273] compared the performance of a PI, FLC and SMC for compensated FWS controllers for driving scenarios with and without asymmetrical braking forces. Song found that the membership functions and rule base of the FLC that was specifically tuned for braking manoeuvres outperformed the SMC and PI controllers, the FLC thus performed worse during constant velocity scenarios. An additional comparison to a FLC tuned to either constant velocity manoeuvres or a FLC able to accommodate the two scenarios would offer a better comparison of the performance of this type of controller.

The YMC presented by Tahami [274] was designed for use during emergency braking and steering manoeuvres. Tahami used a FL wheel slip and yaw moment controller in conjunction
with a neural network to generate target yaw reference values. However, only a constant target wheel slip was used for this investigation, the performance of the network on other surfaces may suffer if the COF changes and the optimum slip value changes.

2.4.5 Research Gaps in the Field of Vehicle Stability Control for HEV/EVs

From the literature reviewed in Section 2.4, the author has the following comments and has recognised the following gaps in knowledge within the current literature:

1) A gradient based wheel slip control algorithm (like the TCS developed by Colli [256, 257]) has not been applied to braking manoeuvres.

2) The TCS system developed by Colli [256, 257] also only considers straight line manoeuvres. Implementation of a gradient based wheel slip control system has not been investigated in combination with yaw rate control systems.

3) The current trend in VSC research is heading in multiple directions including; combining independent vehicle control algorithms with autonomous and connected vehicle systems, improving system robustness and improving real-time implementation for computationally heavy control systems. In addition, improving estimation methods to find the tyre-road COF, vehicle sideslip angle, wheel slip and tyre forces are also of concern.

4) Most of the VSC control algorithms investigated require numerous detailed vehicle parameters to be used within the control algorithms. However, the nonlinear or time varying parameters (e.g. vehicle mass changing due to passengers, luggage and fuel) often required for vehicle simulation and control might cause the system to perform sub-optimally if the values used within the control system do not accurately represent the corresponding real-world parameters. Values that can be accurately estimated (wheel slip, road COF) offer
better wheel slip and yaw rate control over values that use predetermined estimated values within the control algorithm.

2.5 Summary of Literature Gaps and Specific Research Objectives

An overarching aim for this thesis is to investigate how intelligent motor modelling and control techniques can be used to create new HEV/EV development tools, increase vehicle energy efficiency and improve vehicle safety. The first original research objective for this thesis in Section 1.3 has been achieved by examining the technological milestones and state of the art literature while exposing gaps in the current research within this chapter.

Research gaps #1 and #2 from Section 2.2.9 detail the lack of a single FOC algorithm that is able to control multiple vehicle systems without the need for re-tuning and the lack of depth of investigations into the effects of variable motor parameters for HEV/EV applications. As discussed in Section 2.2.8, FLCs offer high robustness and excellent control performance for FOC applications. The first specific research objective investigated within this thesis is:

Objective 1 - To develop a single FL based FOC system that can be implemented into multiple different motor topologies and vehicle powertrain architectures without the need for re-tuning to simplify the development of an HEV/EV. The control system’s robustness will be examined with the effect of variable motor parameters for HEV/EV applications.

This will fulfil the second original research objective listed in Section 1.3 - to develop a traction motor control system in order to simplify the development process of an HEV/EV. A control system such as this would be a useful tool for vehicle manufacturers as this single FOC scheme could be used for any vehicle prototype under investigation without the risk of unstable or undesirable control.
Research gap #3 from Section 2.2.9 highlights how there are no effective methods to estimate the thermal and torque characteristics of the motor operating in the overcurrent region without detailed motor parameters. The second specific research objective investigated within this thesis is:

*Objective 2 - To develop a traction motor model for HEV/EV design applications which uses only readily available empirical motor data to estimate the torque and thermal characteristics of a motor operating in the overcurrent region without any detailed motor parameters.*

This will fulfil the third original research objective in Section 1.3 - to develop a traction motor modelling tool to inform a vehicle manufacturer if a motor and powertrain combination offers the greatest total vehicle energy efficiency or lowest output emissions. A modelling tool such as this would show if the traction motor and powertrain combination allow the vehicle to achieve its own dynamic performance quickly and early on in the development process when only empirical data is available.

Observation #1 - #2 into the literature trend surrounding DC-AC inverter control schemes in Section 2.3.6 show how the on-line SVPWM method by Deng [203, 204] has the lowest computational burden in comparison to other on-line methods, but does not extend its control objectives into other quantifiers (low intermediate switching, low THD) used to describe the quality of SVPWM methods as described in literature observation #3. The third specific research objective investigated within this thesis is:

*Objective 3 - To advance upon the current state of the art on-line SVPWM schemes with a new reduced intermediate switching algorithm which does not inhibit the computational efficiency of the SVPWM algorithm and improves the energy efficiency of the inverter over the entire driving range of an HEV/EV.*
This will fulfil the fourth original research objective in Section 1.3 - to develop an energy efficient method of powering the traction motor of an HEV/EV. By reducing the intermediate switching, there will be lower energy dissipated as heat and therefore a higher energy efficiency, if this can be achieved over the entire driving range of an HEV/EV.

Literature gaps #1 - #2 in Section 2.4.5 show that gradient based wheel slip controllers have not been applied to braking manoeuvres nor do they directly incorporate yaw rate control for steering scenarios. Therefore, the fourth specific research objective investigated within this thesis is:

Objective 4 - To develop a gradient based wheel slip control algorithm for braking manoeuvres which directly incorporates yaw stability into the control algorithm in order to improve the safety of a vehicle during an emergency manoeuvre.

This will fulfil the fifth original research objective in Section 1.3 - to increase a vehicle’s safety by intelligently controlling the traction motors during an emergency manoeuvre.
Chapter Three

Research Methodology and Model Verification Procedures

This chapter presents the methodology and experimental procedures used within this thesis. Section 3.2 discusses the general modelling and control techniques commonly used for the vehicle dynamics, traction motors and DC-AC inverters for HEV/EV simulations. How and why these methods are used in this thesis are explained to offer a basic understanding to the reader of how the advanced control methods work in later chapters. The statistical analysis methods in Section 3.3 are used to quantify the performance of the Processor-in-the-Loop (PIL) verification simulations in Section 3.4 and the systems developed in the remainder of this thesis.

3.1 Research Methodology

The following steps describe the main methodology steps used for the research conducted within this thesis:

1) Model the vehicle components under investigation in MATLAB/Simulink. How and why these components are modelled instead of commercially available models is given in Section 3.2. To ensure that these models perform as expected, they are validated against commercially available equivalents. Both models should produce comparable outputs within acceptable margins of error for a set of given inputs (see Section 3.4).

2) Implement the current state of the art control techniques into the validated models. This highlights areas of room for improvement within the control algorithms. These state of the art control schemes then act as a baseline to compare and highlight the advantages of the new control algorithms developed within this thesis.
3) From examination of the current state of the art control algorithms and considering the current literature from Chapter Two, a new control system is developed addressing the major problems of the system and control algorithms under investigation found by the gaps in the current literature explained in Section 2.2.9, Section 2.3.6 and Section 2.4.5.

4) The newly developed control systems ability to be unaffected by hardware limitations and compiler errors are verified using a series of PIL simulation experiments (see Section 3.4).

5) Compare the new control system to the previous state of the art control techniques. Areas of improvement for both control techniques are highlighted and areas for future work to address are discussed.

3.2 Component Modelling of the HEV/EV

3.2.1 Traction Motor Models

The Induction Motor (IM) and Interior Permanent Magnet Synchronous Motor (I-PMSM) are two common traction motor topologies used in HEV/EVs [67, 275]. Chapter Four presents an intelligent FOC scheme and Chapter Six observes the harmonic quality of the motor’s current waveforms. As discussed in Section 2.2.3, there are several methods for modelling a motor for HEV/EV applications (analytical models, Finite Element Analysis or empirical data based). The torque-speed characteristics and electrical analysis of the motors in these chapters are represented by the equivalent electrical circuits given in Section 3.2.1.3 - 3.2.1.4. This modelling method has been well documented throughout literature as an acceptable method for both standalone motor applications and HEV/EV applications [71, 75, 276, 277]. It should be noted that there are some limitations to this modelling method as they do not include the effects of eddy currents, local saturation points, skin effects or any end effects [67]. This makes them unsuitable for motor design purposes as the errors may be too high. The trade-off between
relatively high accuracy over the full operating range of the motors torque-speed curve with low computational power does make them suitable for HEV/EV applications.

Chapter Five and Chapter Seven do not examine any motor current or voltage control, simple 2D look-up table representations of the traction motors given in Section 3.2.5.1 are sufficient as they simplify the overall control system and reduce simulation time.

3.2.1.1 Voltage Vector Transformations

In Figure 3.1(a), an arbitrary choice of voltages $v_a, v_b$ and $v_c$ from the 3-phase AC waveforms supplied to the motor windings in Figure 3.1(b) are represented on a 2D plane. These voltages use the $A - B - C$ axis for their respective windings (black dotted lines) whose combined magnitude produces a reference voltage $V_{ref}$ which travels around the origin at synchronous speed $\omega_e$.

Only two co-ordinates are required to represent any point in 2D space. The Clarke transformation (1) converts $v_a, v_b$ and $v_c$ into the voltages $v_\alpha$ and $v_\beta$ on an $\alpha - \beta$ axis as shown in Figure 3.1(c). The Park transformation (2) then converts the sinusoidal $v_\alpha$ and $v_\beta$ waveforms into the direct $v_{ds}$ and quadrature $v_{qs}$ voltages on the dq-axis (Figure 3.1(d)) [66]. The dq-axis observes $v_{ds}$ and $v_{qs}$ as DC waveforms on a rotating reference frame with an angular velocity $\omega_e$. The Park transformation requires finding the electrical angle $\theta_e$ from (3) by integrating $\omega_e$ over a time $t$ from the initial time $t_0$. The same transformations are used to find the direct $i_{qs}$ and quadrature $i_{ds}$ stator currents which are responsible for the motor’s torque and magnetic flux respectively.
Figure 3.1 Vector transformations, (a) 2D visual representation of the transformation process, (b) Original 3-phase AC waveforms, (c) Clarke transformation, (d) Park transformation

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
 v_a \\
v_\beta
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
 1 & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \\
 -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
 v_a \\
v_b \\
v_c
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(1)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
 v_{ds} \\
v_{qs}
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
 \cos \theta_e & \sin \theta_e \\
 -\sin \theta_e & \cos \theta_e
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
 v_a \\
v_\beta
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(2)

\[
\theta_e = \theta_e(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} \omega_e \, dt
\]  

(3)
3.2.1.2 **FOC Architecture**

The FOC flowchart in Figure 3.2 is used to control the direct and quadrature currents of the motor of the analytical traction motor models used throughout this thesis [278]. Using the import and export parameters between CarSim and MATLAB/Simulink in Table 3.3 of Section 3.2.4.1, the FOC architecture is explained as follows:

**MATLAB Environment** – MATLAB/Simulink imports the vehicle’s instantaneous longitudinal velocity $V_x$ and the rotational velocity of the wheels $\omega_{\text{wheel}}$ from CarSim. The error between $V_x$ and the target velocity $V_x^*$ of the drive cycle is fed to a speed controller which generates suitable accelerator pedal $\gamma_{\text{acc}} \in [0, 1]$ or brake pedal $\gamma_{\text{brk}} \in [0, 1]$ activation levels.

If the brake pedal is activated, a brake pedal force proportional to the brake pedal’s activation level is exported to CarSim. No traction motor regenerative braking is considered within this FOC scheme. The traction motor model control and verification in Section 3.4.1 show that this FOC architecture and analytical models are able to operate in all four quadrants of the traction motor and regenerative braking is a possible route for future control applications. This was done to simplify the control architecture at this stage of the research to avoid complications with
wheel slip control. Instead, the internal Anti-Lock Braking Systems (ABS) of the CarSim vehicle model will monitor this area by controlling the brake fluid pressure of the pure hydraulic braking system. The wheel slip and regenerative braking systems will be accommodated for in future research by employing the wheel slip control schemes developed in Chapter Seven.

When the accelerator pedal is activated, it signifies that the speed controller is requesting torque from the motors. For motor control and FOC, a torque command corresponds to an increase in torque producing current components. Target q-axis $i_{qs}^*$ and d-axis $i_{ds}^*$ currents are generated which would satisfy the increase in output torque. The independent current controllers compare $i_{qs}^*$ and $i_{ds}^*$ against the instantaneous q-axis $i_{qs}$ and d-axis $i_{ds}$ currents being drawn by the motor respectively.

The current controllers produce unit q-axis $v_{q0}$ and d-axis $v_{d0}$ voltages to reduce the current error. These voltages are de-coupled and have the constraints imposed by the motor applied to them (see Section 3.2.1.5). The final d-axis $v_{ds}$ and the q-axis $v_{qs}$ voltages are then supplied to the stator windings. It is assumed that voltage and current waveforms are perfectly generated by an ideal inverter. The traction motor model generates an output torque $\tau_e$ which is exported to CarSim.

*CarSim Environment* – The vehicle model imports $\tau_e$ and the brake fluid pressure from MATLAB/Simulink. The vehicle model accounts for the 6 degrees of freedom around the vehicle body, spin dynamics of the tyres and uses steering control to maintain a straight heading. The longitudinal velocity of the vehicle’s centre of gravity $V_x$ is then exported back to MATLAB/Simulink.
3.2.1.3 Analytical Model of an IM

The q-axis and d-axis analytical circuits for a squirrel cage IM with magnetic poles $P$ are given in Figure 3.3(a)-(b) respectively. Equations (4)-(14) are used to simulate the characteristics of the IM motor [279, 280].

Equations (4)-(7) represent the voltage drop over the stator winding resistance $r_s$, rotor winding resistance $r_r$ and the Back Electromotive Force (B-EMF). These are used to find the flux linkages $\lambda$ of the d-axis and q-axis circuits for both the stator ($\lambda_{ds}$ and $\lambda_{qs}$) and the rotor ($\lambda_{dr}$ and $\lambda_{qr}$). The magnitude of the B-EMF is proportional to difference between the electrical angular velocity of the rotor $\omega_r$ and $\omega_e$.

\[
\begin{align*}
    v_{ds} &= r_s i_{ds} + \frac{d\lambda_{ds}}{dt} - \omega_e \lambda_{qs} \\
    v_{qs} &= r_s i_{qs} + \frac{d\lambda_{qs}}{dt} + \omega_e \lambda_{ds} \\
    0 &= r_r i_{dr} + \frac{d\lambda_{dr}}{dt} - (\omega_e - \omega_r)\lambda_{qr} \\
    0 &= r_r i_{qr} + \frac{d\lambda_{qr}}{dt} + (\omega_e - \omega_r)\lambda_{dr}
\end{align*}
\]
The inductance leakages of the stator $L_s$ and rotor $L_r$ in Equations (8)-(9) require their respective leakage inductances $L_{ls}$ and $L_{lr}$ as well as the magnetising inductance of the motor $L_m$.

$$L_s = L_m + L_{ls}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

$$L_r = L_m + L_{lr}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

The current flow within the d-axis and q-axis circuits for both the stator ($i_{ds}$ and $i_{qs}$) and rotor ($i_{dr}$ and $i_{qr}$) are found using Equations (10)-(13). The stator d-axis $i_{ds}$ (10) and q-axis $i_{qs}$ (11) currents are fed back to the current controllers. Equation (14) calculates the output torque $\tau_e$ from the IM which is exported to CarSim.

$$i_{ds} = \frac{\lambda_{ds} - L_m i_{dr}}{L_s}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

$$i_{qs} = \frac{\lambda_{qs} - L_m i_{qr}}{L_s}$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

$$i_{dr} = \frac{\lambda_{dr} - L_m i_{ds}}{L_r}$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

$$i_{qr} = \frac{\lambda_{qr} - L_m i_{qs}}{L_r}$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

$$\tau_e = \frac{3P}{4} L_m (i_{qs} i_{dr} - i_{ds} i_{qr})$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

The mechanical rotational velocity of the rotor $\omega_m$ is calculated from the wheel’s rotational velocity $\omega_{wheel}$ imported directly from CarSim. The magnitude of the rotor’s magnetic flux wave $\varphi_r$ is estimated using (15) because it cannot be directly measured [146, 279]. The magnetic flux is induced in the rotor because of the slip between the electrical rotational velocity of the rotor $\omega_r$ (16) and the rotating magnetic flux wave of the stator travelling at synchronous speed $\omega_e$ (17). The supply voltage frequency $f$ is then calculated using (18).
\[
\frac{L_r}{r_r} \frac{d\varphi_r}{dt} + \varphi_r = L_m i_{ds}
\]  
(15)

\[
\omega_r = \frac{P \omega_m}{2}
\]  
(16)

\[
\omega_e = \left( \frac{L_m r_r}{L_r} \right) \left( \frac{i_{qs}}{\varphi_r} \right) + \omega_r
\]  
(17)

\[
\omega_e = \frac{120 f}{p}
\]  
(18)

The priority for an IM is being able to induce the target magnetic flux \( \varphi_r^* \) (19) in the rotor. The IM uses constant target \( \varphi_r^* \) up to the motor’s base speed \( \omega_b \) [107]. The corresponding target d-axis current \( i_{ds}^* \) in Equation (20a) is also constant up to base speed, this is dependent on the rated voltage \( V_s \) and the rated supply frequency \( f_b \). At base speed, the B-EMF matches the rated voltage of the motor and restricts the flow of current. To allow the motor to reach higher speeds, the target flux \( \varphi_r^* \) and \( i_{ds}^* \) reduce proportionally with the rotor speed in Equation (20b) [71, 276]. A scaling factor \( \rho \) is used to control the rate at which \( i_{ds}^* \) reduces.

\[
\varphi_r^* = L_m i_{ds}^*
\]  
(19)

\[
i_{ds}^* = \begin{cases} 
\frac{V_s}{2 \pi f_b L_m} & \omega_m \leq \omega_b \\
\frac{V_s}{2 \pi f_b L_m} \left( \frac{\omega_b}{\omega_m} \right)^\rho & \omega_m > \omega_b
\end{cases}
\]  
(20a)

Because the maximum motor current is limited to the rated value \( I_s \), the target d-axis current \( i_{ds}^* \) is given priority over the target q-axis current [124]. The upper limit of the target q-axis current \( i_{qs, max}^* \) (21) thus varies depending with \( i_{ds}^* \). The target q-axis current \( i_{qs}^* \) (22) which goes towards the current controller is linearly proportional to the accelerator pedal activation level \( \gamma_{acc} \in [0, 1] \).
3.2.1.4 Analytical Model of a PMSM

The q-axis and d-axis analytical circuits for an I-PMSM are given in Figure 3.4(a)-(b) respectively [70, 105]. Equations (23)-(27) simulate the electrical and dynamic characteristics of an I-PMSM [281, 282]. Unlike an IM, permanent magnets with constant magnetic flux $\varphi_m$ are attached to the rotor of a PMSM. The cross-sectional design of the magnets within the rotor effect the q-axis and the d-axis inductance $L_q$ and $L_d$ respectively [283, 284]. In a surface mounted PMSM (S-PMSM), the magnets are attached to the surface of the rotor and $L_q = L_d$. Whereas in an I-PMSM, the magnets are buried inside the rotor, so disturb the magnetic circuit between rotor and stator, this causes $L_q \neq L_d$ [105]. Since there is no slip between the angular velocity of the rotor and the magnetic flux wave of the stator $\omega_r = \omega_r$ and no estimation methods are required as $\omega_r$ is easily measured. The output torque for the I-PMSM is given by Equation (27).

\[
\begin{align*}
    i_{qs_{max}} &= \sqrt{i_s^2 - i_{ds}^2} \quad (21) \\
    i_{qs} &= \gamma \alpha c i_{qs_{max}} \quad (22)
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 3.4** I-PMSM analytical equivalent circuits, (a) d-axis, (b) q-axis
The difference between $L_q$ and $L_d$ within an I-PMSM creates a reluctance torque, if this did not occur (like in an S-PMSM) the output torque would be proportional to $i_{qs}$ and $\varphi_m$. Maximum Torque Per-Amp (MTPA) theory utilises the I-PMSM’s saliency ratio $\varepsilon$ (28) to have the d-axis reluctance torque produce useful work [104, 285, 286].

$$\varepsilon = \frac{L_q}{L_d}$$ (28)

The requested torque by a driver is separated between the d-axis and q-axis currents. As with the IM, the target $i_{qs}^*$ is proportional to the accelerator pedal activation level $\gamma_{acc}$ (22). Equation (29) first finds a suitable target q-axis limit $i_{qs \, max}$ for each rotor speed [287]. The motor’s rotational velocity lies within one of three operating regions; below base speed, partial-flux weakening and full-flux weakening [288]. The partial flux weakening region lies between $\omega_b$ and the critical speed $\omega_c$ (32) [106, 284]. The target d-axis current $i_d^*$ is then found using (30) or (31) according to the flowchart in Figure 3.5 [288].

$$i_{qs \, max} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{\varphi_m - \sqrt{\varphi_m^2 + 8(L_q - L_d)^2 I_s^2}}{4(L_q - L_d)} & \omega_m \leq \omega_b \\
\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 - 1} \left[ \frac{\varphi_m}{L_d} - \sqrt{\left( \frac{\epsilon \varphi_m}{L_d} \right)^2 + (\varepsilon^2 - 1) \left( \epsilon I_s \right)^2 - \left( \frac{V_s}{\omega_e L_d} \right)^2} \right] & \omega_m > \omega_b 
\end{cases}$$ (29)
\[ i_{ds}^* = \frac{\varphi_m}{2(L_q - L_d)} - \sqrt{\frac{\varphi_m^2}{4(L_q - L_d)^2} + i_{dq}^2} \]  
(30)

\[ i_{ds}^* = -\frac{\varphi_m}{L_d} + \frac{1}{L_d} \sqrt{\frac{V_s^2}{\omega_c^2} - (L_q i_{qs})^2} \]  
(31)

\[ \omega_c = \frac{V_s}{P \varphi_m} \]  
(32)

**Figure 3.5** I-PMSM MTPA \( i_{ds}^* \) flow chart

### 3.2.1.5 Voltage Constraints

The process of generating the d-axis voltage \( v_{ds} \) and q-axis voltage \( v_{qs} \) is shown in (33)-(34) [105, 108]. The current controllers’ output unit value d-axis \( v_{d0} \in [-1, 1] \) and q-axis \( v_{q0} \in [-1, 1] \) stator voltages. These are first multiplied by the stator’s rated voltage \( V_s \) before the
respective de-coupling terms are added to them depending on whether an IM or I-PMSM is being controlled.

\[
v_{ds} = v_{d0} V_s + \begin{cases} \omega_e L_s l_{qs} \left( 1 - \frac{L_m^2}{L_s L_r} \right) & \text{IM} \\ -\omega_e L_q l_{qs} & \text{PMSM} \end{cases}
\]

\[
v_{qs} = v_{q0} V_s + \begin{cases} \omega_e L_s l_{qs} \left( 1 - \frac{L_m^2}{L_s L_r} \right) + \omega_e \frac{L_m}{L_r} \lambda_{dr} & \text{IM} \\ \omega_e L_q l_{ds} + \omega_e \varphi_m & \text{PMSM} \end{cases}
\]

As the magnitude between \( v_{ds} \) and \( v_{qs} \) approaches \( V_s \), the d-axis voltage \( v_{ds} \) is given priority over \( v_{qs} \) by reducing the upper q-axis voltage limit \( v_{qs max} \) (35). Limiting the q-axis voltage does inhibit the current controller’s ability to regulate the q-axis current, but this is required to allow the motor to reach higher speeds.

\[
v_{qs max} = \sqrt{V_s^2 - v_{ds}^2}
\]

### 3.2.2 DC-AC Inverter Models

This section discusses the DC-AC inverter topologies and control methods used within Chapter Six whereby the inverter switching devices are controlled using an advanced Space Vector Pulse Width Modulation (SVPWM) scheme.

