

# TESTING OF AN INDIRECT ICE DETECTION METHODOLOGY IN THE HORIZON 2020 PROJECT SENS4ICE

C. Deiler\*

\* DLR (German Aerospace Center), Institute of Flight Systems, Lilienthalplatz 7, 38108, Braunschweig, Germany

## Abstract

Supercooled large droplets (SLD) icing conditions have been the cause of severe aircraft accidents over the last decades. Existing countermeasures, even on modern airplanes, are not necessarily effective against the resulting ice formations, which raises a demand for reliable detection of SLD and all conditions for safe operations. The EU-funded Horizon 2020 project SENS4ICE focused on new ice detection approaches and innovative sensor hybridization to target a fast and reliable (SLD-)ice detection. The performance-based (indirect) ice detection methodology is key to this approach and based on the changes of airplane flight characteristics under icing influence. This paper provides a short overview of the development and implementation of the indirect ice detection system (IIDS) algorithms in SENS4ICE. Moreover, it gives and discusses first exemplary results from the IIDS tests in classical icing conditions during the SENS4ICE North America flight test campaign conducted in February/March 2023 out of St. Louis Regional Airport in Alton (Illinois, USA).

## Keywords

aircraft icing; aircraft flight performance; ice detection; flight test data evaluation

## NOMENCLATURE

			$V_{TAS}$	true airspeed,	m/s
$b_T$	engine model adjustment offset value	N	$\alpha$	angle of attack,	rad
$C_D$	drag coefficient		HIDS	Hybrid Ice Detection System	
$C_{D0}$	zero-lift drag coefficient		IIDS	Indirect Ice Detection System	
$\Delta C_{\bar{D}}$	equivalent drag coefficient		IPS	Ice Protection System	
$\Delta ISA$	temperature offset to standard atmosphere	K	SLD	Supercooled Large Droplets	
$E$	energy	J	<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>		
$\dot{E}_{tot}$	energy change / power imbalance	W	Icing can have hazardous effects on airplane performance characteristics and can be a limiting factor for the safe flight envelope. The change of the dynamic behavior and potential premature stall raise the need for pilot situational awareness and an adaption of control strategy. Different accidents worldwide have shown the criticality of icing-related aircraft characteristics degradations, e.g., Refs. [1–4], especially when caused by supercooled large water droplets (SLD). Although in most cases the involved aircraft were equipped with state-of-the-art ice protection systems, the hazardous effects of SLD ice accretion often led to catastrophic events, i.e. due to ice accretion outside the protected areas. These icing conditions can pose a high risk to the aircraft, crew and passengers, which requires specific detection and countermeasures to assure aircraft safety during flight. The certification of (modern) transport aircraft for flight into (known) icing conditions was mainly based on the certification requirements given in the		
$\dot{E}_{tot,ref}$	reference power imbalance	W			
$f_T$	engine model adjustment factor				
$H$	altitude,	m			
$k_1, k_2$	drag coefficient equation factors				
LWC	Liquid Water Content	g/m <sup>3</sup>			
$m_{AC}$	aircraft mass,	kg			
MVD	Median Volumetric Diameter	microns			
$\mathcal{P}$	percentile/quantile				
$\bar{q}$	dynamic pressure,	Pa			
$S_{Wing}$	wing surface area,	m <sup>2</sup>			
$T$	engine thrust force,	N			

so-called App. C to e.g., CS-25. Though, with the identified hazard to fixed-wing aircraft resulting from SLD the certification requirements were extended by the new App. O including SLD ice. From now on, manufacturers must prove that a newly developed airplane is also safe for flight into the even more hazardous SLD icing conditions. For flight safety it is now mandatory to detect the presence of SLD icing very early after the encounter. Furthermore, monitoring the aircraft's remaining capabilities during the further flight (in icing conditions) would give a relevant information to the pilots about the required adaption of operation, e.g., urgent need to enter warm air in order to melt the ice accretion on the aircraft if the aerodynamics are significantly degraded. As a complicating fact, predicting the distinct change of aircraft characteristics caused by SLD ice formation is challenging and still topic of current aviation research. Most of the existing ice protection systems (IPS) on transport aircraft require a significant amount of energy provided on board. Thermal ice protection systems usually rely on bleed air, which reduces the engine effectiveness and increases fuel consumption of the engines. Using such a system preventively has a direct impact on fuel consumption and therefore aircraft emissions as well as operation cost. A more deliberate activation of the IPS can lead to more efficient but safe flight operations for which a reliable information about, e.g., the IPS effectiveness against the current icing encounter would be necessary. This information could be provided by suitable ice detection methods giving a hint about the presence of icing conditions, actual ice formation on the airframe and the effect on the flight characteristics [5, 6]. Moreover, it would also open possibilities for the modification of existing systems by modulating the thermal power according to the current need, directly reducing the energy consumption and increasing the aircraft efficiency.

