

# VIRTUAL ITERATION FOR SET UP OF TRUCK CAB TESTS

**N. Weigel, S. Weihe, V. Sing, R. Gerlach, A. Ferreiro de Souza**  
Daimler AG, Stuttgart-Untertürkheim

**M. Speckert, A. Marquardt, K. Dreßler,**  
Fraunhofer-Institut für Techno- und Wirtschaftsmathematik ITWM,  
Kaiserslautern

Simpack User Meeting, Bonn, 20th and 21st November  
2007

## Overview

- Introduction and objective
  - Prediction of load data for new vehicles
  - Digital track vs. hybrid road
- MBS model
  - Axor truck cab and frame on test rig / new vehicle
- Back-calculation of invariant load data based on the existing vehicle
  - Identification of transfer function, iteration
  - Simulation results vs. measurements
- Prediction for new vehicle
- Summary and conclusion


## Load data prediction

- Load data for upcoming vehicle models must often be known before a physical prototype is available, e.g. for physical testing or numerical simulation of components
- **Digital track** is one option for load data prediction:  
Simulation of the vehicle on the test track (e.g. rough road)
  - + Straightforward approach
  - + Theoretically, no measurement is required (except for model correlation)
  - Accuracy of tire models very often an issue for x, y
  - Digital model of test track required
- Optional approach: **Hybrid road** ...


## Load data prediction Hybrid road method

Basic idea:

1. Use measurement on an existing vehicle (WFT, accelerations etc.) to generate a „hybrid road“.  
→ Differences between hybrid road and actual road actually counterbalance inaccuracies in tire models.
2. Simulation of new vehicle on hybrid road yields load data.




## Load data prediction Hybrid road method




- It is most straightforward to identify the road excitations (black arrows) and apply these to the new vehicle, i.e. to consider the road as the „invariant“ interface.
- However, one can also consider a different interface as (quasi-)invariant and identify/transfer the excitations there (blue arrows).
- The choice of the interface depends on the similarity between both vehicles, accuracy of MBS models, acceptable compromise between modeling/simulation expense and result accuracy.
- In the present project, the frame was chosen as invariant interface.

## MBS models




### Axor cab and frame on test rig:

- Flexible (i.e. FE) frame
- Nonlinear behavior of cab springs/dampers has been modeled as well as bump stop of rear lateral damper
- For cab, both rigid and flexible (FE) models have been used



### New vehicle



## Back-calculation of drives Methodology (general)

for  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$u_{i+1} = u_i + \Delta u_i$$

$$\Delta u_i = H^{-1} \cdot (T - y_i)$$

$S =$  MBS model of Axor with test rig

$u =$  cylinder displacements

$y =$  (MBS) calculated accelerations and spring displacements

$T =$  measured accelerations and spring displacements (target)

$e =$  error  $T - y$

**Aim:** Find input  $u$  such that the error  $e$  is minimized

**Steps:** a) Identification (frequency domain)

$$\text{Set point: } y_0 = S(u_0)$$

$$y_{noise} = S(u_0 + u_{noise}) - y_0$$

$$H = \hat{P}_{y_{noise}, u_{noise}} \cdot \hat{P}_{u_{noise}, u_{noise}}^{-1}$$

b) Iteration

for  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$u_{i+1} = u_i + \Delta u_i$$

$$\Delta u_i = H^{-1} \cdot (T - y_i)$$


$H =$  linear spectral representation of system  $S$  linearized w.r.t. set point  $u_0$  (frequency response functions FRF)

# Back-calculation of drives Methodology (general)

for  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$u_{i+1} = u_i + \Delta u_i$$

$$\Delta u_i = H^{-1} \cdot (T - y_i)$$



## Back-calculation of drives Methodology (special)

for  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$u_{i+1} = u_i + \Delta u_i$$

$$\Delta u_i = H^{-1} \cdot (T - y_i)$$

### Derive frame motion from measured accelerations

- Measured accelerations on frame
  - front right:  $x, y, z$
  - front left:  $x, z$ ;                      rear right:  $y, z$ ;                      rear left:  $z$
- Calculated (translational) displacements ...
  - Calculate frame displacements by integration of acceleration and subsequent filtering (1Hz)
  - Use front right as reference point since all components of acceleration are known there
  - Calculate relative displacements