The inverter modulates a DC voltage source \( V_{DC} \) into 3-phase AC voltage waveforms \( v_a \), \( v_b \) and \( v_c \). For the purpose of this investigation, pole voltages \( v_{a0} \), \( v_{b0} \) and \( v_{c0} \) are measured between the inverter’s neutral point and the individual output phases. The voltage level of the inverter is in reference to the number of pole voltages that it is able to generate [173]. The phase voltages \( v_{aN} \), \( v_{bN} \) and \( v_{cN} \) are the potential difference between the pole voltage and an isolated neutral point N (i.e. a motor) and are calculated using Equation (36). The phase voltages are
used within the voltage vector transformations in Section 3.2.1.1 [167]. The line voltages $v_{ab}$, $v_{bc}$ and $v_{ca}$ (37)-(39) are the potential difference between two phase voltages.

$$\begin{bmatrix} v_a \\ v_b \\ v_c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} v_{aN} \\ v_{bN} \\ v_{cN} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2/3 & -1/3 & -1/3 \\ 1/3 & 2/3 & 1/3 \\ -1/3 & -1/3 & 2/3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_{a0} \\ v_{b0} \\ v_{c0} \end{bmatrix}$$

(36)

$$v_{ab} = v_{aN} - v_{bN}$$

(37)

$$v_{bc} = v_{bN} - v_{cN}$$

(38)

$$v_{ca} = v_{cN} - v_{aN}$$

(39)

3.2.2.1 Inverter Switch Control

The switching tables for a 5L-NPC and a 5-CHB inverter are given in Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 respectively. These switching tables are used to simulate the pole voltage produced by each phase leg of the inverter. The switching state combination corresponding to a particular switching state is fed into a 2D lookup table which outputs the pole voltage.

Modelling a DC-AC inverter in this manner makes numerous physical assumptions about the system. The switching components act as ideal switches with no resistance, capacitance or inductance, there are no copper or switching losses and the effect of the component temperature on the physical properties are not considered. However, because the purpose of this inverter model is to compare the switching count of different modulation strategies, this modelling technique will be adequate for this investigation. Future investigations with more detailed simulation tools and physical components will incorporate these physical assumptions back into the system at a later date.
Table 3.1 Per-phase switching table for a 5L-NPC inverter [161, 163]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Switching state $S$</th>
<th>Pole voltage $(V)$</th>
<th>Switch number for phase leg $A, B$ or $C$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4$</td>
<td>$\frac{V_{DC}}{2}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3$</td>
<td>$\frac{V_{DC}}{4}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1$</td>
<td>$-\frac{V_{DC}}{4}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$-\frac{V_{DC}}{2}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Per-phase switching table for a 5L-CHB inverter [154, 175]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Switching state $S$</th>
<th>Pole voltage $(V)$</th>
<th>Switch number for phase $A, B$ or $C$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4$</td>
<td>$2V_{DC}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3$</td>
<td>$V_{DC}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2$</td>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1$</td>
<td>$-V_{DC}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0$</td>
<td>$-2V_{DC}$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2.2 Inverter Operating Limits

The initial target reference voltage vector $V_{ref-initial}$ must be enclosed by the outer edges of the hexagonal SVM diagram as shown in Figure 2.7. Voltages outside the SVM diagram cannot be generated by an inverter because no voltage vectors or switching states define the
area. The six outermost vertices of the hexagonal SVM diagram represent the \( \alpha - \beta \) co-ordinates of the inverter operating under 6-step control. The distance between the centre of the hexagon and the outer vertices represent voltage vectors with magnitude \( \frac{2}{3}E \), where \( E \) is twice the maximum pole voltage during 6-step control (see Figure 3.6).

![Diagram of hexagonal SVM diagram with voltage vectors]

**Figure 3.6** Fundamental component of an inverter operating in 6-step square wave control

To begin with, \( V_{\text{ref-initial}} \) is quantified in terms of a modulation index \( m \in [0,1] \) using (40).

This compares the magnitude of \( V_{\text{ref-initial}} \) with respect to the magnitude of the fundamental component \( V_{\text{step}} \) of the voltage waveform using 6-step control \([156, 157, 289]\).

\[
m = \frac{|V_{\text{ref-initial}}|}{|V_{\text{step}}|} = \frac{|V_{\text{ref-initial}}|}{\frac{2}{\pi}E} \quad (40)
\]

The inverter operates in 6-step control when only the six outermost hexagonal voltage vectors of the SVM diagram are used. A diagrammatical view of the inverter’s pole voltage waveform under 6-step control is shown in Figure 3.6. The modulation index classifies what region the inverter operates in (sinusoidal/linear or overmodulation) \([156, 175, 177]\). Figure 3.7 visually shows how the trajectory of \( V_{\text{ref-initial}} \) (dotted red line) at an angle \( \alpha_e \) against the \( \alpha \) axis is modified for sinusoidal mode, overmodulation mode-I, and overmodulation mode-II in one major sector of a 5L-SVM diagram.
For sinusoidal mode ($0 < m < 0.907$) in Figure 3.7(a), the target trajectory of $V_{\text{ref-initial}}$ does not cross any of the outer hexagon boundaries and completes a full circle as it rotates around the SVM diagram. The example reference voltage vectors in Figure 3.7(a) make angles $\alpha_{e1}$ and $\alpha_{e2}$ against the $\alpha$ axis. The reference voltage vector $V_{\text{ref-initial}}$ is directly used as $V_{\text{ref}}$. The inverter remains in sinusoidal mode until the reference voltage reaches the edge of the outer hexagonal boundary where $V_{\text{ref-initial}} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left( \frac{2}{3} E \right)$ and $m = 0.907$ as shown in (41).
\[ m = \frac{|V_{\text{ref-initial}}|}{|V_{\text{step}}|} = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left( \frac{2}{3} E \right) = 0.907 \quad (41) \]

For overmodulation mode-I \((0.907 < m < 0.955)\), the target trajectory of \(V_{\text{ref-initial}}\) partially crosses the outer hexagonal boundary as shown in Figure 3.7 (b). The reference voltage \(V_{\text{ref-initial}}\) is forced to follow the trajectory a-b-c-d. The angular velocity of \(V_{\text{ref}}\) is the same as \(V_{\text{ref-initial}}\), but the magnitude \(V_{\text{ref}}\) follows the linear trajectory b-c when \(\alpha_e\) passes the crossover angle \(\theta_c\) from Figure 3.8(a). To account for the reduction in the fundamental harmonic voltage endured when travelling down the linear trajectory, the magnitude of \(V_{\text{ref-initial}}\) increases to \(V_m^*\) (42) when it re-enters the hexagonal boundaries.

\[ V_m^* = \frac{2V_{\text{dc}} \left( \frac{\pi}{6} - \theta_c \right)}{\pi \sin \left( \frac{\pi}{6} - \theta_c \right)} \quad (42) \]

As \(m\) continues to increase, \(V_m^*\) reaches the outer vertices of the hexagonal boundary and the inverter enters overmodulation mode-II \((0.955 \leq m \leq 1)\) as shown in Figure 3.7(c) where both the magnitude and angular velocity of \(V_{\text{ref-initial}}\) are modified (43). The reference voltage \(V_{\text{ref}}\) is held at one of the hexagon vertices until \(\alpha_e\) passes the required holding angle \(\alpha_h\) from Figure 3.8(b) before travelling along the linear trajectory to the next hexagonal vertex.

\[
\alpha_m^* = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{for } 0 < \alpha_e < \alpha_h \\
\left( \frac{\alpha_e - \alpha_h}{\frac{\pi}{6} - \alpha_h} \right) \frac{\pi}{6} & \text{for } \alpha_h < \alpha_e < \left( \frac{\pi}{3} - \alpha_h \right) \\
\frac{\pi}{3} & \text{for } \left( \frac{\pi}{3} - \alpha_h \right) < \alpha < \frac{\pi}{3}
\end{cases} \quad (43)
\]
3.2.2.3 Inverter Control for Traction Motor Four-Quadrant Operation

The traction motor of an HEV/EV is required to work in all four-quadrants of the torque-speed curve. These quadrants include; forward tractive, forward braking, reverse tractive and reverse braking. The operating mode is dependent on the direction of rotor spin (forward or reverse) and the directional flow of the motor’s supply current to apply either tractive or negative torque. Regardless of the operating quadrant, the reference voltage vector will still be enclosed by a hexagonal SVM diagram. The SVPWM methods examined in this thesis enable the motor to operate in all four quadrants.

3.2.3 Battery Pack Model

The auxiliary power load $P_{\text{Aux}}$ of an HEV/EV represents the power consumed by the headlights, heating system, air-conditions pumps, etc. Along with the power consumption of the motor $P_m$ and the charging power of the APU $P_{\text{Gen}}$, the total energy $J_{\text{Batt}}$ within the battery
pack is calculated using Equation (44). The State of Energy (SOE) can be calculated using Equation (45) which offers a percentage of the battery pack’s energy level with respect to its maximum capacity $J_{\text{Batt-max}}$.

$$J_{\text{Batt}}(t) = J_{\text{Batt}}(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} (- (P_m + P_{\text{Aux}}) + P_{\text{Gen}}) \, dt$$  \hspace{1cm} (44)$$

$$\text{SOE}(t) \% = 100 \left( \frac{J_{\text{Batt}}(t)}{J_{\text{Batt-max}}} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (45)$$

3.2.4 Vehicle Dynamics

3.2.4.1 CarSim Vehicle Modelling

CarSim is a commercial vehicle simulation tool widely used by vehicle manufacturers and researchers around the globe. Figure 3.9 graphically shows the geometry of the vehicle parameters used within CarSim [234, 235].

The vehicle model in Figure 3.9 consists of four 2-degree-of-freedom suspension systems connected by the sprung mass $m_s$. The components at each corner of the vehicle are denoted by the subscript wh in reference to whether they are on the front right (fr), rear right (rr), front left (fl) or rear left (rl) corner of the vehicle, i.e. wh = fr, rr, fl, rl. The model accounts for the global longitudinal $X_s$, lateral $Y_s$ and vertical $Z_s$ positions of the sprung mass as well as its roll $\varphi_s$, pitch $\theta_s$ and yaw $\psi_s$ angle about its centre of mass at height $h_{\text{COG}}$. The model requires the distance $e_s$ between $h_{\text{COG}}$ and the roll axis, the yaw inertia $I_{\text{yaw}}$, roll inertia $I_{\text{roll}}$ and pitch inertia $I_{\text{pitch}}$ of the sprung mass.

The model requires the basic geometrical parameters of the vehicle including the wheelbase $L$, the distance between $h_{\text{COG}}$ to the front axle $a$ and rear axle $b$ as well as the track width of the front $T_f$ and rear axle $T_r$. The steer angle $\delta_{\text{wh}}$ of the wheels are controlled by CarSim’s internal closed-loop steering system to follow a predetermined path.
The suspension system consists of unsprung masses on the front axle $m_{uwh}$ at height $Z_{uwh}$ above the road $Z_{rwh}$ with a spring coefficient $k_{1wh}$ and a damping coefficient $c_{1wh}$. The suspension system from the tyres are represented by spring coefficient $k_{2wh}$ and a damping coefficient $c_{2wh}$. The front and rear anti-roll bars are represented by torsional springs with coefficients $K_{af}$ and $K_{ar}$ respectively. The torsional characteristics of the chassis are represented by spring coefficient $K_{qr}$ and a damping coefficient $C_{qr}$.

CarSim offers detailed multiple degree of freedom vehicle body dynamics, tyre rotational dynamics, steering control, suspension response, braking system control and powertrain models. Chapter Four and Chapter Seven use CarSim vehicle models to simulate the dynamics of the vehicle using the control systems developed in their respective chapters. CarSim allows for direct communication between itself and MATLAB via a dedicated CarSim toolbox in

**Figure 3.9** 14 Degree of Freedom vehicle model [239, 240]
Simulink. Table 3.3 shows the parameters transferred between CarSim and MATLAB/Simulink.

Table 3.3 Input-output parameters between CarSim and MATLAB/Simulink.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis Chapter</th>
<th>CarSim Import</th>
<th>CarSim Export</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Parameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Motor torque (Nm)</td>
<td>Longitudinal velocity (km/h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\tau_e$</td>
<td>Wheel rotational velocity (rad/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_{B-pedal}$</td>
<td>Vertical tyre force (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Longitudinal tyre force (N)</td>
<td>Velocity at wheel-road (km/h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_{xwh}$</td>
<td>Longitudinal velocity (km/h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lateral velocity (km/h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Yaw rate (rad/s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front right steer angel (deg°)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front left steer angel (deg°)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.4.2 The Tyre Model

Due to integration errors within CarSim, external wheel slip control techniques generate unstable tyre responses. Since Chapter Seven requires direct control of the wheel slip, the tyres and braking system are modelled in MATLAB/Simulink, the longitudinal and lateral tyre forces are then exported back to CarSim to simulate the dynamics of the vehicle body.

The wheel slip ratio $\sigma_{wh}$ (46) requires the longitudinal velocity at the centre of the wheel $u_{wh}$ and the velocity of the tyre’s outer surface at a radius $R$ with a rotational velocity $\omega_{wh}$.

$$\sigma_{wh} = \begin{cases} \frac{u_{wh} - R\omega_{wh}}{u_{wh}} & \text{for } R\omega_{wh} < u_{wh} \quad \text{Braking} \\ \frac{R\omega_{wh} - u_{wh}}{u_{wh}} & \text{for } R\omega_{wh} \geq u_{wh} \quad \text{Traction} \end{cases}$$  (46)
The diagrammatical view of the wheel slip velocity components are given in Figure 3.10(a) and the wheel’s sideslip angles are shown in Figure 3.10(b). The longitudinal velocity of the wheels $u_{w_h}$ (47)-(50) and the individual wheel sideslip angle $\alpha_{w_h}$ (51)-(54) are required for the tyre model.

\[
u_{fl} = (V_x + 0.5T_f r) \cos \delta_{fl} + (V_y + ar) \sin \delta_{fl} \quad (47)\]
\[
u_{fr} = (V_x - 0.5T_f r) \cos \delta_{fr} + (V_y + ar) \sin \delta_{fr} \quad (48)\]
\[
u_{rl} = (V_x + 0.5T_f r) \cos \delta_{rl} + (br - V_y) \sin \delta_{rl} \quad (49)\]
\[
u_{rr} = (V_x - 0.5T_f r) \cos \delta_{rr} + (br - V_y) \sin \delta_{rr} \quad (50)\]
\[
\alpha_{fl} = \delta_{fl} - \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{V_y + ar}{V_x - 0.5T_f r}\right) \quad (51)\]
\[
\alpha_{fr} = \delta_{fr} - \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{V_y + ar}{V_x + 0.5T_f r}\right) \quad (52)\]
\[
\alpha_{rl} = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{br - V_y}{V_x - 0.5T_f r}\right) \quad (53)\]
\[
\alpha_{rr} = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{br - V_y}{V_x + 0.5T_f r}\right) \quad (54)\]
The Pacejka Magic Formula produces accurate results for both steady-state and small slip angle transients (the points of concern within this thesis) in both longitudinal and lateral directions [290]. For larger slip angles beyond stable wheel slip control (past peak friction), a transient tyre model which accounts for the larger contact patch time delay would be required, but these models need more parameters and have a higher computational burden [291]. The over parameterisation of the Magic Formula model requires an extensive series of experimental tests to find all the required parameters if they are not provided. Even with these limitations, the high accuracy and low computational effort of the Magic Formula has made it used throughout literature for vehicle simulation and VSC research [235, 271, 272, 292].

The tractive force $F_{twh}$ (55) and side forces $F_{swh}$ (56) of the wheels from the Pacejka magic formula are split into the longitudinal forces $F_{xwh}$ (57) and lateral forces $F_{ywh}$ (58). The tyre-road force characteristics are represented by a peak value $D_x$, shape factor $C_x$, stiffness factor $B_x$ and a curvature factor $E_x$. The effect of the wheels sideslip angle on the stiffness and shape factors are accounted for with parameters $B_\alpha$ and $C_\alpha$ respectively.

$$F_{twh} = F_{2wh} \cos(C_\alpha \tan^{-1}(B_\alpha \alpha_{wh})) D_x \sin[C_x \tan^{-1}(B_x \alpha_{wh} - E_x (B_x \alpha_{wh} - \tan^{-1}(B_x \alpha_{wh})))]] \quad (55)$$

$$F_{swh} = F_{2wh} \cos(C_\alpha \tan^{-1}(B_\alpha \alpha_{wh})) D_x \sin[C_x \tan^{-1}(B_x \alpha_{wh} - E_x (B_x \alpha_{wh} - \tan^{-1}(B_x \alpha_{wh})))]] \quad (56)$$

$$F_{xwh} = F_{twh} \cos \delta_{wh} - F_{swh} \sin \delta_{wh} \quad (57)$$

$$F_{ywh} = F_{twh} \sin \delta_{wh} + F_{swh} \cos \delta_{wh} \quad (58)$$

The rotational velocity of the wheel $\omega_{wh}$ (59) depends on the rotational inertia of the wheel $I_{wh}$, longitudinal tractive force of the tyre $F_{twh}$ as well as the brake torque $\tau_{Bwh}$ and drive torque $\tau_{Dwh}$ supplied to the wheel.

$$\omega_{wh} = \omega_{wh}(t_0) + \frac{1}{I_{wh}} \int_{t_0}^{t} -RF_{twh} - \tau_{Bwh} + \tau_{Dwh} \, dt \quad (59)$$
3.2.5 Simplified HEV/EV Modelling techniques

3.2.5.1 Simplified Traction Motor Model

The detailed analytical models of the traction motors offer a good trade-off between accurate modelling of the motor’s dynamic and electrical characteristics against the time-space modelling complexity. However, the detailed parameters used to create these models may be difficult to obtain from motor manufacturers and performing a series of experiments to find them is impractical if numerous motors are being considered [293, 294].

Where detailed analytical motor models are not required, the output torque $\tau_{PM}$ for a prime mover (traction motor or ICE) is calculated using a 2D look-up table (60). The lookup table requires the full load output torque $\tau_{PM}$ at the current prime mover rotational velocity $\omega_{PM}$ and the accelerator activation level $\gamma_{acc} \in [0 \ 1]$. The electrical efficiency map $\eta_e(\omega_m, \tau_e)$ of the traction motor is used to calculate the electrical power consumption of a traction motor $P_m$ (61)

$$\tau_{PM} = \gamma_{acc} \tau_{PM}(\omega_{PM}) \tag{60}$$

$$P_m = \frac{\tau_{PM}\omega_{PM}}{\eta_e(\omega_{PM}, \tau_{PM})} \tag{61}$$

3.2.5.2 Simplified ICE Model

The torque-speed characteristics of an ICE are simulated using a similar manner to the simplified traction motor models using Equation (60) by replacing $PM = ICE$ or via an equivalent throttle map. The full load torque-speed curve of the traction motors are now representative of the ICE peak torque-speed curve $\tau_{ICE}$ and the efficiency maps of Equation (61) are replaced by the ICE’s fuel consumption and tailpipe output emissions maps. See Section 5.2.3 for an example of the characteristic curves used for an ICE.
3.2.5.3  Simplified APU Model

The APU is defined by numerous factors including; output power $P_{\text{gen}}$ (kW), fuel consumption (L/hr) and output emissions (g/s). These parameters are integrated over time to calculate the total energy provided to the DC-Link, total fuel consumption and the total output emissions over a duty cycle.

The APU model within this thesis provides power $P_{\text{gen}}$ to the DC-link in one of 3 ways; full power mode, idle mode, and off. During full power mode, the genset provides full power to the DC-Link and consumes fuel at its full rate. The APU is turned on-off to keep the battery pack’s SOE within safe upper and lower working limits. During idle mode, the genset provides no power to the DC-Link but consumes fuel at a fraction of the rated value. For the case study in Section 5.2, a value of 10% of the rated fuel is consumed during idle mode to highlight a worst-case scenario. When the genset is off, no power is provided to the DC-Link and no fuel is consumed and the HEV operates in full EV mode.

The manufacturer of the genset used in the case study in Section 5.2 recommends idle mode to be used for 60 seconds before and after full power mode in order to prolong the lifetime of the genset. If the SOE of the battery pack reaches the lower limit during this idling period, the genset switches to full power mode. This overruling control might adversely affect the genset’s lifetime if it occurred frequently, but the more expensive battery pack’s sensitivity to under-discharging is a higher priority.

3.2.5.4  Simplified Vehicle Dynamics

Chapter Five uses a simplified vehicle model to reduce the computational effort required for long simulations. The vehicle in Chapter Five is only simulating straight line velocity dynamics with no roll, pitch, yaw or wheel spin dynamics considered.
A Fuzzy Logic (FL) speed controller is used to control the vehicle’s speed which attempts to follow a target velocity profile by generating appropriate accelerator $\gamma_{ace} \in [0,1]$ and brake pedal $\gamma_{brk} \in [0,1]$ activation levels [128, 295] (see Section 4.1.1).

A vehicle model created in MATLAB/Simulink contains the basic forces acting upon the vehicle. The tractive force $F_{\text{tractive}}$ at the road-wheel interface (62), the rolling resistance $F_{\text{rolling}}$ of the tyres (63), the aerodynamic drag $F_{\text{aero}}$ (64) and the brake force $F_{\text{brake}}$ (65) are all included in the model [49, 53, 296]. The tractive force requires the output torque from the prime mover $\tau_{PM}$, gear ratio of the final drive $N_{fd}$, transmission ratio $N_T$, their combined efficiency $\eta_{Tfd}$ and the wheel’s rolling radius $R$. As the vehicle under investigation in Chapter Five is an aeroplane pushback vehicle, the mass of the aeroplane being towed at the current time $M_{\text{aeroplane}}$ is included in (63) to account for the additional rolling resistance from the aeroplane. Removal of $M_{\text{aeroplane}}$ allows this vehicle model to be used for conventional passenger vehicle simulations. The rolling resistance is also dependant on the acceleration of the vehicle under gravity $g$ and the coefficient of rolling resistance $f_r$ between the tyre and road interface. The aerodynamic drag force $F_{\text{aero}}$ requires the frontal area of the vehicle $A_f$, coefficient of aerodynamic drag $C_D$ and the density of the air $\rho_{\text{air}}$. The combined brake force $F_{\text{brake}}$ uses a linear relationship between the brake pedal activation level $\gamma_{brk}$ and the maximum brake force available to the road-wheel conditions $F_{B_{-\text{max}}}$.

The effective additional towing mass of the vehicle $M_{r}$ (66) is dependent on the rotational inertias of the prime mover $I_{PM}$, transmission $I_T$, final drive $I_{fd}$ and the wheels $I_{Wh}$. The longitudinal acceleration $a_x$ of the vehicle is then calculated using (67). The rotational speed of the prime mover $\omega_{PM}$ is then calculated using (68).
This section presents the statistical analysis tools used to evaluate the accuracy of the modelling techniques described in Section 3.2 and the performance of the control methods developed in this thesis against pre-existing control schemes.

3.3.1 Controller Error Analysis

The Symmetrical Mean Absolute Percentage Error (SMAPE) (69) quantifies the accuracy of a control system with an average percentage error. This is done by comparing the target (forecast) values $F_n$ and the actual values $A_n$ at the time interval $n$ in a time series with $n_{\text{max}}$ data points. The smaller the SMAPE, the greater the accuracy of the control system. Throughout this thesis, SMAPE values below 5% are deemed acceptable error percentages to state that the control system is successfully able to regulate its control variables.

$$SMAPE (\%) = \frac{100}{n_{\text{max}}} \sum_{n=1}^{n_{\text{max}}} \frac{|F_n - A_n|}{|A_n| + |F_n|}$$
The advantage this version of the SMAPE over other average percentage error quantifiers for time series data is that this SMAPE equation will still work when $A_n = 0$. However, this version of the SMAPE is slightly sensitive to percentage value variances between overestimation and underestimation, but it is still commonly used in practice as this variance is usually small enough to be negligible [297].