The goal of the European Union Horizon 2020 Project "SENSors and certifiable hybrid architectures for safer aviation in ICing Environment" (SENS4ICE) is to provide a more comprehensive overview of the icing conditions, ice formation and aircraft degradation status including the aircraft's remaining capabilities (icing-related change in aircraft flight physics, i.e., degraded aircraft performance) [7, 8]. In a layered approach a hybrid ice detection system (HIDS) is forming the core function accompanied by additional new nowcasting and enhanced weather forecasting. The latter allows to initially prevent the flight through hazardous icing conditions from a strategic and tactical point of view, whereas the hybrid detection architecture provides the necessary information to the flight crew for the IPS activation and the execution of safe exit strategies, when required. It combines in-situ measurement from various ice detection sensor technologies based on different physical principles (optical or remote sensing and ice accretion detection) with an indirect detection methodology. Hence, the HIDS allows to give a more general overview of the current




FIG 1. SENS4ICE layered safety concept

aircraft icing than an individual system alone. In addition, the indirect detection methodology monitoring the current aircraft flight characteristic reveals the degraded aircraft flight envelope, which is essential for loss of control prevention. An overview of the layered safety concept is given in Fig. 1. The concept targets a general application and safety enhancement for fixed-wing aircraft icing and is not only dedicated to aircraft already certified for flight into known icing conditions (App. C). It intentionally goes beyond current certified aircraft systems proving safe operations in icing conditions.

Within SENS4ICE the "indirect ice detection system" (IIDS) was further developed and matured and is one important project pillar [6]. It is a novel methodology and system for the on-board surveillance of aircraft flight performance used for ice detection purposes. It was originally formulated and presented as a performance-based ice detection methodology, e.g., in Ref. [5]. It utilizes the effect of aircraft performance degradation due to ice accretion. The idea of the IIDS is not restricted to an application on large transport aircraft but can also enable a reliable ice detection for aircraft systems, such as small UAV, which currently have no ice detection system, but operate in hazardous environments with very different icing conditions.

The SENS4ICE project contained two major icing flight test campaigns: the North America campaign using an Embraer Phenom 300 prototype aircraft and the European campaign with an ATR 42-320 operated by SAFIRE [8,9]. Herein, the first evaluation results from the North America flight test campaign conducted between February 22nd and March 10th 2023 out of St. Louis Regional Airport (Alton, IL, USA) with a focus on the IIDS ability to reliably detect the performance degradation caused by icing during several example ice encounters. As SLD icing conditions have a low probability compared to other App. C conditions, it was very difficult to obtain any SLD encounters during the flight test campaign. For the first presentation of flight test results and the IIDS response to airframe icing during the campaign, one of the first flights with suitable icing encounters (App. C) was selected for this paper.

The paper is structured as follows:

- a brief description of the indirect ice detection methodology based on the observed aircraft flight performance variation is given in section 2;

- section 3 contains the specific implementation of the detection algorithm for the SENS4ICE purpose with focus on the Embraer Phenom 300 test aircraft;
- exemplary flight test data analysis from SENS4ICE North America icing flight test campaign reflecting the system performance with regard to the ability of reliable ice detection in section 4.

Finally, a summary with initial conclusions as well as an outlook are given.

## 2. AIRFRAME ICE DETECTION THROUGH FLIGHT PERFORMANCE MONITORING

One major effect of aircraft ice accretion is a significant drag increase due to surface roughness changes, parasitic influence of ice protuberances, and local flow separation. Another effect of icing is a change of the aircraft lift behavior, causing e.g., earlier or more abrupt flow detachment with increasing angle of attack and/or a reduction in aircraft lift slope. Both together significantly alter the aircraft flight performance which can be monitored during flight. Figure 2 illustrates the typical icing-induced change of the lift and drag curves as generally described, e.g., in the AGARD report 344 [10]. Icing will also change the aircraft's flight dynamics (e.g., pitching and rolling moment). In addition, the control characteristics are negatively affected by icing and change the aircraft dynamics differently according to the specific occurrence of ice accretion. But these changes are very difficult to detect during flight, for what the IIDS relies on the icing-related change of aircraft flight performance [5, 6].