### Describe frame motion by means of a rigid body approach


- Now describe movement of the remaining points (f l, r r, r l) as rigid body motion w.r.t. front right

### Calculate angular displacements of rigid body by means of optimization

- Minimize the difference between rigid body motion of frame and motion derived from accelerations for frame points (f r, f l, r r, r l)


→ **cylinder displacements**

## Back-calculation of drives Results



### 1st drive signal

→ frame displacements calculated by means of rigid body approach have been used as set point  $u_0$  (in this case, this is a better initial drive than  $H^{-1} * T$ )




$$\text{Set point: } y_0 = S(u_0)$$

$$y_{noise} = S(u_0 + u_{noise}) - y_0$$

$$H = \hat{P}_{y_{noise}, u_{noise}} \cdot \hat{P}_{u_{noise}, u_{noise}}^{-1}$$

## Back-calculation of drives Results




### Drive signals (i.e. cylinder displacements) after 5 iterations


for  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$u_{i+1} = u_i + \Delta u_i$$


$$\Delta u_i = H^{-1} \cdot (T - y_i)$$




# Back-calculation of drives Results




## Relative displacement frame vs. cab after 5 iterations




# Back-calculation of drives Results



## Relative displacement frame vs. cab after 5 iterations (detail)






Deviation between measurement and simulation is due to inaccuracies in MBS model  
 (especially, bump stops)




## Back-calculation of drives Simulation of bump stops


On rough road, the bump stop of rear side lateral damper is activated several times as can be seen on the measured cab lateral acceleration ( $r_r$ )




# Back-calculation of drives Simulation of bump stops




## Simulated behavior of rear side lateral bump stop




# Back-calculation of drives Results





## Frame displacements (front side) after 5 iterations (detail)




# Back-calculation of drives Results



For durability testing, statistical properties of loads are often more relevant than time history...





Relative displacements/frame displacements:  
 Target=solid line, Iteration 5=dashed line



## Prediction for new vehicle


- New vehicle's frame is mounted on the test rig at different points than Axor (new vehicle=yellow cubes).
- The drives for the new vehicle are derived from the frame displacements at these mounting points. The elasticity of the frame has to be taken into account.
- Using these drives, cab accelerations etc. can then be computed for the new vehicle via MBS.
- Optionally, these drives can be used in a physical test rig.






# Prediction for new vehicle Comparison of old and new targets

Relative displacements frame/cab:



Accelerations on the cab:



Axor=solid line, new vehicle=dashed line:

Significant differences due to different dynamical behaviour

## Summary and conclusion

- The present methodology allows to determine load data for a new vehicle based on measurements on an existing, similar vehicle. „Hybrid road“ methodology is thus applicable to vehicles on test rigs, too.
- The choice of the interface which is assumed as invariant (i.e. same displacements for existing and new vehicle) depends on degree of similarity between both vehicles, accuracy of MBS models, acceptable compromise between modeling/simulation expense and result accuracy.
- Back-calculation (on Axor) has been carried out yielding a good agreement with measurements. Bump stop behavior is also simulated reasonably well.
- Measurements on the new vehicle should be carried out to verify assumptions regarding „invariance“ interface.

## Back-calculation of drives Co-simulation vs. offline-simulation

- Simpack-Matlab/Simulink Co-simulation
  - Easy to use
  - Higher computing costs due to online data exchange Simpack/Matlab
  - Has to be used if test rig controller/hydraulics are modeled in Matlab
- Offline-simulation
  - Matlab generates if2-file for rig cylinder input as well as num6-file for integration parameters
  - Simpack: Integration, measurements and export of results (option: matlab) take place successively
  - Matlab then reads the simulation results