### 3.3.2 Waveform Harmonic Distortion

The Total Harmonic Distortion (THD) (70) is a measure of how much a waveform has distorted from its fundamental component $|V|_{fund}$ due to other harmonics $Hf$ between the second harmonic ($Hf = 2$) and an upper limit $Hf_{max}$. The Weighted-THD (WTHD) (71) places more emphasis on low order harmonic distortion by giving high frequency harmonics a lower weighting factor [163]. Minimising these values is a key objective for DC-AC inverters as they attempt to produce pure sinusoidal voltage and current waveforms.

\[
THD = \frac{1}{|V|_{fund}} \sqrt{\sum_{Hf=2,3,\ldots}^{Hf_{max}} |V|_{Hf}^2} \quad (70)
\]

\[
WTHD = \frac{1}{|V|_{fund}} \sqrt{\sum_{Hf=2,3,\ldots}^{Hf_{max}} \left(\frac{|V|_{Hf}}{Hf}\right)^2} \quad (71)
\]

### 3.3.3 Vehicle Dynamic Performance Indices

The performance indices (72)-(75) are used to evaluate dynamic and braking performance of a vehicle during an emergency braking scenario. The total braking time ($t_{bk}$) and longitudinal braking distance ($X_{bk}$) are primarily used for straight line braking scenarios, but these do not account for any steering or yaw rate control.
The performance index \( J \) (72) compares the braking severity and steering controllability between the start of the braking scenario at time \( t_1 \) until the vehicle comes to a complete stop at time \( t_2 \) [259]. This index relies on the peak COF between the road and wheel interface \( \mu \), the initial velocity entering the braking manoeuvre \( V_{x0} \) and a weighting factor \( \rho_w \) \((\rho_w = 0.7)\). The weighting factor is used to place more emphasis on the braking severity or the yaw rate control.

The Integrated Yaw Rate Error (IYRE) (73) integrates the error between the vehicle’s target yaw rate \( r^* \) and the actual yaw rate \( r \) over time. Low IYRE values show that the vehicle has good steering responsiveness. The Integrated Sideslip Error (ISSE) (74) integrates the vehicle sideslip angle \( \beta_{ss} \) over time. Low values of the ISSE show that the vehicle has good stability.

The Integrated Steering Control (ISC) (75) shows how much driver steering intervention is needed to maintain control by integrating the steer angle \( \delta \) over time. Inexperienced drivers may be unable to control the vehicle if excessive steering input is required.

\[
J = \rho_w \left( \frac{2 \mu g X_{bk}}{V_{x0}^2} - 1 \right)^2 + (1 - \rho_w) \left( \frac{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} (r - r^*)^2 \, dt}{\int_{t_1}^{t_2} (r^*)^2 \, dt} \right) \tag{72}
\]

\[
IYRE = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |r - r^*| \, dt \tag{73}
\]

\[
ISSE = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\Delta \beta_{ss}| \, dt \tag{74}
\]

\[
ISC = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\delta| \, dt \tag{75}
\]
3.4 Model Verification Procedure

3.4.1 Traction Motor Model Verification

The traction motor models are constructed in MATLAB/Simulink using the equations described in Section 3.2.1 using basic components (integrators, multipliers, etc.). To ensure that the motor models are constructed correctly, their dynamic and electrical performance are compared to the commercial Powertrain Blockset™ motor models. The models within this Blockset were chosen over other commercial MATLAB/Simulink models because they are based on the same analytical equations and the same assumptions described in Section 3.2.1. This makes them not suitable for motor design application, but acceptable for HEV/EV and standalone motor control applications. The commercial models include additional features such as viscous damping, power loss considerations and bandwidth current control. The additional complexity of the commercial models increase the simulation time during parallel simulations and these commercial models cannot be easily deconstructed to examine the internal control signals and do not permit exporting the internal control variables required for the flux wave estimation (see Section 3.2.1.3). The commercial motor models are therefore not used for the main investigation of this thesis but confined to this verification investigation and act as a sensibility check of the newly constructed MATLAB/Simulink models to ensure that they produce similar magnitude results.

The motor models for this verification investigations are modelled independently from a vehicle and instead have a load torque $\tau_L$ providing resistance applied to the rotor with rotational inertia $J_r$. An IM and an I-PMSM motor with parameters given in Table 3.4 are used in both MATLAB/Simulink and within the Powertrain Blockset™ models [143, 298]. These motors are controlled using identical FOC architectures as shown in Figure 3.2 of Section 3.2.1.2 and follow the same target speed-torque profile. The PI controllers for the IM and I-
PMSM motor were tuned for the specific motors using the controller gains in Table 3.5. Data used for the SMAPE results in Table 3.6 were taken at $5 \times 10^{-4}$s discrete time steps, data points lower than 1% of the peak control variable are negated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>I-PMSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of poles</td>
<td>$P_m$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated power (kW)</td>
<td>$P_{max}$</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base speed (rpm)</td>
<td>$\omega_b$</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated Voltage (V)</td>
<td>$V_s$</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated Current (A)</td>
<td>$I_s$</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stator resistance (Ω)</td>
<td>$r_s$</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor resistance (Ω)</td>
<td>$r_r$</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetising inductance (mH)</td>
<td>$L_m$</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakage stator inductance (mH)</td>
<td>$L_{ls}$</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakage rotor inductance (mH)</td>
<td>$L_{lr}$</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor flux max (Wb)</td>
<td>$\varphi_r$</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet flux (Wb)</td>
<td>$\varphi_m$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-axis inductance (mH)</td>
<td>$L_d$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-axis inductance (mH)</td>
<td>$L_q$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor Inertia (kg.m²)</td>
<td>$J_r$</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison between the IM and I-PMSM motor models are given in Figure 3.11 and Figure 3.12 respectively.
Figure 3.11 IM model verification simulation (a) $\omega_m$ comparison, (b) $\tau_e$ comparison, (c) $i_{ds}$ comparison, (d) $v_{ds}$ voltage comparison, (e) $i_{qs}$ comparison, (f) $v_{qs}$ comparison, (g) $\omega_e$ comparison
Figure 3.12 I-PMSM model verification simulation (a) $\omega_m$ comparison, (b) $\tau_e$ comparison, (c) $i_d$ comparison, (d) $v_d$ voltage comparison, (e) $i_q$ comparison, (f) $v_q$ comparison, (g) $\omega_e$ comparison
The dynamic and electrical performance of the motors constructed from basic MATLAB/Simulink components perform comparably to the commercially available models. In addition, the FOC schemes are able to suitably maintain the control variables while conforming to the systems current and voltage limits.

The SMAPE analysis between the MATLAB and commercial motor models given in Table 3.6 show that the error percentage between the two models are within acceptable levels. Therefore, the analytical motor models and FOC scheme architecture produce comparable results to the commercial models (accounting for similar limitations and simplifications as discussed) and deemed suitable for use within the main investigation of this thesis.

**Table 3.6** SMAPE analysis between the MATLAB and Commercial IM and I-PMSM models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variable</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>SMAPE (%)</th>
<th>I-PMSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \omega_m )</td>
<td>9.6x10^{-6}</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau_e )</td>
<td>0.0152</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( i_d )</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_d )</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( i_q )</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v_q )</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \omega_e )</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.2 DC-AC Inverter Model Verification

To ensure that the inverter model described in Section 3.2.2 is constructed correctly, the output voltage for this model is compared to the output voltage of a CHB inverter modelled in the Simscape environment of MATLAB/Simulink. This is to verify that both models output the correct voltage level for a given combination of command signals. The Simscape CHB inverter is constructed using the 5L-CHB architecture as shown in Figure 2.4(b) using 32 ideal switches and 8 ideal DC voltage sources with parameters given in Table 3.7. Simscape models are widely used throughout literature for DC-AC inverter modelling and control applications [160, 299,
Because ideal components are being used for the Simscape model, they will have the same simplifying physical assumptions to the inverter model described in Section 3.2.2, but the justification remains the same in that only the output voltage is being checked for this inverter topology and control signals.

**Table 3.7** Simscape DC-AC inverter model parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DC Source</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltage (V)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Resistance (Ω)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge Capacity</td>
<td>Infinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Resistance (Ω)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Resistance (Ω)</td>
<td>1x10^8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.13** DC-AC inverter model comparison, (a) \( v_{aN} \) at \( m = 0.2 \), (b) \( v_{ab} \) at \( m = 0.2 \), (c) \( v_{aN} \) at \( m = 0.7 \), (d) \( v_{ab} \) at \( m = 0.7 \), (e) \( v_{aN} \) at \( m = 0.9 \), (f) \( v_{ab} \) at \( m = 0.9 \), (g) \( v_{aN} \) at \( m = 1 \), (h) \( v_{ab} \) at \( m = 1 \)
The inverter switching devices are controlled using the SVPWM scheme described in Section 6.1. The inverter uses a switching frequency of \( f_s = 2 \text{ kHz} \) to create a voltage waveform with a fundamental harmonic of 50 Hz over a range of modulation indexes. The comparison between the two inverter models is shown in Figure 3.13. Both models produce identical voltage waveforms to one another over the range of output waveform modulation indices. However, due to the large number of parallel simulations required for the investigation in Section 6.2, the simpler 2D look-up tables will be used for the simulation investigation in this thesis instead of the Simscape model to reduce simulation time.

### 3.4.3 Tyre Model Verification

To ensure that the tyre models are constructed correctly in MATLAB/Simulink, their tractive force and dynamic performance is compared to the commercial Powertrain Blockset™ tyre model. The models within this Blockset were chosen over other commercial MATLAB/Simulink models because they are based on the same Pacejka Magic Formula equations described in Section 3.2.4.2. The commercial models will therefore also suffer with the limitations discussed in Section 3.2.4.2 but still act as a suitable verification tool and act as a sensibility check of the newly constructed MATLAB/Simulink models to ensure that they produce similar magnitude results.

The Powertrain Blockset™ tyre model is more detailed as it includes greater detail about the tyre’s relaxation length, contact patch and damping coefficient. However, this model does not consider the sideslip angle or lateral tyre forces and therefore cannot be used for the VSC vehicle model in Chapter Seven, it will therefore be confined to the comparison simulations for the longitudinal tractive forces using the parameters in Table 3.8. The applied axle torque, longitudinal speed profile and wheel dynamics for both models are given in Figure 3.14.
Table 3.8 Longitudinal tyre parameters for commercial and Simulink tyre models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$I_{W_h}$ (Kg.m²)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxation length (m)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$ (m)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation pressure (kPa)</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_X$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_X$</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_X$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_X$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_z$ (N)</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_s$ (kg)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results in Figure 3.14 and the SMAPE comparison values in Table 3.9, both the commercial and Simulink tyre models have comparable longitudinal performance to one another validating the use of the MATLAB tyres for the main investigation within this thesis.
Data for the SMAPE values in Table 3.9 used at 1x10^{-6}s discrete time steps. Data points lower than 1% of the peak control variable are negated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variable</th>
<th>SMAPE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F_t$</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{wh}$</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{wh}R$</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.4 Control System Verification

There are numerous levels of controller verification, each method progresses upon the previous and increasing the amount of verification. The different methods should be applied at different times of the controller development process as follows:

- Model-in-the-Loop (MIL) – The control system is first designed with a plant model in a fully simulated environment [302]. The parameters of the control system can be initialised, tested and adjusted quickly to obtain a first iteration of the controller design which will operate as intended.

- Software-in-the-Loop (SIL) - The controller designed using the MIL simulations now runs on a simulated version of the hardware which the controller is intended to be implemented into [303]. During the SIL stage, any limitations or undesirable characteristics of the physical hardware will be replicated in the simulation. As both MIL and SIL still operate in a fully simulation-based environment, adjustments to the control system can be made and re-tested quickly.

- Processor-in-the-Loop (PIL) – Here, the MIL controller is compiled into code that enables it to run on physical hardware [302, 304, 305]. As a precursor to the final hardware verification, the key objectives for PIL simulations are to ensure that the compiled code performs numerically identical to the MIL counterparts, check for compiler optimisation.
flags and the memory footprint of the compiled code [306]. PIL is able to run the controller in pseudo-time on physical hardware with a simulated plant environment.

- Hardware-in-the-Loop (HIL) – This is the final stage of the verification process before the controller is implemented on a physical plant. The controller must run successfully in real-time with a simulated plant environment.

A control system that can successfully run in real-time for a HIL simulation can be classed as validated and ready for full scale implementation with a physical control plant. PIL however acts an ideal bridge between MIL/SIL and HIL. In the absence of real-time simulation tools, the pseudo-time PIL simulation can be used to verify the controller code and compiler methods ahead of the HIL simulation. PIL simulations will be carried out throughout this thesis as a method of verifying that the compiled control systems behave numerically identical to their MIL counterparts. The HIL validation procedure will be conducted in the future when real-time simulation and hardware tools become available.

An Arduino Mega 2560 with specifications given in Table 3.10 acts as the physical hardware for the PIL simulations. The open source Arduino toolbox for MATLAB/Simulink enables code generation which directly converts the controllers designed in Simulink into code and directly implements it onto the Arduino.

**Table 3.10** Arduino Mega 2560 microcontroller technical specification [307]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microcontroller</td>
<td>ATmega2560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection Type</td>
<td>USB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Voltage</td>
<td>5 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Current per I/O Pin</td>
<td>20 mA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Memory</td>
<td>256 kb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRAM</td>
<td>8 kb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEPROM</td>
<td>4 kb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock Speed</td>
<td>16 MHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A USB connection between the Arduino and the computer running the software-based simulations enable the two environments to communicate with one another. The flowchart of controller inputs and outputs between MATLAB/Simulink, CarSim and the Arduino is shown in Figure 3.15. The communication between MATLAB/Simulink and CarSim is confined to the software environment, only during the PIL simulations is the Arduino required.

Only one controller (Fuzzy Logic, PI etc) from each system is able to run on the Arduino when communicating with MATLAB/Simulink at a single time. Therefore, numerous PIL simulations are conducted for each process or scenario investigated within this thesis. The individual control system variables for each PIL simulation which are exported to the Arduino and imported back into Simulink are given in Table 3.11, the reader should refer to the corresponding chapters for further detail on the control variables under investigation. All the
controllers in Table 3.11 ran at a discrete time step of 0.001s. However, due to the high computational load on the computer running the simulations and use of serial connection between the Arduino and the computer, the PIL simulations do not run in real time. Therefore, the PIL simulations are conducted before the main simulation study to verify that the compiled controller code acts identically to the MIL simulations which then take over for the remainder of the investigation.

Chapter Four and Chapter Seven each develop new control systems. The results of the PIL simulations are presented in their respective chapters before the simulation investigation begins to ensure that the controllers are unaffected by the code compiler methods. Because Chapter Five introduces a new traction motor sizing strategy which uses no controllers, no PIL simulations are required. Even though Chapter Six does develop a DC-AC inverter control methodology, no controllers (PI, FLC SMC) are used, instead a series of algebraic functions simply generate appropriate switch controls. Future efforts will be undertaken to validate the control methodology in Chapter Six by controlling the physical switches of an inverter, but no PIL simulations are conducted at this stage.

Table 3.11 Arduino PIL controller input-output parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis Chapter</th>
<th>Controller Name</th>
<th>Simulink Export</th>
<th>Simulink Import</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FL-Speed</td>
<td>$\Delta V_x$</td>
<td>$\frac{\Delta V_x}{dt}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FL-Current</td>
<td>$\Delta i_{ds,qs}$</td>
<td>$\tilde{z}_{ds,qs}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FL-Flux</td>
<td>$\Delta \varphi_r$</td>
<td>$\frac{\Delta \varphi_r}{dt}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FL-VSC-GR</td>
<td>$M_Z$</td>
<td>$\frac{M_Z}{dt}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FL-VSC-FR</td>
<td>$\Delta G$</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FL-VSC RL</td>
<td>$\Delta G$</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Summary

This chapter has presented the modelling and control techniques used to represent the traction motor, DC-AC inverter and vehicle dynamics required for the research conducted within the remainder of this thesis. The suitability of the models created in MATLAB/Simulink for use within HEV/EV simulations have been verified by comparing their outputs against commercially available equivalent simulation tools. How and why these models are used for the various research activities within this thesis is given and why they were chosen over the commercially available methods has also been explained.

The statistical analysis methods used to verify the modelling techniques and analyse the control algorithms in the remainder of this thesis have also been introduced. The explanations as to how and why they are used accompany their explanation. These statistical methods are used to quantify the performance of the control systems developed within this thesis against the state-of-the-art predecessors.

The PIL experimental procedures used to verify the intelligent control algorithms have been presented. These are used to confirm that the control systems can perform numerically identical to their software-based counterparts once they have been compiled for use on embedded hardware.
Chapter Four

Fuzzy Logic Field-Oriented Control for Traction Motors

The robustness of Fuzzy Logic (FL) controllers in previous literature have shown them to be insensitive to system and parameter changes, making them a suitable candidate for Field-Oriented Control (FOC) [140, 141, 142]. The author proposes a FL controller based FOC (FL-FOC) system consisting of independent FL; vehicle speed, traction motor $i_{qs}$, traction motor $i_{ds}$ and IM $\varphi_r$ controllers developed in Section 4.1. These controllers take place in the FOC architecture in Figure 3.2 of Section 3.2.1.2. The aim of the FL-FOC scheme is to stably control the FOC objectives within acceptable error tolerances with any HEV/EV powertrain architecture system and multiple traction motor topologies without the need for re-tuning.

Although this chapter only investigates vehicles powered purely by traction motors, as is the case with series-HEVs and pure EVs, it is possible to extrapolate this system to control the electric motors of other HEV powertrain architectures (parallel, power-split) with minimal changes to the control architecture. This is explained where necessary within this chapter.

Section 4.1 presents the FL controllers used within the FL-FOC system whereby the PIL simulations are then given in Section 4.2. The performance of the FL-FOC system in comparison to a PI based FOC scheme is given in Section 4.3 with an investigation into the systems robustness in Section 4.4.

The contents of this chapter have been published in a journal article which presented the FL-FOC scheme [295] and at a conference which analysed its robustness in further detail [308].
4.1 Fuzzy Logic Controllers within the FL-FOC Scheme

The FL-FOC scheme consists of independent FL speed, \( i_{qs}, i_{ds} \) and \( \varphi_r \) (in an IM) controllers. These controllers use the linguistic terms Positive Large (PL), Positive Medium (PM), Positive Small (PS), Zero (Z), Negative Small (NS), Negative Medium (NM) and Negative Large (NL).

4.1.1 Fuzzy Logic Speed Controller

The membership functions for the FL speed controller are given in Figure 4.1 and the rule base is given in Table 4.1. This controller uses the longitudinal velocity error \( \Delta V_x \) (76) at time \( t \) as the first input and its time derivative as the second input to generate a suitable pedal activation level.

\[
\Delta V_x(t) = V_x^*(t) - V_x(t) \tag{76}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \frac{d(\Delta V_x)}{dt} )</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An input range of \( \pm 5 \) km/h in Figure 4.1(a) is used for the controller’s first input \( \Delta V_x \) because this offers the best trade-off between a low steady-state velocity error and control realism. Reducing this input range improves the steady-state error of the vehicle, but it also resulted in erratic pedal control. For this investigation, pulsating the accelerator or brake pedal more than 2 times per second (>2 Hz) with >20% activation level is considered to be erratic pedal control. Larger pedal activation levels at this frequency (or higher frequencies) are
deemed to be beyond typical achievable vehicle speed control by a real driver. Higher pedal activation levels (> 20%) at a lower frequency (< 2 Hz) are permitted. The second input range ±20 km/h/s in Figure 4.1(b) for the time derivative of $\Delta V_x$ is used because 20 km/h/s approaches the acceleration ability of high performance sports vehicles (0-60 mph time ≈ 4.8 s). Most typical drivers would accept ±20 km/h/s to be a large acceleration value.

![FL speed controller membership functions](image)

**Figure 4.1** FL speed controller membership functions, (a) Input 1 - $\Delta V_x$, (b) Input 2 - $\frac{d(\Delta V_x)}{dt}$, (c) Output - Pedal movement

A controller output with a magnitude 1 shows that the accelerator or brake pedal is fully activated. Positive speed controller outputs represent accelerator pedal activation levels and
negative outputs represent brake pedal activation levels. An accelerator pedal activation level corresponds to the driver requesting a motor torque output to either accelerate the vehicle or maintain a steady cruising speed. For series-HEVs and pure EVs, the positive unit value output from the controller is multiplied by the motors rated current $I_x$ and separated into d and q axis currents for the respective motor topologies to generate the required output torque (see Section 3.2.1.3-3.2.1.4). For other HEV powertrain architectures (parallel, power-split, etc.), the positive unit value output is first separated between the individual torque sources (ICE and traction motor). The fraction of the total torque required to be produced by the traction motor/s then follow a similar process as for a pure EV. Brake pedal activation levels correspond to the driver requesting brake torques to decelerate the vehicle.

Some examples of the rule base for the for the FL speed controller are explained as follows:

- If $\Delta V^x$ is (Z) and $\frac{\Delta V^x}{dt}$ is (Z) then Pedal Movement is (Z). If the vehicle is travelling at its target velocity and is not accelerating or decelerating, then no accelerator or brake pedal is required.

- If $\Delta V^x$ is (NL) and $\frac{\Delta V^x}{dt}$ is (NS) then Pedal Movement is (NM). Even though the vehicle is travelling much faster that its target velocity, the brake pedal does not need to be fully applied because the vehicle is already decelerating towards the target velocity.

- If $\Delta V^x$ is (PL) and $\frac{\Delta V^x}{dt}$ is (NS) then Pedal Movement is (PL). If the vehicle is travelling much slower than the target velocity and decelerating, the accelerator pedal is fully applied to bring the vehicle back up to the target velocity.

### 4.1.2 Fuzzy Logic Current Controller

Both $i_{qs}$ and $i_{ds}$ current are controlled using identical independent FL current controllers. The FL current controllers use the membership functions given in Figure 4.2 and the rule base Table 4.2. These controllers use the instantaneous current error $\Delta i_{ds,qs}$ (77) as the first input
and the change in current error from the previous discrete time step \( \zeta_{ds,qs} \) (78) as the second input [148, 287].

\[
\Delta i_{ds,qs}(t) = i^*_{ds,qs}(t) - i_{ds,qs}(t) \\
\zeta_{ds,qs} = \Delta i_{ds,qs}(t) - \Delta i_{ds,qs}(t - 1)
\]  

(77)  
(78)

In the same way as the FL speed controller, the input ranges for \( \Delta i_{ds,qs} \) (Figure 4.2(a)) and \( \zeta_{ds,qs} \) (Figure 4.2(b)) were chosen as they offered the best steady-state performance while

**Figure 4.2** FL Current controller membership functions, (a) Input 1 - \( \Delta i_{ds,qs} \), (b) Input 2 - \( \zeta_{ds,qs} \), (c) Output - \( v_{d0,q0} \)

In the same way as the FL speed controller, the input ranges for \( \Delta i_{ds,qs} \) (Figure 4.2(a)) and \( \zeta_{ds,qs} \) (Figure 4.2(b)) were chosen as they offered the best steady-state performance while
remaining stable. The FL current controllers output the voltage $v_{d0,q0}$ (Figure 4.2(c)) as a unit value, these are then multiplied by the rated stator voltage (see Section 3.2.1.5).