Hence, aircraft flight performance monitoring can provide crucial information to the pilots about the current (limited/degraded) aircraft capabilities while only requiring the sensor information that is available on all modern airliners and business jets. The advantage of the developed methodology is that it relies only on the change in flight performance (i.e., steady flight states) contrary to the many failed attempts (e.g., in Refs. [11–16]) based on the estimation of changes in the aircraft's dynamic behavior or a combination of both. The change/degradation in the flight performance is an indicator of ice accretion that is both robust and highly available: unlike the approaches based on the detection of changes in the aircraft dynamical behavior, it can be used also during steady flight conditions




FIG 2. Expected icing influence on aircraft aerodynamics (lift and drag coefficient); adapted from [10]

(most of an operating flight) and can detect icing effects significantly before entering into stall. Although other direct ice measuring approaches for the detection of icing conditions or ice accretion on the airframe could deliver a partly similar information, the indirect detection using the performance monitoring approach would not require (potentially costly) modifications of existing and future aircraft. It is important to highlight that the method within the IIDS is focused on the flight performance changes without any specific need for additional dynamic aircraft excitations. Such an excitation is not acceptable during normal operations as stated in Ref. [13] and especially not when flying with an aircraft that has a reduced (unknown) maximum-lift angle of attack due to icing.

The basic assumption for the indirect ice detection using performance monitoring is the possibility to discriminate between (very slow and low) performance variation of a single aircraft over lifetime in service (or within a fleet of same type) and the (much faster) performance variation caused by icing. Factors causing the flight performance variations across airplanes from the same type are for example

- production tolerances,
- aircraft skin repairs,
- aircraft skin contamination (e.g., dirt),
- engine aging causing reduced efficiency, or
- engine contamination.

The aircraft flight performance can be seen as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Flight Performance} &= \text{Nominal Aircraft Performance} \\ &+ \text{Expectable Variation} \\ &+ \text{Variation to be detected} \end{aligned}$$


whereby the “Expectable Variation” part gathers the effects mentioned previously and the “Variation to be detected” is subject to the indirect ice detection approach. The first step is to determine the typical and most extreme flight performance variation (“Expectable Variation”) encountered during regular airline operations (due to a real performance variation or sensor errors). There are different approaches to reveal this variation from operational flight data. In Refs. [5, 17] the determination of the performance variation from 75,689 flights with Boeing B737 aircraft operated by a German airline is presented. The results underpinned the above mentioned assumption and revealed that it is possible to successfully monitor the aircraft performance using the regular sensors and with a level of precision that permits to detect the performance degradation induced by the ice accretion at a very early stage (before this degradation of the performance reaches a critical level).

The flight data for the Phenom300 prototype flight test aircraft (Fig. 3) serving as flight test bench in SENS4ICE North America flight test campaign were processed to obtain the measured performance variation during flight. The resulting performance variation (without icing) and the test aircraft without specific




**FIG 3. Embraer Phenom 300 flight test bench: prototype aircraft with all modifications for the SENS4ICE North America flight test campaign (credit Embraer).**

SENS4ICE modifications is given in Fig. 4, serving as a baseline performance variation evaluation. The measured variation in this case results from the non-filtered measurements which are also not corrected for external disturbances. Therefore, the measured variation does include (external) effects on the aircraft, e.g., resulting from encountered atmospheric disturbances or conducted maneuvers, together with additional influences on the performance calculation like measurement noise. This is in contrast to the results given in Refs. [5, 17], where the data were corrected for most of these effects. But for the design of the IIDS, it is essential to also evaluate the measured performance variation of a single aircraft, which is mainly the variation between the actual aircraft and the reference model together with the named additional influences. Hence, in this case the 90 % quantile is the most relevant, because it can be reliably assumed that the variation above results from the external influence which can be ignored for the ice detection or filtered within the designed algorithm. If the measurements of the flight condition are available with sample rate (and frame rate for transmission to the IIDS) above e.g., 20 Hz and are not filtered or corrected for e.g., measurement noise, the IIDS must account for a higher observed performance variation (“Expectable Variation”). But it is assumed to be able to reliably detect a performance degradation due to icing fast. If the rate is significantly lower (e.g., 5 Hz) and/or the data are already low-pass filtered, the IIDS will observe a smaller performance variation and the detection of the degradation might be slower than for the higher measurement rate case. Consequently, within the application of the IIDS approach, the potential detection speed and accuracy is directly related to the quality of the flight data measurements. The basic idea of the performance-based ice detection method is to compare the current (possibly ice-influenced) aircraft flight performance characteristics with a known reference (see Fig. 5). The flight performance can be defined as a power imbalance (change of total energy)  $\dot{E}_{tot}$  for the current state and the reference, which allows representing the change of aircraft characteristics in a sole value. Consequently, this reduces the complexity of the detection algorithm. It fur-