### Table 4.2 FL current controller rule base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\zeta_{ds,qs}$</th>
<th>$\Delta i_{ds,qs}$</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some examples of the rule base for the FL current controllers are explained as followed:

- **If** $\Delta i_{ds,qs}$ **is** (Z) **and** $\zeta_{ds,qs}$ **is** (Z) **then** $v_{d0,q0}$ **is** (Z). When the current error is zero and the error has not changed since the previous time step, the voltage output is zero. The only time this condition occurs is when the target voltage is zero, otherwise the (Z) membership functions is used to scale down the applied voltage from the other rules.  

- **If** $\Delta i_{ds,qs}$ **is** (N) **and** $\zeta_{ds,qs}$ **is** (P) **then** $v_{d0,q0}$ **is** (NL). When the instantaneous current is much larger than the target value and is increasing, then a large negative voltage is used to prevent overshooting the target current.  

- **If** $\Delta i_{ds,qs}$ **is** (N) **and** $\zeta_{ds,qs}$ **is** (N) **then** $v_{d0,q0}$ **is** (Z). When the instantaneous current is much larger than the target value, but the error is reducing, then zero voltage is used because the current is going to reach the target value without any intervention.  

### 4.1.3 Fuzzy Logic Flux Controller

The same FL speed and current controllers are used in both the I-PMSM and IM FOC systems, but a third FLC is used to control the magnitude of the magnetic flux wave $\varphi_r$ (by outputting $i^*_{ds}$) for an IM. The FL flux controller uses the error of the rotor’s magnetic flux $\Delta \varphi_r$ (79) and its time derivative as the two inputs in Figure 4.3(a)-(b) respectively. The controller then outputs a target d-axis current $i^*_{ds}$ in Figure 4.3(c) as a unit value, this is then multiplied
by the motor’s rated current $I_s$. The membership functions and rule base for the FL flux controller are given in Figure 4.3 and Table 4.3 respectively. The rules and membership function input ranges were chosen in a similar manner to the FL speed controller in order to prevent overshooting the target objectives.

\[
\Delta \varphi_r(t) = \varphi^*_r(t) - \varphi_r(t)
\]  

\[(79)\]

**Figure 4.3** FL Flux controller membership functions, (a) Input 1 – $\Delta \varphi_r$, (b) Input 2 – $\frac{d(\Delta \varphi_r)}{dt}$, (c) Output – $i_{ds}^*$
Table 4.3 FL Flux Controller rule base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d(Δφₚ)</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Δφₚ</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The role of $i_{ds}$ is to induce a magnetic flux wave within the IM’s rotor. However, if the properties of the IM change, causing the target magnetic flux $\varphi_r$ to no longer be represented by a previously defined $i_{ds}$ (e.g. due to temperature changes), then the performance of the IM becomes compromised. Directly controlling $\varphi_r$ avoids this scenario so long as it is estimated accurately. In addition, permitting a larger $i_{ds}$ current for start-up operations in order for $\varphi_r$ to reach its target value quicker is useful for motors that have large $\varphi_r$ time constants.

4.2 FL-FOC Verification

Two separate driving cycles using two different vehicles are used within the PIL simulations to examine how the FL-FOC scheme interacts with different vehicle systems. The first PIL driving scenario uses a FWD C-class hatchback (vehicle B in Table 4.4) using two independent 37.5 kW in-wheel IMs (IM#1 in Table 4.5) following the US Federal Drive Cycle. This drive cycle is a close representation to real-world driving scenarios and tests the controller’s ability to handle aggressive acceleration and decelerations. The second PIL driving scenario involves a RWD E-Class sedan (vehicle A in Table 4.4) using a single 100 kW I-PMSM (I-PMSM in Table 4.5) following a short section of the Extra Urban Driving Cycle Drive Cycle. This drive cycle examines the controller’s ability to control the vehicle at high speed and how the control system approaches a constant target velocity.
### Table 4.4 Vehicle parameters used for this simulation investigation [309]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chassis type</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sedan</td>
<td>Hatchback</td>
<td>Compact</td>
<td>Compact</td>
<td>SUV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprung mass (kg)</td>
<td>$m_s$</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsprung mass Front (kg)</td>
<td>$m_{uf}$</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsprung mass Rear (kg)</td>
<td>$m_{ur}$</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll inertia (kg.m²)</td>
<td>$I_{roll}$</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch inertia (kg.m²)</td>
<td>$I_{pitch}$</td>
<td>2788</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaw inertia (kg.m²)</td>
<td>$I_{yaw}$</td>
<td>3234</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelbase (m)</td>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre of mass height (m)</td>
<td>$h_{cog}$</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front axle to centre of mass (m)</td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerodynamic coefficient of drag</td>
<td>$C_D$</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontal Area (m²)</td>
<td>$A_f$</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission and final drive ratio</td>
<td>$N_{FT}$</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel radius – loaded (mm)</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.5 IM and I-PMSM parameters used for the simulation investigation [143, 298]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>IM #1</th>
<th>IM #2</th>
<th>I-PMSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of poles</td>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated power (kW)</td>
<td>$p_{max}$</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated speed (rpm)</td>
<td>$\omega_m$</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated Voltage (V)</td>
<td>$V_s$</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated Current (A)</td>
<td>$I_s$</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stator resistance (Ω)</td>
<td>$R_s$</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor resistance (Ω)</td>
<td>$R_r$</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetising inductance (mH)</td>
<td>$L_m$</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakage stator inductance (mH)</td>
<td>$L_{ls}$</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakage rotor inductance (mH)</td>
<td>$L_{lr}$</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor flux max (Wb)</td>
<td>$\varphi_r$</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet flux (Wb)</td>
<td>$\varphi_m$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-axis inductance (mH)</td>
<td>$L_d$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-axis inductance (mH)</td>
<td>$L_q$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The PIL results for driving scenarios 1 and 2 are given in Figure 4.4 and Figure 4.5 respectively.

Figure 4.4 PIL simulations for a C-Class hatchback vehicle using dual IMs following a short section of the US Federal Drive Cycle, (a) $V_x$, (b) Pedal movement, (c) $i_{qs}$ current, (d) $v_{qs}$ voltage, (e) $i_{ds}$ current, (f) $v_{ds}$ voltage, (g) Flux wave magnitude $\phi_r$

Figure 4.4(a) and Figure 4.5(a) show that the vehicles are able to follow their respective drive cycles with minimal error. The pedal activation levels for both vehicles in Figure 4.4(b) and Figure 4.5(b) are stable with no erratic movements.
Both the $i_{qs}$ and $i_{ds}$ currents in Figure 4.4(c) and Figure 4.4(e) for the first driving scenario are well regulated and use suitably stable $v_{qs}$ and $v_{ds}$ voltages in Figure 4.4(d) and Figure 4.4(f) respectively. Similar conclusions are drawn from the current control for driving scenario 2.
Finally, the FL flux control in Figure 4.4(g) shows that the IM’s rotor magnetic flux is well maintained over the drive cycle and reduces as the vehicle’s velocity increases.

These results show that the FLC PIL simulations act identically to their software-based counterparts. Due to the time-consuming effort of running multiple PIL simulations, the remainder of this chapter investigates the performance of the FL-FOC system using the software-based controllers.

### 4.3 Performance Evaluation of the FL-FOC System

This section directly compares the performance of a vehicle and traction motors controlled by the FL-FOC system against a PI based FOC (PI-FOC) counterpart. This comparison is conducted using two different vehicles with different motor topologies to further examine how the FL-FOC scheme interacts with different vehicle systems. The FL-FOC system does not change between simulations but the PI-FOC is tuned for the specific vehicle it is implemented. The PI-FOC controller gains for both driving scenarios, given in Table 4.6, offer the greatest trade-off between system responsiveness, low steady-state error and remain stable for the duration of the simulation. The FOC system must be able to maintain the control objectives stably with minimal error throughout the drive cycle. The control actuation must be achievable by physical real-world counterparts (i.e. no erratic control of accelerator/brake pedals).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driving scenario</th>
<th>Controller</th>
<th>Proportional gain</th>
<th>Integral gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$i_{qs}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$i_{ds}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flux</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$i_{qs}$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$i_{ds}$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first driving scenario uses a FWD A-Class compact vehicle (vehicle C in Table 4.4) using a single 50 kW IM (IM#2 in Table 4.5) following a short section of the Japan 10-15 drive cycle. The second driving scenario uses a RWD D-Class SUV (vehicle D in Table 4.4) with a single 100 kW I-PMSM (I-PMSM in Table 4.5) following a short section of the Worldwide Harmonized Light vehicle Test Procedure (WLTP).

The SMAPE values in Table 4.7 show that the FL-FOC system overall has a slightly larger average percentage error than the PI-FOC system due to having a larger steady-state error, but still well within acceptable error tolerances. The SMAPE values in Table 4.7 use data used at 5x10^-4s discrete time steps. Data points lower than 1% of the peak control variable are negated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driving scenario</th>
<th>Control Variable</th>
<th>SMAPE (%) for the control system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PI-FOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$V_x$</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$i_{qs}$</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$i_{ds}$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\varphi_r$</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$V_x$</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$i_{qs}$</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$i_{ds}$</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1 FOC Driving Scenario 1

The comparison using the FL-FOC and PI-FOC systems for the vehicle’s velocity (Figure 4.6), $i_{qs}$ current (Figure 4.7), $i_{ds}$ current (Figure 4.8) and flux magnitude (Figure 4.9) for the first driving scenario shows that all control objectives remain stable throughout the drive cycle.
The $i_{qs}$ and $i_{ds}$ current control shows that both FOC systems regulate the motors current to meet their respective target values over the drive cycle using stable and adequately controlled axis voltages.

Figure 4.6 PI and FL speed control for driving scenario 1, (a) $V_x$ comparison, (b) Pedal movement, (c) $\Delta V_x$ comparison
Figure 4.6(a) shows that the vehicle’s velocity using the PI-FOC system overshoots the target speed whereas Figure 4.6(b) shows that the FL-FOC system reduces the amount of applied accelerator and brake pedal ahead of the approaching target velocity. This makes the FL-FOC system a closer representation to how a vehicle would be controlled by a real driver.

![Figure 4.6(a)](image1)

![Figure 4.6(b)](image2)

![Figure 4.6(c)](image3)

**Figure 4.7** PI and FL $i_{qs}$ current control for driving scenario 1, (a) $i_{qs}$ comparison, (b) $v_{qs}$ comparison, (c) $i_{qs}$ error comparison

The FL-FOC scheme responds to the initial acceleration from standstill quicker by applying a larger acceleration pedal angle and generating a larger peak $i_{qs}$ current sooner as shown in
Figure 4.7. Further adjustments to the current control could be made to the FL-FOC scheme to limit the current output and achieve a similar velocity profile to the PI-FOC scheme.

Because of the longer time response and the overshooting tendency of the PI-FOC scheme, the current controllers apply a greater voltage than what is required once steady-state conditions have been met. Therefore by analysing the electrical requirements in Figure 4.7-Figure 4.9, it
might appear that the PI-FOC vehicle requires a higher voltage rated battery packs and inverter over the FL-FOC system.

![Figure 4.9](image)

**Figure 4.9** PI and FL $\varphi_r$ control for driving scenario 1, (a) $\varphi_r$ comparison, (b) $i_{ds}^*$ comparison, (c) $\varphi_r$ error comparison

Figure 4.9 shows that both FOC systems permit a large $i_{ds}$ current to flow at the beginning of the simulation to allow the rotor’s magnetic flux to increase at a faster rate to that achievable using a constant current. The rotor’s magnetic flux controlled by the PI-FOC system in Figure 4.9(a) also overshoots its target objective. If it attempts to apply too much rotor flux, then the
motors magnetic material might saturate and lower the electrical efficiency. If the rotor flux goes too low, then the motor might not be able to output the required torque.

### 4.3.2 FOC Driving Scenario 2

The comparison using the FL-FOC and PI-FOC systems for the vehicle’s velocity (Figure 4.10), $i_{qs}$ current (Figure 4.11) and $i_{ds}$ current (Figure 4.12) for the second driving scenario shows that all control objectives remain stable throughout the drive cycle for both FOC system.

![Figure 4.10](image.png)  
**Figure 4.10** PI and FL speed control for driving scenario 2, (a) $V_x$ comparison, (b) Pedal movement, (c) $\Delta V_x$ comparison
The pedal control in Figure 4.10(b) causes the $i_{qs}$ and $i_{ds}$ PI current controllers some difficulty as seen by the SMAPE values in Table 4.7. The FL-FOC system appears to outperform the PI-FOC current controllers. This may be due to the FL speed controller using a much smoother pedal actuation and thus enabling the FL current controller to follow smoother targets. Alternatively, it might be possible to tune the PI controllers better to achieve a lower SMAPE, but this further highlights the difficulties that arise with a PI controller based FOC system.

Figure 4.11 PI and FL $i_{qs}$ current control for driving scenario 2, (a) $i_{qs}$ comparison, (b) $v_{qs}$ comparison, (c) $i_{qs}$ comparison
The WLTP drive cycle doesn’t have any constant target velocities and thus is a much smoother velocity profile. The overshooting characteristics of the PI speed controller and its effect on the vehicle’s velocity in Figure 4.10(a) are not as pronounced as those in Figure 4.6(a). However, it must be noted that the pedal actuation for the FL-FOC system in Figure 4.10(b) is much smoother than the PI-FOC system. This produces a greater reflection on real-world vehicle speed control.

**Figure 4.12** PI and FL $i_{ds}$ current control for driving scenario 2, (a) $i_{ds}$ comparison, (b) $v_{ds}$ comparison, (c) $i_{ds}$ error comparison
4.4 Robustness Analysis using Variable Motor Parameters

In part, the robustness of the FL-FOC system has already been established due to its ability to control multiple different vehicle systems and traction motors without the need for any re-tuning between simulations. But now, the performance of the FL-FOC is investigated under scenarios which may affect the control system in the real world. This is achieved by varying the stator resistance of an IM (IM#1 in Table 4.5) in Equations (4)-(5) from their original value of $r_s = 0.04 \, \Omega$ to $r_s = 0.16 \, \Omega$. Lubin [148] used a similar methodology to examine the robustness of his FL speed and $i_{ds}$ controllers.

A FWD C-class hatchback (vehicle B in Table 4.4) using two independent 37.5 kW in-wheel IMs follows a short section of the NEDC drive cycle and accelerate the vehicle up to 30 km/h. The FL-FOC system is compared against another FOC system (FOC-2) which uses a FL speed, FL $i_{ds}$ and FL flux controller with a PI $i_q$ current controller. This removes any coupling effects in the PI-FOC system that may arise between two PI controllers. Firstly, the performance of both FOC systems are compared using the original stator resistance of $r_s = 0.04 \, \Omega$. These simulations are repeated using a stator resistance of $r_s = 0.16 \, \Omega$. The PI controller in FOC-2 uses the same gains as the $i_q$ controller during driving scenario 1 in Table 4.6 and are not re-tuned between the two simulations.

Table 4.8 shows that the SMAPE values for both FOC systems remain within acceptable error tolerances over the drive cycle. The values in brackets ( ) next to the variable stator resistance SMAPE represent the percentage change from the original SMAPE.

Figure 4.13 shows the vehicle’s velocity (Figure 4.13(a)), pedal actuation (Figure 4.13(b)) and $i_q$ current control (Figure 4.13(c)) for both FL-FOC and FOC-2 using the original stator resistance. Both FOC systems are able to adequately and stably meet the target velocity profile and maintain control over their respective target $i_q$ currents with minimal error. The pedal
actuation in Figure 4.13(b) for the FOC-2 system is different to the FL-FOC system, this is due to a slightly slower response time in the $i_{qs}$ current control. The data used for the SMAPE values are in Table 4.8 and were taken at $5\times 10^{-4}$s discrete time steps, data points lower than 1% of the peak control variable are negated.

Table 4.8 PI-FOC and FL-FOC SMAPE performance evaluation for the original and variable stator resistance simulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variable</th>
<th>FOC-2</th>
<th>FL-FOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_s = 0.04 \Omega$</td>
<td>$2.40$</td>
<td>$2.26$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_s = 0.16 \Omega$</td>
<td>$2.77 (15.4 %)$</td>
<td>$2.40 (6.2 %)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_x$</td>
<td>$2.40$</td>
<td>$2.26$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{qs}$</td>
<td>$5.04$</td>
<td>$1.99$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{ds}$</td>
<td>$0.71$</td>
<td>$0.72 (1.4 %)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi_r$</td>
<td>$0.41$</td>
<td>$0.41$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both FOC systems in Figure 4.14(a) are still able to maintain the target velocity as with Figure 4.13(a). The pedal actuation and $i_{qs}$ current control for the FL-FOC in Figure 4.14(b) and Figure 4.14(c) respectively are comparable to those in Figure 4.13. Table 4.8 shows that the error for the FL-FOC $i_{qs}$ current control and vehicle’s velocity is slightly larger than the original conditions, but still within acceptable error tolerances. The error difference is so small that it doesn’t influence the pedal actuation between the two simulations.

For HEV/EV design purposes, it might appear that a vehicle using the PI-FOC scheme requires a larger target $i_{qs}$ current over the FL-FOC scheme. This may lead the vehicle designer to believe that a battery pack with a larger current output or larger current rated traction motor would be required for this vehicle to achieve this velocity profile.

The PI controller in Figure 4.14(b) for the FOC-2 scheme is unable to maintain the target $i_{qs}$ current when the stator resistance varies. The speed controller of the FOC-2 scheme has to apply the accelerator pedal more (and thus increase the target $i_{qs}$) in order for the motor’s actual $i_{qs}$ current (and thus output torque) to be large enough for the vehicle to follow the target drive
cycle. Furthermore, when the FOC-2 reduces the target $i_{qs}$ current, the *momentum* of the PI current controller (due to the large integral error) means that the $i_{qs}$ current overshoots the target value. The speed controller of the FOC-2 system has to then apply the brake pedal in Figure 4.14(b).

![Graphs](image)

**Figure 4.13** Stator resistance $r_s = 0.04\Omega$ simulation for the FOC-2 and FL-FOC, (a) $V_x$ comparison, (b) Pedal movement, (c) $i_{qs}$ comparison

The SMAPE values in Table 4.8 show that the $i_{qs}$ error during the variable stator resistance simulation is much higher than the original stator resistance simulation. Due to the coupling effects of the two axes, the SMAPE value for the $i_{ds}$ also increases, however the robustness of
the FL $i_{ds}$ controller in the FOC-2 scheme ensures that the $i_{ds}$ SMAPE value remains within acceptable error tolerances.

This investigation has shown that the FL-FOC system is more robust than a PI based FOC system by means of the FOC-2 scheme for variable motor parameters. This is due to the PI controller gains which were intended for the original motor parameters no longer being the optimal choice for the new motor parameters.

**Figure 4.14** Stator resistance $r_s = 0.16\Omega$ simulation for the FOC-2 and FL-FOC, (a) $V_x$ comparison, (b) Pedal movement, (c) $i_{qs}$ comparison

This investigation has shown that the FL-FOC system is more robust than a PI based FOC system by means of the FOC-2 scheme for variable motor parameters. This is due to the PI controller gains which were intended for the original motor parameters no longer being the optimal choice for the new motor parameters.
4.5 Summary

A FLC based FOC (FL-FOC) scheme for the traction motor of an HEV/EV was developed which consists of independent vehicle speed, traction motor current and magnetic flux FLCs. The FLCs were verified ready for use in a HIL experiment via a series of PIL simulations and showed comparable control to their simulated counterparts after compiling. The FL-FOC scheme showed to be able to control multiple motor topologies and HEV/EV powertrain architectures without the need for re-tuning.

The FL-FOC scheme managed to regulate the FOC variables (speed, current, flux) within acceptable error tolerances (of below 5% error) for a wide range of vehicle systems. In comparison to a PI controller based FOC (PI-FOC) scheme, the FL-FOC showed more realistic vehicle control and thus a better representation of how a physical vehicle would behave. A more detailed robustness analysis showed that the FL-FOC scheme performs significantly better than PI-FOC scheme when variable motor parameters were introduced.
Chapter Five

Overcurrent-Tolerant Traction Motor Sizing Strategy

This chapter presents a new traction motor sizing strategy proposed by the author by utilising an overcurrent-tolerant prediction motor model to estimate the dynamic and thermal characteristic of the motor operating in the overcurrent region. This control scheme only uses basic motor torque-speed characteristics as they are easily obtained from a motor manufacturer. The prediction model quickly shows if a prospective traction motor operating in the overcurrent region and the powertrain configuration would enable the vehicle to achieve its required dynamic and electrical objectives. Similarly, to Chapter Four, only a vehicle powered purely by a traction motor is investigated (series-HEV), but again it is possible to extrapolate this sizing strategy for use on various HEV powertrain architectures (parallel or power-split). It will be denoted where these changes would occur within this chapter. The work presented in this chapter has been accepted by IET Intelligent Transport Systems awaiting online publication and at a conference [310].

The motor’s rate of change in temperature and its output torque are both proportional to the magnitude of the supply current. The safe torque-speed operating region where the motor is able to run for its entire lifetime is referred to as the continuous region. Here, the supply current is limited to a rated value to prevent the motor from overheating, but this also has the effect of limiting the output torque. A motor’s overcurrent region temporarily permits a higher supply current to produce a larger output torque. Motor manufacturers represent the overcurrent region by one or more torque-speed curves which are assigned time limits to show how long the peak overcurrent torque can be used before the motor begins to overheat. Operating in the overcurrent region is desirable for HEV/EVs because a smaller, cheaper and more efficient
motor operating in its overcurrent region might be able to achieve the same output torque as a larger motor confined to its continuous torque-speed region.

This chapter is structured as followed; Section 5.1 introduces the overcurrent-tolerant prediction model, Section 5.2 presents a case study where an aeroplane pushback is converted into a series HEV utilising this sizing strategy.

5.1 The Overcurrent-Tolerant Temperature Prediction Motor Model

The role of the overcurrent-tolerant prediction model is to decide if the continuous (where $PM = C$ in (80)) or overcurrent (where $PM = O$ in (80)) torque-speed curves should be used in (80) at any given time at the respective traction motor speed $\omega_m$. The choice of torque-speed curve is dependent on the estimated temperature of the motor.

The torque-speed characteristics of a traction motor in this investigation are modelled using 2D look-up tables in MATLAB/Simulink as described in Section 3.2.5.1. A control flowchart for the overcurrent-tolerant prediction model is shown in Figure 5.2. The following steps describe the decision making process within the overcurrent tolerant prediction model:

1) When the driver of the vehicle model (see Section 4.1.1) requests a torque output by activating the accelerator pedal $\gamma_{acc} \in [0,1]$, the motor model initially attempts to access the overcurrent torque curve, where $PM = O$ in (80). For a series-HEV or pure EV, the torque will be fully accommodated by the traction motor. For a parallel or power-split HEV, the fraction of the command torque required to be supplied by the traction motor will take the role of the required output torque in (80).

\[
\tau_{PM}(\omega_m, \gamma_{acc}) = \gamma_{acc} \hat{\tau}_{PM}(\omega_m)
\]

Where $PM = O, C$

\[
(80)
\]
2) The rate of change in temperature is dependent on the position of the relative output torque \( \delta_r \in [0,1] \) from (81). This is relative to the peak continuous torque \( \bar{T}_C(\omega_m) \) and the peak overcurrent torque \( \bar{T}_O(\omega_m) \). A diagrammatical view of how \( \delta_r \) is calculated in proportion to the torque-speed curves is shown in Figure 5.1 where \( \delta_r(\omega_{m1}) > \delta_r(\omega_{m2}) \).

\[
\delta_r(\omega_m) = \frac{\tau_O(\omega_m) - \bar{T}_C(\omega_m)}{\bar{T}_O(\omega_m) - \bar{T}_C(\omega_m)} \tag{81}
\]

![Figure 5.1 Diagrammatical view of how \( \delta_r \) is generated](image)

3) The rate of change in temperature is represented by a Temperature Factor \( T_F \) from (82a-b).

\[
T_F = \begin{cases} 
\frac{100 \, \delta_r(\omega_m)}{t_{Lim}} & 0 < \delta_r(\omega_m) \leq 1 \\
\frac{-100}{t_{Stop}} & \delta_r(\omega_m) \leq 0 
\end{cases} \tag{82a}
\]

\[
T_F = \begin{cases} 
\frac{100 \, \delta_r(\omega_m)}{t_{Lim}} & 0 < \delta_r(\omega_m) \leq 1 \\
\frac{-100}{t_{Stop}} & \delta_r(\omega_m) \leq 0 
\end{cases} \tag{82b}
\]

The time limits \( t_{Lim} \) and \( t_{Stop} \) accompany the overcurrent torque-speed curves provided by the motor manufacturer. The estimated temperature from operating in the overcurrent region increases at a rate according to (82a). If \( \bar{T}_O \) were to be used at an initial motor
temperature $T = 0$, then the estimated temperature reaches the upper temperature limit $T_{High}$ over a time period $t_{Lim}$.

4) The motor’s estimated temperature $T$ (83) is calculated by integrating $T_F$ over time $t$ from the beginning of the simulation at time $t_0$.

$$ T(t) = T(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} T_F \, dt $$

Where

$$ 0 \leq T \leq 100 $$

5) If the estimated temperature reaches $T_{High}$, the motor enters a cool-down phase, where $PM = C$ in (80). The maximum output torque is restricted to the peak torque of the continuous region $\tau_C(\omega_m)$.

6) During the cool-down phase, the estimated temperature must reduce to the lower limit $T_{Low}$ over a pre-determined cool-down time $t_{stop}$ before the overcurrent region is allowed to be used again. The estimated temperature reduces at a rate according to (82b) during the cool-down phase or whenever the motor returns to the continuous region.

If only a single overcurrent torque-speed curve is given from the motor manufacturer, then $\delta_r$ is a linear function. If numerous overcurrent curves and time limits are provided, $\delta_r$ becomes a quadratic function and offers a better estimation of the motor’s thermal characteristics.

The overcurrent-tolerant prediction model observes the motor’s temperature $T$ as a percentage between $T_{High}$ and $T_{Low}$. For this investigation, these limits are represented as a percentage. For example, $T_{High}$ and $T_{Low}$ are 100% and 50% of the maximum temperature limit respectively.

If $\delta_r$ is linear and $\delta_r = 1$, the motor outputs $\tau_C(\omega_m)$ and increase the motor’s estimated temperature at a rate where $T$ reaches 100% over the time period $t_{Lim}$. If $\delta_r = 0.5$, the output
torque is half way between \( \tau_c(\omega_m) \) and \( \tau_0(\omega_m) \). The rate of change in temperature is half that of when \( \delta_t = 1 \), the motor is now able to operate in this region for twice as long, or \( 2t_{lim} \).

**Figure 5.2** Overcurrent-tolerant prediction model torque control flowchart
During the cool-down phase, the vehicle’s towing and acceleration ability is limited, this is necessary to prevent overheating and premature component failure. Ideally, the overcurrent region would only be used for a short time period to accelerate the vehicle to a cruising speed where a lower motor torque would be required to maintain a constant steady-state velocity.

5.2 Aircraft Pushback HEV Conversion: A Case Study

A case study is now investigated to show how the overcurrent-tolerant prediction model developed in this chapter should be applied in a real-world case-study to convert an aeroplane pushback vehicle into a series-HEV. Relating back to the Purpose of the Research for this thesis in Section 1.1, the benefits of correctly sizing the traction motor using the newly developed overcurrent motor model will be discussed in relation to fuel consumption, a possible reduction in output emissions and the energy usage.

Effective HEV/EV design requires optimising the choice of electrical storage/generation systems and powertrain components to meet the vehicle’s target driving range and dynamic performance [53, 311, 312]. The development process of an HEV/EV must also compromise between other constraints such as price and legislative requirements [313, 314]. Therefore, a vehicle manufacturer might deliberate between numerous vehicle iterations before the final design is confirmed. Quick estimation of the motors dynamic and thermal performance is key in selecting the appropriate motor without wasting crucial time and resources.

Conventional pushback vehicles use high capacity ICEs as their prime mover with several transmission ratios. Between pushback operations, the vehicle might rest for long periods until it is needed again. The ICE remains idling whenever the vehicle is resting to avoid any technical difficulties when turning the ICE on (particularly during cold weather). These long idle times significantly increase the total fuel consumption and output emissions over the working day.
5.2.1 ICE Pushback Vehicle Parameters

The torque-speed curve for the 185 kW ICE used in the conventional pushback vehicle is given in Table 5.1. Further chassis and powertrain information for the former ICE powered vehicle is shown in Table 5.2, the same chassis information (vehicle mass, wheel radius etc.) is used for the HEV in Section 5.2. The torque-speed curve overlays the fuel consumption map in Figure 5.3 and the output emissions maps in Figure 5.4. The ICE engine of the original pushback vehicle is simulated using the simplified model in Section 3.2.5.2. The longitudinal dynamics of the pushback vehicle are modelled using the simplified vehicle model in 3.2.5.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed (rpm)</th>
<th>600</th>
<th>700</th>
<th>900</th>
<th>1100</th>
<th>1300</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>2300</th>
<th>2500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torque (Nm)</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 ICE Speed-Torque characteristics for the conventional aeroplane pushback vehicle

Table 5.2 Vehicle parameters of the typical ICE powered pushback vehicle to be converted into an HEV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transmission ratios [1,2,3]</td>
<td>$N_T$</td>
<td>[5.8,2.5,0.98]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission inertia (kg m²) [1,2,3]</td>
<td>$I_T$</td>
<td>[0.14, 0.1, 0.08]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final drive ratio</td>
<td>$N_{fd}$</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final drive inertia (kg m²)</td>
<td>$I_{Fd}$</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final drive efficiency</td>
<td>$\eta_{fd}$</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveshaft inertia (kg m²)</td>
<td>$I_{Fd}$</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE inertia (kg m²)</td>
<td>$I_{ICE}$</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICE and HEV shared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>$M_{veh}$</th>
<th>16000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of Drag</td>
<td>$C_D$</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontal Area (m²)</td>
<td>$A_f$</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel Radius (m)</td>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient of rolling resistance (%)</td>
<td>$f_r$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Brake Force (N)</td>
<td>$F_{B-max}$</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air density (kg m⁻³)</td>
<td>$\rho_{air}$</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel Inertia (kg m²)</td>
<td>$I_{Wh}$</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.3 Conventional ICE powered pushback vehicle torque-speed curve and fuel map (L/hr)

Figure 5.4 Conventional ICE powered pushback vehicle emissions maps, (a) Hydrocarbons (HC) (g/s), (b) Carbon Monoxide (CO) (g/s), (c) Nitrous Oxides (NOx) (g/s), (d) Particulate Matter (g/s)
5.2.2 Duty Cycle of the Aircraft Pushback Vehicle

An aeroplane pushback vehicle is required to move aeroplanes away from airport terminals and occasionally tow them across an airfield to receive routine maintenance. Therefore, the pushback vehicle must be able to generate a large towing force, but also have a relatively high-top speed to travel quickly between pushback operations (~30 km/h unloaded).

Airport regulations require all pushback vehicles to have the capacity to generate a theoretical minimum tractive force for each aeroplane weight class that the vehicle is registered to move. An example of the tractive force requirements to move a Boeing 737-7 aeroplane over various runway surface conditions is shown in Figure 5.5 [315], these are supplied for each aeroplane and must be adhered to by the pushback vehicle manufacturers. An HEV aeroplane pushback vehicle must also comply with these regulations in order to be a viable product.

![Figure 5.5 Towing tractive force requirements for a Boeing 737-7 aeroplane over numerous runway conditions](image)

Figure 5.5 Towing tractive force requirements for a Boeing 737-7 aeroplane over numerous runway conditions [320]
A datalogger connected to the pre-existing ICE powered pushback vehicle via CAN bus recorded the vehicle’s engine speed, output torque, output power and longitudinal velocity. This was used to construct a target duty cycle for the HEV to follow. The pushback vehicle’s duty cycle is broken down into four major areas as shown in Table 5.3 and explained as followed:

- Low velocity pushback operations of heavy aircraft. This scenario occurs when the pushback vehicle is required to move aeroplanes away from the airport terminal
- Medium velocity towing operations of medium weight aircraft. This represents a maintenance run where the pushback vehicle tows an aeroplane for a longer duration across an airfield to receive routine maintenance.
- High velocity unloaded solo runs. Here the pushback vehicle is travelling back and forth between resting areas where it must wait until the next operation.
- Stationary resting periods. Here the vehicle is waiting for its next pushback operation. All hazard warning lights must remain on as the vehicle is still on the operating airfield.

The conventional ICE powered pushback vehicle uses three transmission ratios $N_T$ for the various pushback operations. Gear ratio 1 is used for the towing operation, gear ratio 2 is used for the maintenance runs, and gear ratio 3 is used for the unloaded solo runs. These gears cannot change while the vehicle is moving and must be set before the operation begins.

The pushback HEV would not be held to conventional passenger vehicle development criteria, i.e. fast 0-60 mph acceleration times or able to reach motorway cruising speeds. This

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>No. of operations</th>
<th>$M_{Aero}$ (Tonne)</th>
<th>Target Speed (km/h)</th>
<th>Time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tow</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standby</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is because aeroplane manufacturers impose low acceleration limits for towing operations to prevent damage to the landing gear and there are speed limits enforced on working airfields for the safety of ground support vehicles.

5.2.3 Battery Pack Constraints and APU Control

As well as having to power the traction motors, the pushback vehicle must also provide power its own heating/air-conditioning unit, external warning lights and various systems on the aeroplane. On the conventional ICE vehicle, these systems are either electrically or hydraulically powered, they are replaced with fully electrical systems on the HEV. In the real vehicle, this load varies throughout the day, but a high constant load contributes to the worst-case scenario duty cycle.

The price of the battery pack grows as its energy storage capacity and peak output power increases. During pushback and towing operations, the peak power demand from the traction motor is substantial. A battery pack capable of solely supplying the necessary power for these towing operations would therefore be large and expensive. To reduce the total price of the HEV, a battery pack with a smaller peak output power is used with supplemented power from the genset $P_{gen}$ to the DC-Link during towing operations. A flowchart for the genset control is shown in Figure 5.6.

For the HEV to be truly comparable to the ICE counterpart, the SOE of the battery pack must be full at the end of the duty cycle. This would be similar to the ICE vehicle having its fuel tank filled at the end of a working day. Once the final pushback operation has been completed, the genset enters full power mode (with the necessary start-up phase) and begins charging the battery pack while the HEV returns to the overnight storage area. The genset turns off once the SOE of the battery pack has reached its upper limit.
5.2.4 HEV Pushback Vehicle Feasibility and Efficiency Analysis

The feasibility of two HEV powertrain configurations are considered for the final vehicle prototype, the parameters for both are given in Table 5.4. Suitable powertrain components that would enable the vehicle to achieve the desired duty cycle are investigated first, including; the traction motor torque-speed characteristics, final drive ratio and transmission ratios. The electrical storage and generation components of the HEV are then explored. The vehicle must have the capacity to complete a full duty cycle using only the energy stored or generated internally. The electrical system requires specifying the minimum capacity and peak output power of the battery pack, as well as the output power of the genset.

Configuration 1 uses two relatively low torque and high speed in-wheel traction motors with a single gear ratio $N_{T-fd_1}$. The torque-speed curves for these motors and the efficiency map is shown in Figure 5.7. This motor is based on a de-rated 3-phase 170 kW PMSM produced by
Zytek [316]. Configuration 1 was developed to fully exploit the traction motors’ overcurrent region. A single gear ratio $N_{T-fd1}$ enables the HEV to tow the aeroplanes to their target speed for the required duration while also allowing the vehicle to reach its maximum unloaded speed.

Table 5.4 HEV parameters for configuration 1 and configuration 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Configuration 1</th>
<th>Configuration 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous power (kW)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous torque (Nm)</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcurrent power 60 sec (kW)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcurrent torque 60 sec (Nm)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum motor speed (rpm)</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>3252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_{T-fd1}$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_{T-fd2}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Configuration 2 uses a single high torque and low speed traction motor connected to a transmission with 2 gear ratios and a final drive. The torque-speed curves for this motor and an efficiency map is shown in Figure 5.8. This motor is based on a 9-phase 245 kW IM produced by TM4 [317]. Configuration 2 was developed to meet the minimum tractive force requirements imposed by the airport regulations for the aeroplane weight classes within this duty cycle. A high gear ratio $N_{T-fd1}$ is used during towing and maintenance operations as it achieves the minimum tractive force requirement. A low gear ratio $N_{T-fd2}$ was chosen for unloaded solo runs that allows the vehicle to reach its top unloaded speed.

The two vehicle configurations follow the target duty cycle with minimal velocity error. Therefore, both powertrain configurations could theoretically be used for the final HEV as they achieve the target dynamic objectives. However, the price of incorrectly/oversized components increases the final vehicle price and the electrical energy usage differs as shown.
Figure 5.7 Torque Speed curves and efficiency map (%) for the traction motors used in HEV configuration 1

Figure 5.8 Torque Speed curves and efficiency map (%) for the traction motor used in HEV configuration 2
5.2.4.1 Torque Characteristics for HEV Configuration 1

Figure 5.9 shows the traction motor’s torque-speed curve usage for the vehicle with configuration 1 over the duty cycle. The overcurrent and constant power regions are fully exploited. The theoretical temperature profile of the motors in Figure 5.10 increases at a greater rate while the HEV is accelerating during a towing operation than when the vehicle reaches its cruising speed.

During the maintenance operations, the command torque also enters the overcurrent region to accelerate the vehicle to its target velocity. However, the rate of change in temperature is smaller than the pushback operations. The motor only stays in the overcurrent region for a short time before the command torque returns to the continuous region to maintain cruising velocity. During solo operations, the command torque remains within the boundaries of the continuous torque region.

![Figure 5.9 Motor usage for the HEV with configuration 1 over the daily duty cycle](image)
The torque-speed characteristics and theoretical temperature profiles for configuration 1 are only obtainable for simulation purposes using the overcurrent tolerant prediction model. The prediction model shows how the traction motor’s cool-down time differs depending on how long it operates within the overcurrent region. Without this prediction model, it would be much more difficult to verify that this choice of traction motor and gear ratio allows the vehicle to reach both its unloaded velocity and the maximum tow weights for the required times without overheating.

5.2.4.2 Torque Characteristics for HEV Configuration 2

Figure 5.11 shows that the motor usage throughout the duty cycle for the vehicle using configuration 2 remains within the boundaries of the continuous torque-speed curve. The large headroom between the torque usage and the continuous torque-speed curve shows that the traction motor is oversized for this application. The traction motor operates in an inefficient
region for a large percentage of the duty cycle. Oversized components also increase the price of the HEV where smaller and cheaper components (Configuration 1) prove to be sufficient.

The overcurrent tolerant prediction model is not fully utilised for this traction motor as the output torque does not enter the overcurrent region. The model acts similarly to a conventional empirical data based model confined to the continuous region. This traction motor is not fully exercised and the advantages of operating in the overcurrent region are not revealed.

![Motor Speed vs. Torque Output](image)

**Figure 5.11** Motor usage for the HEV with configuration 2 over the daily duty cycle

### 5.2.4.3 HEV Electrical Performance Comparison

Because both HEV configurations accurately follow the target duty cycle, their peak power requirements are similar enough that they are able to use the same battery pack and genset configuration with parameters given in Table 5.5.

Figure 5.12-Figure 5.13 shows the SOE of the battery pack, vehicle velocity and the genset operation for Configuration 1 and Configuration 2 respectively over the duty cycle.

The blue shaded areas of Figure 5.12-Figure 5.13 show that the genset is providing full power to the DC-Link and that the traction motors are fully utilising this power during towing.
operations. Where the genset power does not meet the output power requirements, the remaining power is provided by the battery pack. The yellow shaded regions show that the genset provides full power to the DC-Link and the battery pack is being charged.

**Table 5.5** Battery pack parameters used in the pushback HEV for both configuration 1 and configuration 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per cell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated energy capacity (kWh)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated current (A)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal voltage (V)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous power output (kW)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak power output (kW)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pack configuration and parameters</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cells in series per string</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strings of series in parallel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper SOE limit (%)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower SOE limit (%)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery pack capacity (kWh)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genset parameters</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genset power (kW)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genset fuel consumption (L/h)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It might seem at first glance that the SOE for configuration 1 does not meet the SOE requirements since it drops below the lower SOE limit. Because the in-wheel traction motors in configuration 1 operates in a higher efficiency region than the single traction motor used in configuration 2, the HEV using configuration 1 enters and exits the first maintenance run with a higher SOE. Whereas configuration 2 reaches the lower SOE limit before the end of the first maintenance run, the genset turns on to begin charging the battery pack earlier than in configuration 1. Because configuration 1 SOE does not reach the lower limit during the rest period after the first maintenance run, it enters the second maintenance run with a much lower SOE than configuration 2.
**Figure 5.12** Velocity profile and battery pack SOE over the complete duty cycle for the HEV using configuration 1

**Figure 5.13** Velocity profile and battery pack SOE over the complete duty cycle for the HEV using configuration 2
Since the duty cycle used for this investigation is a rigorous worst-case scenario, the SOE profile for configuration 1 is deemed acceptable. If the duty cycle was designed differently by slightly shifting the maintenance runs, then the SOE for configuration 1 would remain within the upper and lower limits. In the real world, a driver would be able to decline a maintenance run if they think the SOE of the battery pack is insufficient or manually control the genset if they are expected to have long breaks.

A comparison between the electrical energy required and the fuel consumed by the genset for both HEV configurations against the original ICE powered vehicle is shown in Table 5.6. Configuration 2 requires 6.97% more energy and consumes 5.7% more fuel than configuration 1. This is because the dual hub traction motors of configuration 1 operate in the higher efficiency overcurrent region for large portions of the duty cycle. The increase in efficiency and improved energy usage of configuration 1 could only have been revealed by the overcurrent tolerant prediction model. If an empirical data-based traction motor model confined to the continuous torque region was used, the traction motors and powertrain in configuration 1 would not have been able to achieve the target duty cycle and therefore could not have shown an improvement over configuration 2. However, since configuration 1 does not meet the minimum tractive force regulations, configuration 2 is used as the final design for the HEV pushback vehicle. This legislative constriction further verifies the use of the overcurrent prediction model for vehicle design as there might be various other design limitations other than dynamic performance and require a larger number of traction motors to be investigated. Table 5.6 shows that configuration 2 reduced fuel consumption by 52% from the original ICE powered pushback vehicle over the duty cycle.

Throughout different ICE working conditions (e.g. start-up, cold running, hot running etc.), different emissions are produced at different rates. This makes it difficult to assess the change
in output emissions between the two HEV configurations and the original ICE vehicle. However, there is a consensus that significant reductions in fuel consumption correlates to a reduction in engine emissions [9, 15, 16]. In addition, for HEV/EVs there is a similar conclusion drawn between electrical efficiency and output emissions. From the results in Table 5.6, we can assume at this point in the vehicle’s development there is a reduction in engine emissions for both HEV configurations over the ICE vehicle and the overcurrent prediction model produced a vehicle design that was more fuel economic and reduced the total output emissions further.

Table 5.6 Aeroplane pushback vehicle powertrain configuration energy requirement and fuel consumption comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Powertrain Configuration</th>
<th>Energy required (kWh)</th>
<th>Fuel consumed (L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEV Configuration 1</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEV Configuration 2</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>91.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.5 Pushback HEV Final Outcome

The prototype HEV aeroplane pushback vehicle is shown in Figure 5.14 using configuration 2 [318]. The vehicle is currently being challenged with following similar duty cycle operations to the ones investigated in this chapter to validate the choice of powertrain components.

Figure 5.14 Final HEV aeroplane pushback vehicle prototype [323]
5.3 Summary

A new HEV/EV traction motor sizing strategy was developed based on an overcurrent-tolerant prediction model of a traction motor operating in the overcurrent region. Using minimal motor parameters, this model is able to gauge if a motor’s torque and thermal characteristics are able to fulfill the vehicle’s target dynamic and electrical objectives. Using the motor’s overcurrent torque-speed curve time constraints, the motor’s temperature was estimated between safe upper and lower working boundaries. The rate of change in temperature was dependent on the position of the motor’s output torque between the continuous and overcurrent torque-speed curves to represent the supply current magnitude.
Chapter Six

Reduced Switching Inverter Control for Traction Motors

This chapter aims to increase the efficiency of a DC-AC inverter for HEV/EV applications. The author proposes an extension to the on-line D-SVPWM method developed by Deng [203, 204] by introducing a Reduced Intermediate Switching SVPWM (RIS-SVPWM) scheme. The RIS-SVPWM method advances upon a previous on-line SVPWM method to find all possible available null switching states enclosing the reference voltage vector. The RIS-SVPWM scheme assigns inverter switching patterns which require the minimal amount of intermediate switching to reduce the power losses. The available null voltage vectors are generated on-line which negates the need for large and complicated look-up tables. This inverter control scheme is applicable to any HEV or EV that utilises traction motors without modifications.

This chapter is structured as follows; Section 6.1 presents the RIS-SVPWM method. Section 6.2 then analyses the intermediate switching losses and the harmonic quality of the generated waveforms when controlling a 5L-CHB inverter while powering a traction motor.

6.1 The RIS-SVPWM scheme

6.1.1 The D-SVPWM method

The D-SVPWM method developed by Deng [203, 204] is able to calculate all the switching states for one of the voltage vectors enclosing $V_{ref}$. The original SVM diagram with $nL$ voltage levels ($nL$-SVM) is slowly reduced (e.g. $(nL-1, nL-2, \ldots)$ until only a $2L$-SVM diagram remains enclosing $V_{ref}$. The switching states $S$ of the voltage vector representing the origin of the $nL$-SVM diagram $V_{nL-SVM}(S_a, S_b, S_c)$ are modified with each mapping iteration. Any
invalid switching states are then removed at the end of the mapping process. The remaining
switching states corresponding to one of the voltage vectors enclosing $V_{ref}$ are then assigned to
the inverter. The co-ordinates of $V_{ref}$ are also mapped to the remaining voltage vector so the
2$L$-SVM duty cycle equations to be used. The preliminary steps required for the D-SVPWM
and the RIS-SVPWM methods are as followed:

1) The $nL$-SVM diagram is scaled so the distance between any two voltage vectors have a unit
length of 1. Label the outermost hexagon boundary $H_1$.

2) The co-ordinates of the reference voltage vector $V_{ref}$ are also made proportional to the new
SVM diagram. The maximum length of $V_{ref}$ is $(nL - 1)$ of unit length.

3) The $nL - SVM$ diagram is labelled $H_1$ and has an origin at $V_i$ with
coordinates $V_{nl-SVM} (\alpha, \beta) = (0,0)$.

To complete the mapping process, a total of $(nL - 2)$ mapping iterations are required, each
iteration is denoted by $h = 1, 2 \ldots (nL - 2)$. The following steps explain the D-SVPWM
iterative mapping process:

1) Set the mapping iteration number $h$.

2) Separate the $(nL - h + 1)L$-SVM diagram into 6 mapping sectors separated by 60° (an
example is shown in Figure 6.1 for the first mapping iteration of a $5L$-SVM diagram).