**FIG 4. Measured aircraft performance variation based on specific flight test data gathered with the Embraer Phenom 300 prototype at several flight conditions (2.2 million data points): estimated drag polar and convex hulls ( $P_{90}$ ,  $P_{99}$ ,  $P_{99.99}$  &  $P_{100}$ ).**



**FIG 5. Basic principle of the IIDS method based on the aircraft power imbalance; from [5]**

ther combines the individual parts of the aircraft performance related to aerodynamics and engines in a single observation. The power imbalance  $\dot{E}_{tot}$  can be formulated as

$$(1) \quad \dot{E}_{tot} = V_{TAS} \cdot \dot{V}_{TAS} \cdot m_{AC} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot V_{TAS}^2 \cdot \dot{m}_{AC} + g \cdot \dot{H} \cdot m_{AC} + g \cdot H \cdot \dot{m}_{AC},$$

with the altitude change (with respect to time)  $\dot{H}$  referenced to the surrounding air, the speed change (with respect to time)  $\dot{V}_{TAS}$  and the change of aircraft mass  $\dot{m}_{AC}$  corresponding to the aircraft fuel consumption. Note that the gravitational acceleration is assumed to be constant and its variation with time can be neglected for the calculation of the power imbalance. To convert the power imbalance into an equivalent drag coefficient variation, which is easier to assess from an engineering point of view, the formulation from Ref. [5] is used:

$$(2) \quad \Delta C_{\bar{D}} \approx \frac{\dot{E}_{tot,ref} - \dot{E}_{tot}}{V_{TAS} \cdot \bar{q} \cdot S_{Wing}}.$$

This non-dimensional equivalent drag coefficient is calculated by comparison of the current determined

power imbalance  $\dot{E}_{\text{tot}}$  and a predefined reference value  $\dot{E}_{\text{tot,ref}}$ . The performance reference value is a function of the aircraft flight state defined by parameters like altitude, speed and load factor, the aircraft configuration (e.g., mass, high-lift system configuration) as well as the propulsion system state. If required, some corrections for additional influences, e.g., flight with side-slip condition, could be applied [5]. Furthermore, the airspeed  $V_{\text{TAS}}$  is derived from several measurements and contains a combination of aircraft flight path velocity and wind speed (both to be understood as 3D vectors). For the time derivative  $\dot{V}_{\text{TAS}}$  the component related to the change of wind vector should be ignored in order to prevent it from falsifying the performance estimate. A variable wind-corrected energy change  $\dot{E}_{\text{tot,corr}}$  could then be used changing  $\dot{V}_{\text{TAS}}$  in Eq. (1) to  $\dot{V}_{\text{TAS},\dot{V}_k}$  considering only the airspeed change related to the flight path; see Ref. [5] for a more detailed explanation.

The equivalent drag coefficient is well comparable to a predefined threshold value and indicates an abnormal performance variation when exceeding. This is further independent from any flight point. Note that a drag coefficient value is well interpretable in terms of aerodynamics and flight mechanics by aerospace engineers and allows a direct assessment of the magnitude of aerodynamic degradation caused by icing. Within the IIDS, this drag coefficient is normalized with the aircraft's zero-lift drag coefficient and compared to a predefined threshold. For the SENS4ICE North America flight test campaign with the Phenom 300 prototype, a threshold of 10% is defined in order to provide a good sensitivity and reliability.

A simple way for the definition of the aircraft flight performance reference is the usage of a multi-dimensional table including the different above-mentioned states and conditions as dimension [5, 6]. Another way is to calculate the reference power imbalance from an aerodynamic data base and engine thrust model, if both are available. In such case it must be determined if the variation in the reference power imbalance results from changes of the aircraft aerodynamics or the engine performance. For the implementation in SENS4ICE, an engine thrust model was available and the reference power imbalance can be formulated as a function of flight condition,

aircraft configuration (using a reference aerodynamic model representation) and the current predicted engine thrust. For example, a methodology to adapt flight performance models from operational flight data is given in Refs. [18–20], which could be relevant for the adaptation of the performance reference with separated models (aerodynamics and engine thrust). Note that the choice for the representation of the performance reference is also dependent on the requirement for adaptation to a specific aircraft, which might be easier in the table approach [5]. Further detailed information on performance-based ice detection, which is already under patent protection in several countries [21], can be found in Ref. [5].