3) Label the voltage vectors closest to the origin in each sector $Q_{hq}$. The sector $q$ that $V_{ref}$ lies
in is calculated using Equation (84), where $\theta_\alpha \in [0 \ 2\pi]$ is the angle $V_{ref}$ makes with the $\alpha$
axis.

$$q = \text{int} \left\{ \text{mod} \left( \theta_\alpha + \frac{\pi}{6}, 2\pi \right) \cdot \frac{3}{\pi} \right\} + 1 \quad (84)$$

4) Place the origin of an $(nL - h)L$-SVM diagram (labelled $H_{1+h}$) on the vector $Q_{hq}$.
5) Modify all the switching states of $V_{nl-SVM}$ according to the switching state modifier $q$ in Table 6.1.

6) Subtract the $\alpha$ modifier and the $\beta$ modifier for sector $q$ from the $V_{ref}(\alpha, \beta)$ co-ordinates. This maps $V_{ref}$ to the origin of the $(nL - h + 1)\text{-L-SVM}$ diagram.

7) If $nL - h \neq 2$, go back to step 1 using $h + 1$. If $nL - h = 2$, the iterative mapping process is now complete.

At this point, the D-SVPWM method is complete, the mapping vector and switching patterns from the final mapping iteration would be used to control the switching devices of the inverter. However, the switching states at this stage may require multiple intermediate switching before starting the next SVPWM cycle. An example of the iterative mapping process in Figure 6.2 graphically demonstrates how the D-SVPWM reduces the SVM diagram from a 5L-SVM diagram down to a 2L-SVM diagram.
6.1.2 Advancement to the RIS-SVPWM method

It is now the role of the RIS-SVPWM to find the switching states of the other enclosing vectors to determine if they would be more appropriate null voltage vectors. An example $V_{ref}$ enclosed by the voltage vectors $V_G[442,331,220]$, $V_f[431,320]$ and $V_K[441,330]$ is shown in Figure 6.3. The D-SVPWM method would map $V_{ref}$ against $V_f$. Mapping $V_{ref}$ against $V_G, V_f$ or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector $q$</th>
<th>State Modifier</th>
<th>$\alpha$ Modifier</th>
<th>$\beta$ Modifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$(S_a + 1)S_bS_c$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$S_aS_b(S_c - 1)$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$S_a(S_b + 1)S_c$</td>
<td>$-0.5$</td>
<td>$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$(S_a - 1)S_bS_c$</td>
<td>$-1$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$S_aS_b(S_c + 1)$</td>
<td>$-0.5$</td>
<td>$-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$S_a(S_b - 1)S_c$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.2 5L-SVM mapping process example for the D-SVPWM method [208, 209]
$V_K$ to create $V_{\text{ref } G}$, $V_{\text{ref } j}$ or $V_{\text{ref } K}$ respectively allows for simpler $2L$-SVM duty cycle. The reference voltage vector with respect to the origin of a 2LTS is labelled $V_{\text{ref }-2L}$.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 6.3** Example 2-level optimised dwell vector mapping options

The RIS-SVPWM mapping process is explained as followed:

1) Locate the current 2-Level triangular sector $2LTS$ that $V_{\text{ref }-2L}$ lies in with respect to the final mapped voltage vector from the D-SVPWM method ($2LTS = 1, 2 \ldots 6$). The example in Figure 6.3 attempts to map $V_{\text{ref}}$ to $V_j$, this means $V_{\text{ref }-2L}$ lies within a $2LTS = 3$ sector. Figure 6.4 shows two more examples, the red $V_{\text{ref }-2L}$ lies in $2LTS = 1$ and the blue $V_{\text{ref }-2L}$ lies in $2LTS = 4$ with respect to the origin $V_0$.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 6.4** 2L-SVM diagram inverter reference points
2) In a similar manner to steps 5 and 6 for the D-SVPWM method, apply two more mapping iterations to the origin vector of the current 2L-SVM diagram. Independently apply the mapping modifier \( q = 2LTS \) and \( q = 2LTS + 1 \) (if \( q > 6 \), then \( q = 1 \)).

3) There are now three separate lists of switching state options, one list for each voltage vector enclosing \( V_{ref - 2L} \).

4) Any switching state combinations \((S_a, S_b, S_c)\) that contain invalid switching states are removed. Invalid switching states include values \( S < 0 \) or \( S > (nL - 1) \).

5) Calculate which vector requires the lowest total number of intermediate switching to start the next SVM cycle.

6) If multiple combinations of switching states have the same minimum number of intermediate switches from the previous SVM cycle, the switching combination on the voltage vector ahead of \( V_{ref} \) in the direction of travel is used. This is because the next voltage vector triangle that \( V_{ref} \) enters will share this null voltage vector, this reduces future intermediate switching losses ahead of time.

7) Label the optimal voltage vector \( V_0 \).

8) Subtract the \( \alpha \) modifier and the \( \beta \) modifier from the \( V_{ref}(\alpha, \beta) \) co-ordinates using the state modifier for the optimal voltage vector. If the original voltage vector using D-SVPWM holds \( V_0 \), no modifications are required.

The RIS-SVPWM scheme is now complete. The optimal null voltage vector which requires the minimum total number of intermediate switching has been found and the reference voltage vector has been mapped to it. The complete null switching state mapping process under the RIS-SVPWM scheme for the example given in Figure 6.2 is shown in Figure 6.5.
Inverter Switching Device Control

Timing pulses $X$, $Y$ and $Z$ delivered to the switching devices of phase $A$, $B$ and $C$ respectively ensure only one complimentary pair of switching devices change over the SVPWM cycle for each phase. The timing pulses are calculated using the following steps:

1) Find the magnitude of $V_{ref-2L}(\alpha, \beta)$ with respect to the optimal choice of 2L voltage vector in the range $m_2 \in [0 1]$.

2) Find the $2LTS$ sector $V_{ref-2L}$ lies in with respect to the optimal $V_0$.

3) $V_{ref-2L}$ makes an angle $\varphi_{2LTS} \in \left[0 \frac{\pi}{3}\right]$ with respect to the vector $V_{2LTS}$. Two examples are given in Figure 6.4 for the correct voltage vector that $\varphi$ is measured against.

4) The reference voltage vector $V_{ref-2L}$ is generated over a SVM switching cycle of length $T_s$ using (85). The required on-times $T_0$, $T_1$ and $T_2$ for the enclosing vectors $V_0, V_{2LTS}$, and

---

**Figure 6.5** Null vector mapping state value example for 5L-SVM diagram with $V_{ref}$ in Figure 6.2
V_{2LTS+1} respectively must be calculated using the 2L-SVM diagram Equations (86)-(88) [154, 175, 319, 320].

\[
V_{ref-2L} = T_0 V_0 + T_1 V_{2LTS} + T_2 V_{2LTS+1}
\]

(if 2LTS + 1 > 6 then \( V_{2LTS+1} = V_1 \))

\[
T_1 = \frac{T m_2 \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{3} - \varphi\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right)}
\]

(86)

\[
T_2 = \frac{T m_2 \sin(\varphi)}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right)}
\]

(87)

\[
T_0 = T_s - T_1 - T_2
\]

(88)

5) Table 6.2 converts the vector on-times \( T_0, T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) into phase pulses \( X, Y \) and \( Z \) depending on 2LTS [192].

**Table 6.2** 2-Level SVPWM duty ratio calculations converts the vector on-times \( T_0, T_1, T_2 \) into phase pulses \( X, Y \) and \( Z \) to be applied to phase \( A, B \) and \( C \) respectively [192].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2LTS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( X = T_1 + T_2 + \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td>( Y = T_2 + \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td>( Z = \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>( X = T_1 + \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td>( Y = T_1 + T_2 + \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td>( Z = \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>( X = \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td>( Y = T_1 + T_2 + \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td>( Z = T_2 + \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>( X = \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td>( Y = T_1 + \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td>( Z = T_1 + T_2 + \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>( X = T_2 + \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td>( Y = \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td>( Z = T_1 + T_2 + \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>( X = T_1 + T_2 + \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td>( Y = \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td>( Z = T_1 + \frac{T_0}{2} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The switching table for a 5L-NPC inverter in Table 3.1 consists of 4 pairs of complimentary power electronic switching devices on each phase leg. The switch control is simplified by only observing the top 4 switches and acknowledging that the bottom 4 switches have complimentary switch positions. For phase-\(A\) to change from switching state 2 to 3, switch \(A_2\) in phase-\(A\) remains off for \((T_s - X)\)s, and then remains on for the remainder of the SVPWM cycle (refer to Figure 2.4 for switch labels). During this time, all of the switches above switch \(A_2\) are off, and all the switches below \(A_2\) remain on for the entire of the SVPWM cycle. For phase-\(A\) to change from switching state 3 to 2, switch \(A_2\) in phase-\(A\) remains on for \(X\)s and is then turned off for the remainder of the SVM cycle.

The switching table for a 5L-CHB inverter in Table 3.2 shows that multiple combinations of inverter switching patterns are able to output the same switching state [154]. Keeping with the objective of reducing intermediate switching losses, the switching pattern that requires the minimum number of intermediate switching has the phase pulse assigned to it.

### 6.2 Performance evaluation of the RIS-SVPWM method

#### 6.2.1 Simulation setup procedure

For HEV/EV applications, an inverter must be able to generate voltage waveforms of varying magnitude and frequency that enable a traction motor to operate in its entire torque-speed region. A C-Class Hatchback (Vehicle B in Table 4.4) using an IM (IM# 1 in Table 4.5) covering a velocity range of 15-75 mph or 25-115 km/h would require the motor and inverter to operate with a voltage supply frequency range of \(f \in [30, 150]\) Hz according to the synchronous speed. Therefore, supply voltage waveforms within this frequency range are explored covering a wide range of modulations indices \(m \in [0.2, 1]\). The 5L-CHB inverter model discussed in Section 3.2.2 generates voltage waveforms and feeds them to a traction
motor model (IM# 1) presented in Section 3.2.1. The 5L-CHB inverter for these simulations uses a switching frequency $f_s$ of 10 kHz (i.e. $T_s = 1/f_s$). To compare the switching count and harmonic quality when using the D-SVPWM and the RIS-SVPWM modulation schemes, both methods are used to control the individual switching devices of the inverter.

The following steps describe the process of determining appropriate load torques applied to the rotor during the simulations, this process is repeated for each supply frequency $f$:

1) An output voltage waveform of $f$ Hz with a modulation index of $m = 0.9$ is supplied to the motor windings.

2) The load torque is steadily increased until the line current meets the rated supply current of the motor.

3) Because no speed or current control is implemented for this investigation, the motor’s speed decreases. The speed at which the motor dropped down to is recorded as $\omega_f$.

4) The peak load torque for each supply frequency is shown in Table 6.3. This waveform matches the expected speed-torque profile for IM# 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.3 Peak Torque Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$f$ (Hz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load (N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) This was repeated for a range of modulation indices $m \in [0.2 \ 0.9]$. The load torque was steadily increased until the motors speed reached $\omega_f$.

6) The percentages of the load torque for each modulation indices with respect to the peak torque is shown in Table 6.4. The investigation showed that the same load torque percentages in Table 6.4 is used for every supply frequency investigated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.4 Load Torque percentage profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.2 Switch Count Analysis

At the start of each SVM cycle, both modulation methods are allowed to select a starting null voltage vector which would minimise the intermediate switching count from the previous SVM cycle from the options made available to them from their respective control schemes.

The percentage decrease in intermediate switching using the RIS-SVPWM method over the D-SVPWM method is given in Figure 6.6(a) for a range of modulation indices and output waveform frequencies. The total switching count percentage decrease is shown in Figure 6.6(b).

![Figure 6.6 Switch count reduction over a range of modulation indices](chart)

**Figure 6.6** Switch count reduction over a range of modulation indices $m \in [0.2, 1]$ and output voltage frequencies $f \in [20, 150]$ Hz for a 5L-CHB inverter $f_s = 10$ kHz, (a) Intermediate switch decrease, (b) Total switch decrease

The reduction in intermediate switching over the range of waveform frequencies remain somewhat comparable when using the RIS-SVPWM scheme. This is because over a single
voltage waveform cycle (or one rotation of the $V_{ref}$) the same number of enclosing vector triangles are crossed. However, the total reduction in switching count increases as the output waveform frequency increases. This is because $V_{ref}$ completes a full rotation faster for high output waveform frequencies, the total number of SVM cycles inside an enclosing voltage vector is lower and thus there is a lower total switching count.

The RIS-SVPWM method significantly reduces the amount of intermediate switching for modulation indices $m \in [0.35 \ 0.55]$ by up to 90%. This is because $V_{ref}$ crosses the highest number of enclosing voltage vector triangles for a 5L inverter in this range with a high number of possible null voltage vectors.

Due to the linear trend between the energy lost during the turn on-off phases of the power electronics and the switching losses for this inverter, it is assumed that the switching losses also reduce in proportion to the reduction in switching count [321]. For modulation indices $m \in [0.55 \ 1]$, the RIS-SVPWM method shows little improvement over the D-SVPWM method since the number of available switching vectors suitable for SVPWM decreases in this modulation range.

It must be noted that as part of this investigation the vector $V_{nL-SVM}$ (the origin of the $nL$-SVM diagram) was not included in the RIS-SVPWM scheme. This was done to avoid adversely affecting the THD or DC-voltage balancing. If this vector was included, there would be no intermediate switching losses for the RIS-SVPWM method when $V_{ref}$ if fully contained within the 6 innermost voltage vector triangles of the $nL$-SVM diagram. The slight increase in switching count from the D-SVPWM in the modulation index range $m \in [0.55 \ 0.7]$ is a result of using a constant starting null vector of [2 2 2] at the beginning of all the simulations. The results in Figure 6.6 were created over a time period of $2T_s$ s, if the simulation were to continue running, this increase in switching count would become negligible.
6.2.3 Waveform Harmonic Analysis

The WTHD for the phase voltage \(v_a\) is shown in Figure 6.7 for the full range of modulation indices and output waveform frequencies. Figure 6.7(a) shows the WTHD using the D-SVPWM method, Figure 6.7(b) for the RIS-SVPWM method and the percentage difference is shown in Figure 6.7(c). The WTHD for the RIS-SVPWM scheme is higher than the D-SVPWM method but remains within acceptable tolerances during the sinusoidal region below 1% [322].

![Figure 6.7 WTHD comparison for \(v_a\) over a range of modulation indices and output voltage frequencies for a 5L-CHB inverter using \(f_s = 5kHz\), (a) D-SVPWM, (b) RIS-SVPWM, (c) Percentage Difference](image)

The THD for the line current \(i_{AB}\) is shown in Figure 6.8 for a range of modulation indices and output waveform frequencies. Figure 6.8(a) shows the THD using the D-SVPWM method,
Figure 6.8(b) for the RIS-SVPWM method and the percentage difference is shown in Figure 6.8(c). The THD for the RIS-SVPWM scheme is again higher than the D-SVPWM method, but remains well within acceptable tolerances (according to the IEEE Standard 519-92) for large portions of the sinusoidal region of below 5% [322, 323, 324]. This is in part a reflection on the research presented by Pahlavani [193] and McGrath [325] who recognise the trade-off between lower switching counts and an increase in harmonic distortion.

Once the inverter enters the overmodulation region, the choice of available switching vectors become limited and the modulation methods begin to perform comparably to one another. However, the WTHD and THD values for the phase voltage and line currents respectively reach

**Figure 6.8** THD comparison for $i_{ab}$ over a range of modulation indices and output voltage frequencies for a 5L-CHB inverter using $f_s = 5$ kHz. (a) D-SVPWM, (b) RIS-SVPWM, (c) Percentage Difference
unacceptable values. Operation in the overmodulation region has been addressed by previous researchers who suggest restricting SVPWM to the sinusoidal region for low speed operation and permit overmodulation for high speed operation [326, 327, 328]. The THD for 150 Hz line currents in Figure 6.8 are higher in the overmodulation region than the sinusoidal region but reduce for low frequencies (i.e. 30-50 Hz).

6.2.4 Inverter Output Waveform Analysis

The pole voltage $v_{a0}$, the line voltage $v_{ab}$ and line current $i_{ab}$ for a target waveform frequency of 50 Hz and modulation index $m = 0.2$ is shown in Figure 6.9(a)-(c) respectively. The phase voltage WTHD and line current THD harmonic spectrum for these waveforms are shown in Figure 6.10(a)-(b) respectively. Similar graphs are shown for waveforms of the same output frequency with modulation indices of $m = 0.45$ (Figure 6.11-Figure 6.12), $m = 0.7$ (Figure 6.13-Figure 6.14), $m = 0.907$ (Figure 6.15-Figure 6.16), $m = 0.955$ (Figure 6.17-Figure 6.18) and $m = 1$ (Figure 6.19-Figure 6.20). These graphs show that the inverter is producing the correct number of voltage levels (pole and phase) for a respective modulation index and inverter voltage level (i.e. 5L-CHB).
Figure 6.9 5L-CHB inverter simulation waveform results $m = 0.2$, (a) $v_a$, (b) $v_{ab}$, (c) $i_{ab}$

Figure 6.10 5L-CHB inverter simulation harmonic analysis results $m = 0.2$, (a) $v_a$, (b) $i_{ab}$
Figure 6.11 5L-CHB inverter simulation waveform results $m = 0.45$, (a) $v_a$, (b) $v_{ab}$, (c) $i_{ab}$

Figure 6.12 5L-CHB inverter simulation harmonic analysis results $m = 0.45$, (a) $v_a$, (b) $i_{ab}$
Figure 6.13 5L-CHB inverter simulation waveform results $m = 0.7$, (a) $v_a$, (b) $v_{ab}$, (c) $i_{ab}$

Figure 6.14 5L-CHB inverter simulation harmonic analysis results $m = 0.7$, (a) $v_a$, (b) $i_{ab}$
Figure 6.15 5L-CHB inverter simulation waveform results $m = 0.907$, (a) $v_a$, (b) $v_{ab}$, (c) $i_{ab}$

Figure 6.16 5L-CHB inverter simulation harmonic analysis results $m = 0.907$, (a) $v_a$, (b) $i_{ab}$
Figure 6.17 5L-CHB inverter simulation waveform results $m = 0.955$, (a) $v_a$, (b) $v_{ab}$, (c) $i_{ab}$

Figure 6.18 5L-CHB inverter simulation harmonic analysis results $m = 0.955$, (a) $v_a$, (b) $i_{ab}$
Figure 6.19 5L-CHB inverter simulation waveform results $m = 1$, (a) $v_a$, (b) $v_{ab}$, (c) $i_{ab}$

Figure 6.20 5L-CHB inverter simulation harmonic analysis results $m = 1$, (a) $v_a$, (b) $i_{ab}$
The waveform analysis for the voltage waveforms show that the inverter is capable of generating waveforms whose fundamental components meet their target respective modulation indices as shown in Table 6.5. It should be noted that the THD analysis of the current waveforms show that large harmonics are generated at high frequencies. It may be possible to improve the THD of the RIS-SVPWM with additional filters to remove these high harmonic components.

Table 6.5 Inverter output waveform harmonic magnitude and quality analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>Target $v_a$ Harmonic (V)</th>
<th>Actual $v_a$ Harmonic (V)</th>
<th>Error (%)</th>
<th>$v_a$ WTHD (%)</th>
<th>Actual $i_{ab}$ Harmonic (A)</th>
<th>$i_{ab}$ THD (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>50.92</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>28.07</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>114.59</td>
<td>114.55</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>62.15</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>178.25</td>
<td>178.22</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>96.01</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>230.96</td>
<td>230.86</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>125.1</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>243.18</td>
<td>243.57</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>130.15</td>
<td>9.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>254.64</td>
<td>256.14</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>148.98</td>
<td>40.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Summary

An on-line Reduced Intermediate Switching Space Vector Pulse Width Modulation (RIS-SVPWM) scheme for multilevel DC-AC inverters for HEV/EV applications was presented. The RIS-SVPWM scheme is applicable to multiple inverter topologies for HEV/EVs of any voltage level. By advancing upon a previous popular on-line SVPWM method, the RIS-SVPWM method included a strategy to reduce the intermediate switching and increase the inverter efficiency. This was achieved by extending the mapping process to calculate alternative switching patterns enclosing the reference voltage vector.

The RIS-SVPWM scheme reduces the intermediate switching by up to 90% and the total switching count by 30% over the previous on-line SVPWM method. This increases the inverter’s efficiency while maintaining acceptable levels of voltage and current waveform harmonic distortion. A wide range of voltage and current waveform harmonics was presented and showed that the output waveforms matched their target harmonic component magnitude at the correct frequency.
Chapter Seven

Fuzzy Logic HEV/EV Stability Control

In this chapter, the author proposes a Fuzzy Logic (FL) based Vehicle Stability Control (VSC) system which aims to improve the controllability and stability of an HEV/EV during combined emergency braking and steering manoeuvres. A new gradient command controller assigns target operating gradients to a modified wheel slip controller using information obtained from a pre-existing popular FL Yaw Moment Controller (YMC).

In comparison to other VSC systems, the FL based VSC (FL-VSC) system aims to offer; minimal constant vehicle data to be used within the control algorithm, high robustness for superior and stable control over various driving scenarios. The FL-VSC scheme in this work is only implemented into a vehicle utilising four independent traction motors to fully highlight the level of control freedom only obtainable by the traction motors and the FL-VSC scheme. However, future research is planned to investigate this control scheme with various other HEV/EV powertrain architectures. It is expected that minimal changes to the control architecture presented in this chapter would be required.

This chapter is sectioned as follows; Section 7.1-7.2 presents the control architecture and controllers used for the FL-VSC system respectively. Section 7.3 discusses the results of the simulation study by investigating various emergency braking scenarios with a comparison against other VSC systems.
7.1 Operating principles of the FL-VSC

The FL-VSC comprises of a FL YMC, FL gradient command controller and four independent FL gradient based wheel slip controllers. The top-level vehicle control flowchart for the FL-VSC system is shown in Figure 7.1 and is explained as follows:

1) The vehicle’s instantaneous longitudinal velocity $V_x$, lateral velocity $V_y$, front wheel steer angle $\delta$ and the yaw rate $r$ are all exported from the CarSim vehicle model and imported into MATLAB/Simulink (see Section 3.2.4.1 for further CarSim details).

![Figure 7.1 Top level FL-VSC control flow architecture](image)

2) The FL YMC subsystem in Figure 7.2 (explained in Section 7.2.1) generates an ideal additional yaw moment $M_2$ which if applied directly to the vehicle’s yaw axis would reduce the yaw rate error and the sideslip angle.

3) A FL gradient command controller (Section 7.2.2) uses the additional yaw moment $M_2$ to calculate appropriate target operating gradients $G^*$ and assigns them to the independent wheel slip controllers. If $G^*$ is positive, then $G^*$ becomes the new target operating gradient.
for both the front right (fr) and rear right (rr) wheels. If $G^*$ is negative, then its magnitude becomes the new target gradient for the front left (fl) and rear left (rl) wheels.

4) The new target operating gradient is sent to the FL gradient based wheel slip controllers in Figure 7.3 (explained in Section 7.2.3). These controllers calculate appropriate brake torques that would enable the wheels to operate around the target operating gradients.

5) The target brake torque goes to the braking and tyre system in Figure 7.3 (Section 3.2.4.2). The traction motors are modelled using the simplified models described in Section 3.2.5.1. This subsystem calculates the respective tractive and lateral tyre forces for each wheel to export to the CarSim vehicle model.

Figure 7.2 YMC and Gradient Command control flowcharts

Figure 7.3 Gradient Controller with the Braking and Tyre Model control flowchart
7.2 Fuzzy Logic Controllers for the FL-VSC

The FL membership functions and rules in this investigation use the linguistic terms; Negative Large (NL), Negative Medium (NM), Negative Small (NS), Zero (Z), Positive Small (PS), Positive Medium (PM) and Positive Large (PL).

7.2.1 Fuzzy Logic YMC

The FL YMC developed by Boada [234, 235] uses the yaw rate error $\Delta r$ (89) and vehicle sideslip error $\Delta \beta_{ss}$ (90) as inputs. The membership functions for this controller are shown in Figure 7.4 and the rule base in Table 7.1.

The target yaw rate $r^*$ is dependent on the vehicle’s longitudinal velocity $V_x$, front wheel steer angle $\delta$, wheelbase $L$ and a stability factor $A$. The stability factor $A$ allows for the steering responsiveness of the vehicle to be tuned to meet the vehicle’s target dynamic objectives. The vehicle’s sideslip error $\beta_{ss}$ is the angle made between the velocity vectors $V_x$ and the lateral velocity $V_y$. The target value for $\beta_{ss}$ remains zero for all driving scenarios in this investigation.

The FL YMC controller outputs an ideal yaw moment $M_Z$.

$$\Delta r = r^* - r = \frac{V_x}{L(1 + AV_x^2)} \delta - r \quad (89)$$

$$\Delta \beta_{ss} = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{V_y}{V_x} \right) \quad (90)$$

The input-output ranges for this controller are used because they offer stable and accurate control of the vehicle throughout the various braking manoeuvres. The output range is a unit value, this is scaled to achieve to the desired sensitivity of the FL YMC system.
Table 7.1 FL YMC rule base [234, 235]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.4 FL YMC membership functions [239, 240], (a) Input 1 - Δr, (b) Input 2 - Δβ_{ss}, (c) Output - M_Z
Some examples of the rules for the FL YMC in Table 7.1 are explained as follows:

- If $\Delta r$ is (Z) and $\Delta \beta_{ss}$ is (Z) then $M_z$ is (Z). If there is no yaw rate error and the sideslip angle is zero, then the vehicle is following a target trajectory, no additional yaw moment is required.

- If $\Delta r$ is (PL) and $\Delta \beta_{ss}$ is (PL) then $M_z$ is (NL). If the vehicle’s yaw rate error and the sideslip angle is positive large, then a large negative additional yaw moment is required to reduce these understeering characteristics.

- If $\Delta r$ is (NL) and $\Delta \beta_{ss}$ is (Z) then $M_z$ is (NM). If the vehicle’s yaw rate error is positive large and the sideslip angle is zero, then an additional medium negative yaw moment is required. This is giving priority to the tracking ability of the yaw rate error over the sideslip angle.

### 7.2.2 Fuzzy Logic Gradient Command Controller

A FL gradient command controller is used to assign the target operating gradient $G^*$ to the individual wheels $G_{wh}^*$ ($wh = fl, fr, rl, rr$). This controller uses the membership functions in Figure 7.5 and the rule base in Table 7.2. This FLC uses the additional yaw moment calculated by the FL YMC in Section 7.2.1 and its time derivative as the two inputs to generate $G^*$.

The input and output ranges for this controller are of unit value, the yaw moment input $M_z$ is scaled according to the target yaw performance of the vehicle under control. The output target gradient is also scaled by a factor of $S_G$. As $S_G$ increases, the wheel’s target operating gradient gets closer to the free-rolling condition $\sigma = 0$. To compromise between steering control and braking force a gradient scale of 6 was used in this investigation.
Some examples of the rules for the FL gradient command controller in Table 7.2 are explained as follows:

- If $M_Z$ is (Z) and $\frac{dM_Z}{dt}$ is (Z) then $G^*$ is (Z). If no additional yaw moment is required and this value has not changed since the last time step, then the controller outputs a command gradient of zero. This is applied to the four wheel slip controllers.

- If $M_Z$ is (PL) and $\frac{dM_Z}{dt}$ is (Z) then $G^*$ is (NL). The command additional yaw moment is positive large and has not changed since the last time step, the controller outputs a large

---

Figure 7.5 FL Gradient control, (a) Input 1 - $M_Z$, (b) Input 2 - $\frac{d(M_Z)}{dt}$, (c) Output - $G^*$
negative gradient. The magnitude of this gradient is applied to the wheels on the left of the vehicle.

- If \( M_z \) is (NS) and \( \frac{dM_z}{dt} \) is (PM) then \( G^* \) is (NS). Even though the command yaw moment is negative, the rate of change is positive and larger in magnitude. The controller sends a small negative gradient to be used in the wheels on the left of the vehicle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.2 FL Gradient controller rule base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.2.3 Fuzzy Logic Wheel Slip Controller

The gradient based FL TCS by Colli [256, 257] is modified for use during braking scenarios. The membership functions for this controller are shown in Figure 7.6 and the rule base in Table 7.3. The brake pedal activation level \( \gamma_{brk} \in [0, 1] \) and the error in operating gradient \( \Delta G_{wh} \) (91) are used as the two inputs. The controller calculates an ideal brake torque \( \tau_{wh} \) which would reduce the operating gradient error. This brake torque must be generated by the Electrohydraulic Braking (EHB) system.

\[
\Delta G_{wh} = G_{wh^*} - \frac{d\mu_{xwh}}{d\sigma_{wh}}
\] (91)
The input range for the gradient error offers stable and acceptable control of the wheel operating gradient throughout all the braking manoeuvres. Both the brake pedal input activation level and output brake torque are unit values. The output brake torque is scaled with respect to the maximum brake torque allowed by the vehicle’s braking system $B_{gf}$.

Figure 7.6 Gradient based wheel slip controller membership functions, (a) Input 1 – $\Delta G_{wh}$, (b) Input 2 – $\gamma$, (c) Output – $\tau_{Bwh}$
Some examples of the rules in Table 7.3 are explained as follows:

- If $\Delta G_{wh}$ is (Z) and $Y_{brk}$ is (Z) then $\tau_{Bwh}$ is (Z). If the operating gradient error is zero and the driver has no intent on decelerating the vehicle, no brake torque is supplied to the wheels.

- If $\Delta G_{wh}$ is (PL) and $Y_{brk}$ is (PL) then $\tau_{Bwh}$ is (PL). If the gradient error is positive and large, then the wheel is much closer to the free rolling condition of the wheel and far from the target operating point. Because the brake pedal is also large, the driver aims to decelerate the vehicle quickly. A large brake torque is required to decelerate the wheel and reduce the operating gradient error.

Table 7.3 Gradient based wheel slip controller rule base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$Y_{brk}$</th>
<th>$\Delta G_{wh}$</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EHB system utilises the independent in-wheel traction motor’s regenerative brake torque and the vehicle’s hydraulic braking system to generate $\tau_B$. The traction motors and hydraulic braking systems are modelled using first order filters with time constants $B_M$ and $B_H$ respectively [245]. The traction motor’s time constant is lower than the hydraulic system because they are able to modulate the brake torque at a much higher frequency. These time constants offer a good representation of the brake torque responsiveness of a typical EHB system. If the command $\tau_{Bwh}$ from the FL wheel slip controller is larger than the brake torque of the traction motor for a given motor speed $\omega_{mwh}$, then the excess brake torque is
compensated by the hydraulic braking system [329]. The control flowchart for the EHB system is shown in Figure 7.3.

7.3 FL-VSC Performance Evaluation

7.3.1 Simulation Setup and Evaluation Criteria

A vehicle containing the new FL-VSC system is compared against identical vehicles using other VSC systems during numerous different braking maneuvers. A vehicle using $G^* = 0$ on all four wheels is labelled Z-GR (Zero-Gradient) and one which uses a Conventional-ABS is labelled C-ABS. The C-ABS vehicle applies full brake torque when the wheel slip is 0.09 or lower and releases the brake torque at a wheel slip of 0.15. To show how the controllers are affected by hardware limitations and compiler errors, a series of PIL simulations are conducted alongside the main investigation. Since only one controller can operate in PIL mode at a single time, multiple PIL simulations are required for each braking scenario. Simulations where the gradient command controller is implemented in hardware are labelled FL-VSC-GR. Simulations where the front right and real left wheel slip controllers are implemented in hardware are labeled FL-VSC-FR and FL-VSC-RL respectively. During these PIL, the remaining controllers in the FL-VSC system operate in software in MIL mode.

All three vehicles use identical vehicle parameters in Table 7.4. The vehicle model uses four independent 35 kW traction motors with torque-speed characteristics given in Table 7.4. The traction motors are simulated using 2D lookup tables as described in Section 3.2.5.1.
### Table 7.4 Vehicle parameters for CarSim vehicle model [234, 235]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$M_{veh}$</td>
<td>1412 kg</td>
<td>$k_{1r}$</td>
<td>30 kN/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_s$</td>
<td>1270 kg</td>
<td>$k_{2f}$</td>
<td>240 kN/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{uf}$</td>
<td>36 kg</td>
<td>$k_{2r}$</td>
<td>240 kN/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{ur}$</td>
<td>36 kg</td>
<td>$c_{1f}$</td>
<td>0.96 kNs/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_f$</td>
<td>1.675 m</td>
<td>$c_{1r}$</td>
<td>0.8 kNs/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_r$</td>
<td>1.675 m</td>
<td>$c_{2f}$</td>
<td>5 kNs/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>2.91 m</td>
<td>$c_{2r}$</td>
<td>5 kNs/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>1.01 m</td>
<td>$K_{af}$</td>
<td>6.7 kNm/rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>1.9 m</td>
<td>$K_{ar}$</td>
<td>6.7 kNm/rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{COG}$</td>
<td>0.54 m</td>
<td>$K_{\varphi}$</td>
<td>6.6 kNm/rad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e_s$</td>
<td>0.45 m</td>
<td>$C_{\varphi}$</td>
<td>3.5 kNs/rad/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{yaw}$</td>
<td>1536 kg.m²</td>
<td>$N_{jd}$</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{pitch}$</td>
<td>1540 kg.m²</td>
<td>$P_m$</td>
<td>35 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{roll}$</td>
<td>490 kg.m²</td>
<td>$\omega_B$</td>
<td>1675 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>$\omega_{MAX}$</td>
<td>6000 rpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{wh}$</td>
<td>2 kg.m²</td>
<td>$B_M$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>0.3 m</td>
<td>$B_H$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{1f}$</td>
<td>27 kN/m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.3.2 Scenario 1 – Straight Line Braking

The first braking scenario simulates a straight-line braking manoeuvre from 120 km/h on a surface with peak COF $\mu = 1$. The brake pedal is applied at time $t_1 = 1$ s ($y_{brk} = 1$). Figure 7.7 shows the braking force on all four wheels for the three vehicles. Figure 7.8(a)-(b) shows the longitudinal velocity and the total distance travelled $X_d$ for the three vehicles respectively.

The Z-GR and FL-VSC vehicles operate identically to one another. Because the vehicle travels in a straight line on an even COF surface, no steering intervention or YMC is required. The target operating gradient for all the wheels of FL-VSC vehicle is zero. All four wheels generate maximum braking force and are balanced on either side of the vehicle. Table 7.5 shows that the Z-GR and FL-VSC vehicles are able to reduce the stopping distance by 10% and braking time by 11% down from the C-ABS vehicle.
The PIL simulations in Figure 7.7-Figure 7.8 produce numerically identical control signals to their simulated MIL counterparts, this shows that the controllers have been unaffected by the code compiler and the FL-VSC system is ready for HIL experimentation in a straight-line braking scenarios. In addition, the braking forces in Figure 7.7 for the C-ABS vehicle pulsate at a much higher frequency and magnitude than the other two vehicles, this may induce a panic release response from drivers who do not know that the juddering pedal feedback is from the ABS activating.

**Figure 7.7** Longitudinal braking forces for scenario 1, (a) $r_l$, (b) $f_l$, (c) $r_r$, (d) $f_r$
Table 7.5 Performance Indices comparison for braking scenario 1. Units in brackets represent percentage change from the C-ABS vehicle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>C-ABS</th>
<th>Z-GR</th>
<th>FL-VSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$t_{bk}$</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{bk}$</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | \(-10.99\\%\) | \(-10.99\\%\) |
| | | \(-10.06\\%\) | \(-10.06\\%\) |

The animation screenshots from CarSim for this braking scenario are shown in Figure 7.9 and offers a representation of how the braking distances are reduced in proportion to the vehicle’s scale. The Z-GR (Blue vehicle) and FL-VSC (Red Vehicle) vehicles come to a complete stop ~1.5 car lengths shorter than the C-ABS (Green Vehicle).
Figure 7.9 Animation preview for the accident avoidance braking manoeuvre scenario 4, (a) $t = 1$ s (start), (b) $t = 3.5$ s, (c) $t = 4.7$ s final resting position.
7.3.3 Scenario 2 – Split $\mu$ Braking

The vehicle initially travelling at 120 km/h fully activates the brake pedal at time $t_1 = 1s$ ($\gamma_{brk} = 1$) on a split $\mu$ surface. The roads peak COF is 0.5 and 1 on the left and right hand side of the vehicle respectively. Ideally, the FL-VSC system would enable the FL-VSC vehicle to travel straight with no yaw and minimal driving steering intervention.

The individual wheel gradient control in Figure 7.10 shows that the FL wheel slip controllers are able to control the wheel slip around positive operating gradients. The wheels on the right of the vehicle in Figure 7.10(c)-(d) have a positive operating gradient where wheels on the left in Figure 7.10(a)-(b) have a zero target operating gradient. The FL and RL wheels are thus operating at the maximum brake force available to them on their respective surface (the low COF surface).

![Figure 7.10 Independent gradient control for the FL-VSC vehicle during braking scenario 2, (a) rl, (b) fl, (c) rr, (d) fr](image-url)
Although the $fr$ and $rr$ wheels on the high COF surface are able to generate higher brake forces, the FL-VSC reduces the operating wheel slip to produce a lower brake force and match the braking forces on the other side of the vehicle. This reduces the additional yaw moment generated from asymmetrical brake forces. Figure 7.11 shows that the Z-GR vehicle overall achieves higher brake forces than the FL-VSC vehicle because it attempts to operate around maximum brake for the duration of the braking manoeuvre.

**Figure 7.11** Longitudinal braking forces for scenario 2, (a) $rl$, (b) $fl$, (c) $rr$, (d) $fr$

The vehicle dynamics in Figure 7.12 and the performance indices in Table 7.6 show that the $X_{bk}$ and $t_{bk}$ are 6.7% and 9.8% higher respectively for the FL-VSC vehicle over the C-ABS vehicle. However, the IYRE, ISSE and ISC indices are 43%, 53% and 39% lower.
respectively. The performance index $J$ for the FL-VSC vehicle is 36% lower over the C-ABS vehicle. These indices show that the additional braking distance of the FL-VSC vehicle is justified because there is a greater trade-off for vehicle stability and controllability. The C-ABS and Z-GR vehicles both have a much higher sideslip angle and much more driver steering intervention as seen in Figure 7.12(c)-(d). The PIL simulations in Figure 7.11-Figure 7.12 show comparable control and stability after code compiling to their software counterparts.

![Vehicle Dynamics comparison for braking scenario 2](image)

**Figure 7.12** Vehicle Dynamics comparison for braking scenario 2, (a) $V_x$, (b) $X_g$, (c) $\beta_{ss}$, (d) Steering wheel angle
The animation screenshots from CarSim for this braking scenario are shown in Figure 7.13. The FL-VSC vehicle has a consistently straight heading throughout the simulation. The FL-VSC vehicle comes to a complete stop ~3 – 4 car lengths more than the Z-GR vehicle, this might be perceived as having poor braking performance. However, it’s unlikely that an average driver in the C-ABS or Z-GR vehicle is able to control the vehicle’s heading, but instead more likely to spin out of control as shown by the ISC values in Table 7.6 and the steer angle in Figure 7.12(d). For the results shown, there was no limit to the steering wheel angle in this braking scenario. Previous simulations which included a steer limit of ±100° - investigated during the development of this control system - showed the C-ABS vehicle and Z-GR vehicles spinning out of control during this braking scenario.

Table 7.6 Performance Indices comparison for braking scenario 2. Units in brackets represent percentage change from the C-ABS vehicle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>C-ABS</th>
<th>Z-GR</th>
<th>FL-VSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$t_{bk}$</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-9.85%)</td>
<td>(6.77%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{bk}$</td>
<td>81.90</td>
<td>75.05</td>
<td>89.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-8.36%)</td>
<td>(9.85%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J$</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-11.84%)</td>
<td>(-36.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYRE</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(49.4%)</td>
<td>(-42.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>367.19</td>
<td>536.34</td>
<td>224.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(46.1%)</td>
<td>(-38.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSE</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>26.12</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59.1%)</td>
<td>(-52.74%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.13 Animation preview for the accident avoidance braking manoeuvre scenario 2, (a) $t = 2 \, s$ C-ABS greatest positive sideslip, (b) $t = 2.7 \, s$ Z-GR greatest positive sideslip, (c) $t = 3 \, s$ C-ABS greatest negative sideslip, (d) $t = 3.6 \, s$ Z-GR greatest negative sideslip, (e) $t = 6.2 \, s$ final resting position
7.3.4 Scenario 3 – Double Lane Change on a Low \( \mu \) Surface

At time \( t_1 = 1s \), the vehicle applies the brake pedal \( \gamma_{brk} = 1 \) and begins following the target path of a Double Lane Change (DLC) manoeuvre. The vehicle has an initial velocity of 80 km/h and the test track has an average peak COF of 0.5 to replicate wet driving conditions. This scenario replicates a driver attempting to avoid a head-on collision by manoeuvring around an obstacle. It would be unlikely that the driver in this scenario would use extreme steering angles, therefore the steering wheel angle is limited to \( \pm 100^\circ \).

The gradient control for the four wheels in Figure 7.14 show that the FL gradient command controller is able to change the target operating gradient between the wheels on the left and right hand side of the vehicle during a braking manoeuvre. Figure 7.15 shows the corresponding brake forces generated by the four wheels.

![Figure 7.14](image)

**Figure 7.14** Independent wheel gradient control for FL-VSC vehicle during scenario 3, (a) \( rl \), (b) \( fl \), (c) \( rr \), (d) \( fr \)
The vehicle’s yaw rate and sideslip angle for the three vehicles is given in Figure 7.17(a)-(b) respectively, it shows that the FL-VSC vehicle follows its respective target yaw rate (dotted line) closer than the C-ABS or Z-GR vehicles. It must be noted that Z-GR has the lowest sideslip angle over the entire manoeuvre, but this is a by-product from its poor yaw rate control. Figure 7.16(a)-(c) shows the global co-ordinates, steering wheel input and longitudinal velocity respectively for all three vehicles. The global co-ordinates in Figure 7.16(a) show that the FL-VSC vehicle follows the target path closer than C-ABS or the Z-GR vehicle.

Table 7.7 shows that $X_{bk}$ and $t_{bk}$ are similar for all three vehicles with the Z-GR vehicle having the lowest braking distance. However, the way these values are achieved are different for each vehicle system. The IYRE and ISSE for the FL-VSC vehicle are 48% and 22% lower
respectively over the C-ABS vehicle, this is achieved with 7% less steering intervention. The advantage of the FL-VSC vehicle in this scenario being that not only does it follow the DLC test track with the greatest accuracy, stability and controllability, but it also requires the least amount of steering control to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.7</th>
<th>Performance indices comparison for braking scenario 3. Units in brackets represent percentage change from the C-ABS vehicle.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>C-ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{bk}$</td>
<td>4.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-4.36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{bk}$</td>
<td>56.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-3.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{max}$</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-8.82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J$</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYRE</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(105.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>299.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSE</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-14.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FL-VSC vehicle has a better trade-off between braking and steering control by reducing the $J$ index by 85%. In addition, the FL-VSC vehicle also reduces the peak global Y-coordinates ($Y_{max}$) by 10% which shows the FL-VSC vehicle’s ability to regain control after the initial steering input and doesn’t overshoot the target path. This might avoid collision with a barrier or another obstacle outside of the target trajectory.

The high IYRE for the Z-GR in Table 7.7 shows poor yaw rate control. Although the ISC for the Z-GR and FL-VSC vehicles are similar, examination of Figure 7.16(b) shows that the
FL-VSC vehicle responds quicker to the steering input and begins applying a counter steering angle sooner than the Z-GR vehicle. The shorter braking distance of the Z-GR vehicle is a by-product of poor steering controllability which cannot be relied on for every braking scenario.

**Figure 7.16** Vehicle dynamics comparison for braking scenario 3, (a) Global co-ordinates, (b) Steering wheel angle, (c) $V_x$
The animation screenshots from CarSim for this braking scenario are shown in Figure 7.18. It appears that all three vehicles follow similar global trajectories with the Z-GR vehicle having the shortest braking distance. However, a major part of this braking scenario is the manoeuvre around an obstacle and the vehicles responsiveness to steering control.
Figure 7.18 Animation preview for the accident avoidance braking manoeuvre scenario 3, (a) $t = 2.7 \, s$ FL-VSC greatest negative sideslip, (b) $t = 3.2 \, s$ C-ABS greatest negative sideslip, (c) $t = 4.3 \, s$ C-ABS and FL-VSC greatest corrective sideslip, (d) $t = 5.9 \, s$ final resting position
7.3.5 Scenario 4 – Distracted Driver Accident Avoidance

The final braking scenario is an accident avoidance manoeuvre where the driver tries to exit a 6 m danger zone on a road with an even COF of 1. This scenario may occur in the real-world if a driver is distracted from the road and quickly turns the steering wheel in a panic to avoid an obstacle. The vehicle with an initial velocity of 120 km/h begins steering at time $t = 0.5s$ and applies the brake pedal at $t_1 = 1s$ ($\gamma_{brk} = 1$). The steering wheel input is limited to ±100°.

Once the vehicle has exited the 6 m danger zone, the driver attempts to regain steering control and position the vehicle on the 6 m target line. Ideally, the vehicle would exit the danger zone quickly with minimal overshoot. This would not only avoid the head-on collision inside the danger zone but also avoids a collision with a road barrier or other vehicles once it has exited the 6 m area.

The yaw rate and sideslip angle for the three vehicles are given in Figure 7.19(a)-(b) respectively and show that only the C-ABS vehicle is unable to regain control after the initial steering input. The varying braking forces across the vehicle using the FL-VSC is shown in Figure 7.20. The global co-ordinates, steering wheel input and longitudinal velocity for the three vehicles in Figure 7.21(a)-(c) respectively show that for similar steering wheel inputs, the FL-VSC vehicle has a superior path tracking ability than the Z-GR vehicle. Since the C-ABS vehicle did not complete the manoeuvre, its performance indices were negated from this comparison.

Table 7.8 shows that the for similar ISC, the FL-VSC vehicle reduces IYRE, ISSE and $J$ indices by 65%, 33% and 46% respectively over the Z-GR vehicle. In addition, from Figure 7.21(c) and the $Y_{max}$ in Table 7.8, the FL-VSC reduces lateral overshoot over the Z-GR vehicle by 28%. This may see the Z-GR vehicle colliding with either a road barrier or other vehicles.
outside the 6 m danger zone, whereas the FL-VSC vehicle is able to quickly regain yaw control and maneuver the vehicle back towards its target path.

The yaw rate error in Figure 7.19(a) is large for all three vehicles in the time between the initial steering input and the brakes being applied. The FL-VSC is not operating during this time period as it relies on the braking pedal activation level. It may be possible for future iterations of the FL-VSC to consider both constant velocity and braking scenarios.

The animation screenshots from CarSim for this braking scenario are shown in Figure 7.22. The scale of how much the FL-VSC vehicle improves upon the Z-GR vehicle clearly shows that there is a high likelihood that the Z-GR vehicle might collide with either a barrier or another obstacle. The final resting positions of the FL-VSC vehicle is ~3 - 4 car widths closer to target path than the Z-GR vehicle.

**Figure 7.19** Vehicle controllability and stability variables for braking scenario 4, (a) $r$, (b) $\beta_{ss}$

The yaw rate error in Figure 7.19(a) is large for all three vehicles in the time between the initial steering input and the brakes being applied. The FL-VSC is not operating during this time period as it relies on the braking pedal activation level. It may be possible for future iterations of the FL-VSC to consider both constant velocity and braking scenarios.

The animation screenshots from CarSim for this braking scenario are shown in Figure 7.22. The scale of how much the FL-VSC vehicle improves upon the Z-GR vehicle clearly shows that there is a high likelihood that the Z-GR vehicle might collide with either a barrier or another obstacle. The final resting positions of the FL-VSC vehicle is ~3 - 4 car widths closer to target path than the Z-GR vehicle.
Table 7.8 Performance indices comparison for braking scenario 4. Units in brackets represent percentage change from the Z-GR vehicle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>C-ABS</th>
<th>Z-GR</th>
<th>FL-VSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$t_{bk}$</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>4.189</td>
<td>4.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{bk}$</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>75.379</td>
<td>76.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_{max}$</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>14.598</td>
<td>10.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYRE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>410.7</td>
<td>411.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>13.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.20 Longitudinal braking forces for scenario 4, (a) $r_l$, (b) $f_l$, (c) $r_r$, (d) $f_r$
Figure 7.21 Vehicle dynamics comparison for braking scenario 4, 
(a) Global co-ordinates, (b) Steering wheel angle, (c) $V_x$
Figure 7.22 Animation preview for the accident avoidance braking manoeuvre scenario 4,
(a) $t = 1 \, \text{s}$ Brake pedal activation, (b) $t = 1.7 \, \text{s}$ FL-VSC crosses the target lateral position, (c) $t = 2.3 \, \text{s}$, (d) $t = 3 \, \text{s}$ greatest FL-VSC lateral position, (e) $t = 3.8 \, \text{s}$ Greatest Z-GR lateral position, (f) $t = 5.28 \, \text{s}$ final resting position
7.4 Summary

A FL based VSC (FL-VSC) system was developed to improve the controllability and stability of an HEV/EV during an emergency braking manoeuvre. A FL YMC controller produced a target additional yaw moment which would reduce the yaw rate error and vehicle sideslip angle. This additional moment was sent to a new FL gradient command controller which assigned target operating gradients to the wheels on either side of the vehicle. A FL gradient based wheel slip controller regulated the wheels operating gradient via a combined Electrohydraulic Braking (EHB) system.

The FL-VSC scheme requires minimal vehicle parameters to be used within the control system, is insensitive to variable parameters or changing vehicle-road conditions and is able to be tuned to meet a vehicle’s target dynamic objectives. A series of PIL experiments verify that the FLCs within this control system are unaffected by the code compiler and therefore ready to move onto the next stage of HIL validation.

In comparison to a conventional vehicle ABS system, the FL-VSC system; reduces the straight-line braking distance by 10%; requires little driver steering intervention when braking on split $\mu$ surfaces; increases stability for double lane change braking manoeuvres; and recovers control of the vehicle during an accident avoidance manoeuvre.
Chapter Eight

Summary and Conclusions

This chapter summarizes the major outcomes of the research presented in chapters four-seven in Section 8.1, plans for future research are then given in Section 8.2.

8.1 Summary of the Main Outcomes

8.1.1 Summary of Chapter Four

The research conducted within Chapter Four satisfies the first research objective set out in Section 2.5 by investigating a single FOC algorithm that is able to control multiple vehicle systems without the need for re-tuning with a further investigation into the effects of variable motor parameters on HEV/EV applications. A Fuzzy Logic (FL) based Field-Oriented Control (FOC) scheme for the traction motor/s of an HEV/EV was developed which consists of independent vehicle speed, traction motor q-axis current, d-axis current and magnetic flux (for IM) FL controllers. Developed in MATLAB/Simulink in conjunction with CarSim vehicle models, the FL based FOC (FL-FOC) scheme showed that it would be a useful tool during the development of an HEV/EV where multiple vehicle designs are under consideration, but its insensitivity to real-world variable motor parameters would make it a viable option for continuous control of the traction motors in the final production vehicle. The main outcomes from the FL-FOC scheme are as follows:

1) The FLC’s showed to be unaffected by the code compiling via a series of PIL simulations which produced comparable performance to their software-based counterparts and ready to move onto the HIL validation.
2) The FL-FOC system is able to maintain the control objectives within acceptable error tolerances for multiple vehicle systems and traction motor topologies without the need for re-tuning.

3) The FL-FOC system has greater robustness over a PI controller based FOC system, not only through continual control of the various vehicle systems, but also with the inclusion of variable stator resistances.

4) The FL-FOC system is able to control the vehicle’s velocity closer to how a real driver would control the vehicle over a PI based FOC scheme. This offers a better representation of how the physical vehicle would perform in the real world.

Not only would the FL-FOC scheme act as a useful control technique during the development of an HEV/EV where multiple vehicle designs are under consideration, but its insensitivity to real-world variable motor parameters would make it a viable option for continuous control of the traction motors in the final production vehicle.

8.1.2 Summary of Chapter Five

The research conducted within Chapter Five satisfies the second research objective set out in Section 2.5 by creating an empirical data based traction motor model to characterise the dynamic and thermal constraints of a motor operating in the overcurrent region. The model was able to narrow down the choice of prospective traction motors and optimise the choice of powertrain components as explained using a case study. A new traction motor sizing strategy for HEV/EVs based on an overcurrent-tolerant prediction model was developed. Using the motor’s overcurrent torque-speed curve time constraints, the motor’s temperature was estimated between safe upper and lower working boundaries. The rate of change in temperature is dependent on the position of the motor’s output torque between the continuous and
overcurrent torque-speed curves to represent the supply current magnitude. The main outcomes of this chapter are summarised as followed:

1) The overcurrent-tolerant prediction model is able to estimate the dynamic and thermal characteristics of a motor operating in the overcurrent region requiring minimal detailed motor parameters.

2) A case study was explored where an aeroplane pushback vehicle was converted into a series HEV using this sizing strategy. Two possible HEV configurations using different traction motors and powertrain configurations were then analysed.

3) The advantages of operating in the overcurrent region and its effect on the HEV/EVs driving range, fuel consumption and emissions is revealed. The HEV using traction motors operating in the overcurrent region shows a reduction in fuel consumption by 5.7% and a reduction in electrical energy consumption of nearly 7% over a large motor confined to the continuous torque region.

This modelling technique would be more applicable during the early development stages where a wide range of traction motors are under consideration. The FL-FOC scheme of Chapter Five could then be used for control of the real model or once more detailed motor parameters become available.

8.1.3 Summary of Chapter Six

The research conducted within Chapter Six satisfies the third research objective set out in Section 2.5 to develop an on-line SVPWM scheme without impeding upon computational burden and examination of the control scheme over the full operating region applicable to HEV/EV applications. An on-line Reduced Intermediate Switching Space Vector Pulse Width Modulation (RIS-SVPWM) scheme for multilevel DC-AC inverters for HEV/EV applications
was developed. This was achieved by extending the mapping process to calculate alternative switching patterns enclosing the reference voltage vector. The switching vector which required a lower number of intermediate switching from the previous SVPWM cycle was chosen to reduce the total switching losses and increase the inverters efficiency. The main outcomes of this chapter are summarised as followed:

1) The RIS-SVPWM method operates on-line for any inverter level or topology without the need for large look-up tables.

2) The new RIS-SVPWM scheme managed to reduce the intermediate switching by 90% over the previous on-line modulation method.

3) The new RIS-SVPWM scheme managed to reduce the total number of switching by 32% for an output waveform of 150 Hz over the previous on-line modulation method. The switching losses are therefore reduced proportionally.

4) The line current THD and phase voltage WTHD for the RIS-SVPWM method are well within acceptable tolerances for the sinusoidal operating region over the full range of modulation indices and output waveform frequencies.

5) The RIS-SVPWM shows a similar linear growth in time-complexity with increasing inverter voltage levels to previous on-line SVPWM methods.

6) The RIS-SVPWM method is able to generate voltage waveforms in the sinusoidal and overmodulation regions of the inverter.

8.1.4 Summary of Chapter Seven

The research conducted within Chapter Seven satisfies the fourth research objective set out in Section 2.5 by developing a gradient based wheel slip controller which incorporates yaw control in order to improve the safety of an HEV/EV during an emergency manoeuvre.
Furthermore, the system developed required little information about the vehicle system it was implemented into that could not be estimated. A FL based Vehicle Stability Control (VSC) system (FL-VSC) was developed to improve the controllability and stability of an HEV/EV during an emergency braking manoeuvre. A FL YMC controller produced a target additional yaw moment which would reduce the yaw rate error and vehicle sideslip angle. This additional moment was sent to a new FL gradient command controller which assigned target operating gradients to the wheels on either side of the vehicle. A FL gradient based wheel slip controller regulated the wheels operating gradient via a combined Electrohydraulic Braking (EHB) system. The outcomes of this chapter are summarised as followed:

1) The FL-VSC requires minimal vehicle information as part of the control algorithm and whose robustness make it insensitive to time varying parameters.

2) The sensitivity of the control scheme is able to be tuned to meet the target dynamic objectives of a vehicle.

3) A series of PIL simulations showed that the FLCs were unaffected by the code compiler verifying that the control system is ready for HIL validation.

4) For straight line braking scenarios, the FL-VSC system reduced the braking distance by 10% over a conventional Anti-Lock Braking System (C-ABS).

5) For straight line split $\mu$ braking scenarios, the FL-VSC showed a 36% improved trade-off between braking distance and yaw rate control. The FL-VSC system also reduced the yaw rate error (IYRE) by 42%, driver steering intervention (ISC) by 39% and sideslip angle (ISSE) by 52% over this braking scenario.

6) For a double-lane change manoeuvre on a wet surface, the FL-VSC system showed an 85% greater trade-off between braking distance and yaw rate control. The FL-VSC system also reduced the IYRE by 48% and the ISSE by 23% with 7.2% less ISC.
7) For a distracted driver accident avoidance manoeuvre, the FL-VSC system showed a 28% greater trade-off between braking distance and yaw rate control over a vehicle which achieved peak longitudinal coefficient of friction (Z-GR). The FL-VSC system also reduced the IYRE by 64% and the ISSE by 33% over this braking scenario. The C-ABS vehicle could not regain control during this manoeuvre whereas the FL-VSC remained in control at all times.

8.2 Further Discussion and Future Work

8.2.1 Further Discussion for Chapter Four

Even though the SMAPE values using the FL-FOC system are within acceptable error tolerances, the SMAPE values for the PI-FOC system are still lower. The PI controllers continually integrate the input error which gives them the advantage during steady-state conditions. The input-output ranges of the FL controllers used within this work were all chosen as they offered the greatest trade-off between control stability and relatively low steady-state error. Future investigation of the FL-FOC system would involve improving the steady-state error performance of these controllers. One way to do this would be to construct an optimisation problem out of the FL-FOC scheme to tune the membership function shapes and input-output ranges in a similar manner to Hannan [85]. This may produce a FOC system that is not only more robust than a PI based FOC system, but also have comparably low steady-state error.

To fully validate the FL-FOC system, further research into how the system performs experimentally with real motors is required. The FL-FOC system has shown to work with physical hardware on a microcontroller, but any further physical limitations imposed by the motor, inverter or sensors may cause further problems. It is the intent of the author to investigate these problems in the future when more data, infrastructure, and equipment become available.
8.2.2 Further Discussion for Chapter Five

The overcurrent tolerant prediction model currently only utilises the time limits imposed by the overcurrent torque-speed curves which is ideal for when only these time limits are available from a motor manufacturer. However, it may be possible for the prediction model to incorporate the motor's efficiency map into how the temperature increases and decreases over time. Which observes the overall heat dissipation of the motor over the entire torque-speed curve. If the motor operates within an inefficient region of the continuous torque speed curve (~50% efficiency), it might decrease the total time allowed in the overcurrent region before overheating than if the motor operated in a more efficient region of the continuous torque speed curve (~90% efficiency). This would increase the accuracy of the prediction model and offer a greater representation of the motors thermal and torque characteristics.

8.2.3 Further Discussion for Chapter Six

At the current time of this research, the hardware (switching devices, DC sources, etc.) required to construct a working inverter was unavailable. It is the intent of future research to conduct a full hardware investigation into the RIS-SVPWM method to fully validate the scheme. In addition, a wider comparison into other on-line SVPWM methods and even offline methods which seek to reduce switching losses, harmonic distortion, audible noise and DC voltage balancing will be undertaken to offer a greater understanding and comparison into the current state-of-the-art SVPWM techniques.

A future Reduced Switching Loss SVPWM method is planned which directly calculates the appropriate switching pattern to reduce switching losses using switching loss equations [181]. In contrast to the RIS-SVPWM method, the Reduced Switching Loss SVPWM scheme may
not reduce the intermediate switching losses but might reduce the overall switching losses and increase the efficiency further.

8.2.4 Further Discussion for Chapter Seven

To fully validate the FL-VSC system, a complete experimental investigation is required. This would be carried out in various levels which aim to validate the various parts of the FL-VSC system:

1) The FL-VSC system is reliant on accurate estimation of the wheel slip ratio and longitudinal coefficient of friction. Finding a method which works well within this control scheme must be found and implemented into the control system.

2) Small scale bench top experimental tests to validate the estimation methods and EHB systems ability to control the wheel gradient around different operating gradients.

3) Full scale validation – A full experimental investigation with a physical vehicle, traction motors and braking system to fully validate the controller’s performance.

It is the intention of the author to conduct these experimental validations in the future when the infrastructure and equipment becomes available.
Appendix: Nomenclature

Simulation setup

\[ t \] Time
\[ t_0 \] Initial time

Motor Parameters

\[ P_{\text{max}} \] Maximum motor power
\[ \omega_e \] Synchronous speed
\[ \theta_e \] Electrical angle
\[ v_{ds} \] d-axis supply voltage (flux)
\[ v_{qs} \] q-axis supply voltage (torque)
\[ V_s \] Rated supply voltage
\[ v_{d0} \] d-axis supply voltage unit value (flux)
\[ v_{q0} \] q-axis supply voltage unit value (torque)
\[ v_{qs \text{ max}} \] Maximum q-axis voltage
\[ i_s \] Rated supply current
\[ i_{qs} \] q-axis current (torque)
\[ i'_{qs \text{ max}} \] Maximum target q-axis current
\[ i_{ds} \] d-axis current (flux)
\[ i_{dr} \] d-axis rotor current
\[ i_{qr} \] q-axis rotor current
\[ i_{ds} \] d-axis stator current
\[ i_{qs} \] q-axis stator current
\[ r_s \] Stator winding resistance
\[ r_r \] Rotor winding resistance
\[ P \] Number of motor magnetic poles
\[ \lambda \] Magnetic flux linkage
\[ \lambda_{ds} \] d-axis stator magnetic flux linkage
\[ \lambda_{qs} \] q-axis stator magnetic flux linkage
\[ \lambda_{dr} \] d-axis rotor magnetic flux linkage
\[ \lambda_{qr} \] q-axis rotor magnetic flux linkage
\[ \omega_r \] Rotor electrical rotational velocity
\[ L_{ls} \] Stator leakage inductance
\[ L_{lr} \] Rotor leakage inductance
\[ L_m \] Magnetising inductance
\[ L_s \] Stator inductance
\[ L_r \] Rotor inductance
\[ L_q \] q-axis inductance
\[ L_d \] d-axis inductance
\[ \varepsilon \] Saliency ratio
\[ \varphi_r \] Rotor magnetic flux wave magnitude
\[ \varphi_m \] Permanent magnet flux magnitude
\[ f \] Supply voltage waveform frequency
\[ f_b \] Base speed voltage supply frequency
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_b$</td>
<td>Motor base speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_c$</td>
<td>Critical speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{MAX}$</td>
<td>Maximum motor rotational velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_m$</td>
<td>Rotational velocity of prime mover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_f$</td>
<td>Dropped motor speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>Rate of d-axis current decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>Temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_F$</td>
<td>Temperature factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>Relative output torque position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{Lim}$</td>
<td>Peak overcurrent time curve time limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{Stop}$</td>
<td>Cool down time limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{High}$</td>
<td>Maximum motor temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{Low}$</td>
<td>Cool down motor temperature lower limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td>Traction motor output torque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_O$</td>
<td>Overcurrent torque curve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_C$</td>
<td>Continuous torque curve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_r$</td>
<td>Rotor inertia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_e$</td>
<td>Motor efficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vehicle Parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_{acc}$</td>
<td>Accelerator pedal activation level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_{brk}$</td>
<td>Brake pedal activation level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_x$</td>
<td>Longitudinal vehicle velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_y$</td>
<td>Vehicle lateral velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_x$</td>
<td>Longitudinal acceleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>Sprung mass yaw rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_{ss}$</td>
<td>Vehicle Side-slip angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{max}$</td>
<td>Maximum global lateral distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{wh}=f_{l,fr,rl,rr}$</td>
<td>Wheel slip ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_{wh}=f_{l,fr,rl,rr}$</td>
<td>Velocity at road-wheel contact patch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{wh}=f_{l,fr,rl,rr}$</td>
<td>Rotational velocity of wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{mwh}=f_{l,fr,rl,rr}$</td>
<td>Rotational velocity of the motor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{wh}=f_{l,fr,rl,rr}$</td>
<td>Sideslip angle of wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{B \text{wh}}=f_{l,fr,rl,rr}$</td>
<td>Brake torque at wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{D \text{wh}}=f_{l,fr,rl,rr}$</td>
<td>Drive torque at wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_L$</td>
<td>Load torque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{PM}$</td>
<td>Torque from prime mover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{ICE}$</td>
<td>ICE output torque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{Aero}$</td>
<td>Aerodynamic drag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{Rolling}$</td>
<td>Wheel rolling resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{Traction}$</td>
<td>Combined Tractive force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{Z \text{wh}}=f_{l,fr,rl,rr}$</td>
<td>Tyre-road reaction force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{B-pedal}$</td>
<td>Brake pedal applied force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{Brake}$</td>
<td>Brake force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>Wheel rolling radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_{Veh}$</td>
<td>Total vehicle mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_{Aero}$</td>
<td>Total aeroplane mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>Wheelbase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>Centre of gravity to rear axle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>Centre of gravity to front axle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_{COG}$</td>
<td>Centre of gravity height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_s$</td>
<td>Sprung mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{ur,r}$</td>
<td>Rear axle unsprung mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{uf,r}$</td>
<td>Front axle unsprung mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi_s$</td>
<td>Sprung mass yaw angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi_s$</td>
<td>Sprung mass roll angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e_s$</td>
<td>Centre of gravity to roll axis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Y_s$</td>
<td>Centre of gravity Lateral position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z_s$</td>
<td>Centre of gravity vertical position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_s$</td>
<td>Centre of gravity longitudinal position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_s$</td>
<td>Sprung mass pitch angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_f$</td>
<td>Wheel steer angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_r$</td>
<td>Rear track width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_f$</td>
<td>Front track width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{1 f}$</td>
<td>Suspension damping coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{2 f}$</td>
<td>Tyre damping coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{1 f}$</td>
<td>Suspension spring coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{2 f}$</td>
<td>Tyre spring coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z_{sf,r}$</td>
<td>Vertical height of sprung mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z_{uf,r}$</td>
<td>Vertical height of unsprung mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z_{r f,r}$</td>
<td>Vertical height of road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{roll}$</td>
<td>Sprung mass roll inertia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{pitch}$</td>
<td>Sprung mass pitch inertia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{yaw}$</td>
<td>Sprung mass yaw inertia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{PM}$</td>
<td>Rotational inertia of prime mover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_T$</td>
<td>Rotational inertia of transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{Fd}$</td>
<td>Rotational inertia of final drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{Wh}$</td>
<td>Rotational inertia of wheel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_{Fd}$</td>
<td>Final drive gear ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_T$</td>
<td>Transmission gear ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_{T-fd,1,2}$</td>
<td>Combined transmission final drive gear ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{fd}$</td>
<td>Final drive efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_r$</td>
<td>Tyre rolling resistance coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_D$</td>
<td>Coefficient of aerodynamic drag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{air}$</td>
<td>Density of air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_f$</td>
<td>Vehicle frontal area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M_r$</td>
<td>Effective additional vehicle mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{r f,l,r,rr}$</td>
<td>Wheel tractive force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{s f,l,r,rr}$</td>
<td>Wheel side force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_X$</td>
<td>Tyre magic formula peak value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_X$</td>
<td>Tyre magic formula shape factor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tyre magic formula stiffness factor
Tyre magic formula curvature factor
Tyre magic formula shape factor modifier
Tyre magic formula stiffness factor modifier
Wheel operating gradient
Independent wheel operating gradient
Wheel operating gradient scale function
Traction motor braking time constant
Hydraulic braking system time constant
Braking force scale function
Stability factor
Road coefficient of friction
Independent wheel operating gradient
Longitudinal coefficient of friction
Lateral coefficient of friction
Front anti-roll bar stiffness
Rear anti-roll bar stiffness
Roll axis torsional stiffness
Roll axis torsional damping
Acceleration of gravity
Output motor power
Auxiliary power load
Generator output power
Battery pack energy
Maximum battery pack energy
DC source voltage
Line voltages
Pole voltages
Phase voltages
Line currents
Alpha axis voltage
Beta axis voltage
Alpha axis
Beta axis
Initial reference voltage vector
Reference rotating voltage on alpha -beta axis
Voltage vector of nL-SVM diagram
2-Level reference voltage vector
2-Level enclosing voltage vector
6 step waveform fundamental
Optimal null voltage vector
Inverter phase switching state
3-Phase AC voltage axis
Maximum inverter potential difference
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>Modulation index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_m^*$</td>
<td>Extended reference voltage magnitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_m^*$</td>
<td>Modified reference voltage angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_n$</td>
<td>Reference voltage holding angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_c$</td>
<td>Crossover angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$nL$</td>
<td>Inverter voltage level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H$</td>
<td>SVM hexagon number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h$</td>
<td>Mapping iteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_{hq}$</td>
<td>Inner sector voltage vector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q$</td>
<td>SVM hexagon sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2LTS</td>
<td>2-level triangular sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U$, $V$ and $W$</td>
<td>Inverter phase on-time pulses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_2$</td>
<td>2-level modulation index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{0,1,2}$</td>
<td>Inverter voltage vector on-times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_s$</td>
<td>Inverter SVPWM cycle time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_s$</td>
<td>Inverter SVPWM switching cycle frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi_{2LTS}$</td>
<td>2LTS reference voltage vector angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_\alpha$</td>
<td>Initial alpha axis reference voltage angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>Neutral point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_G$, $V_I$ and $V_K$</td>
<td>Example voltage vectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{ref G}$, $V_{ref I}$ or $V_{ref K}$</td>
<td>Example 2LTS reference voltage vectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_f$</td>
<td>Harmonic component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{f \text{ max}}$</td>
<td>Maximum harmonic component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\xi_{k=d,q}$</td>
<td>Change in current error since last time step</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis tools and operators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>Maximum data points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>Data point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_n$</td>
<td>Actual value at data point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_n$</td>
<td>Forecast value at data point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{bk}$</td>
<td>Total braking time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{1,2}$</td>
<td>Start and end braking times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{bk}$</td>
<td>Total braking longitudinal distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{x0}$</td>
<td>Initial velocity at the start of braking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{\text{w}}$</td>
<td>Braking distance to yaw rate weighting value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J$</td>
<td>Braking distance-yaw rate trade-off value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta$</td>
<td>Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d}{dt}$</td>
<td>Time derivative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\overset{\sim}{\cdot}$</td>
<td>Peak value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\cdot$</td>
<td>Complimentary switch position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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