### 3. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIRECT ICE DETECTION ALGORITHM

The indirect ice detection is implemented as a modular set of functions, including the core detection algorithm, the required data preprocessing and a subsequent detection result filtering to prevent false detections. The latter also guarantees the necessary system robustness and consequently reliability. Within SENS4ICE, the indirect ice detection is part of the HIDS developed by SAFRAN Aerosystems and allows with its specific implementation detecting performance degradations and therefore the ice accretion (see Fig. 6). The HIDS implementation is designed to be applicable to both flight test benches used for SENS4ICE flight test campaigns, which are very different aircraft configurations: a light business jet aircraft (Embraer Phenom 300) and a regional class turboprop aircraft (ATR 42). This applicability is possible through the generic formulation of the detection methodology itself, not relying on specific information about the aircraft: the required aircraft-specific adaptation of the detection is achieved by considering the aircraft-specific reference, which is an input to the algorithm and not part of the core implementation.

There are several needs for adjustments inside the IIDS for a specific aircraft type, mainly as part of the "Aircraft Flight Data" and "Performance Reference Data Base" blocks in Fig. 6:

- flight data preprocessing,
- flight performance reference data base,
- indirect ice detection threshold and confirmation times and
- detection reliability conditions.




FIG 6. Visualization of HIDS concept used within SENS4ICE (pictures credit DLR / Embraer / SAFIRE).

A detailed description about these required adjustments is given in Ref. [6] and the flight performance reference as well as the detection threshold and confirmation times are briefly described below.

For the SENS4ICE flight tests, the IIDS is implemented in MATLAB®/Simulink. The HIDS runs on a dSpace MicroAutoBox in real time for the flight tests, and the IIDS Simulink model can be easily transferred to this specific hardware. Anyway, for a further IIDS and HIDS maturation a direct implementation in the aircraft avionics is foreseen.

### 3.1. Flight Performance Reference Data Base

The IIDS relies on an accurate flight performance reference which allows to compute an expected current flight performance to be compared to the measured one within the detection module. For the presented case, the IIDS consists of a performance reference data base splitting engine and aerodynamic influence into individual parts. Having this separation, it was more easy to adapt the reference aerodynamics to the specific conditions given by the flight test benches having several external probes attached to the test aircraft influencing the aircraft's flight performance.

The flight test case-specific adaption of the aerodynamic performance reference is formulated as an additional part to the "base" aircraft reference, which allowed a very fast adaption of the reference data base prior to the icing flight tests. For the North America flight test campaign, the final configuration of the aircraft with all modifications, i.e. external sensors and pods mounted on wing pylons or at the fuselage, was available for a check flight before the campaign in February 2023. Moreover, the ferry flights from Brazil, where the prototype was modified at Embraer facilities, to the United States, where the flight test campaign took place, served as an additional source of information for the corresponding changes of the aerodynamics due to aircraft modifications with SENS4ICE equipment (compared to the "base" aircraft). Using a kind of delta approach to the aerodynamic reference, it could be shown that the performance reference was successfully adapted to the modified aircraft. Having a representation of the aircraft drag polar given by

$$(3) \quad C_D = C_{D0} + k_1 \cdot C_L + k_2 \cdot C_L^2,$$

a linear parameter extension was already foreseen in the IIDS implementation allowing the adaptation of the aircraft aerodynamics to the SENS4ICE aircraft modifications:

$$(4) \quad C_D = (C_{D0,ref} + \Delta C_{D0}) + (k_{1,ref} + \Delta k_1) \cdot C_L + (k_{2,ref} + \Delta k_2) \cdot C_L^2.$$

Figure 7 shows the drag polar calculated from flight test data of the clean air flights with the aircraft in campaign configuration together with the pre-campaign reference used to design the IIDS and the modified drag polar used for the icing flight tests.




FIG 7. Aircraft drag polar for Phenom300 prototype used for the SENS4ICE North America icing flight test campaign: calculated lift and drag coefficient from flight test data (blue dots), pre-campaign reference drag polar (gray line, no SENS4ICE aircraft modification) and adapted campaign reference drag polar considering aircraft modifications (magenta line); clean air flight test data with aircraft in final configuration with all modification required for SENS4ICE in February 2023

Note that the flight performance reference in SENS4ICE is based on certain a priori knowledge and information obtained from a specific flight data evaluation. But for new aircraft designs it could be also based on the design models and initial prototype flight test results.

### 3.2. Detection Threshold, Confirmation Time and Reliability Conditions

A detection threshold on the equivalent drag coefficient is defined to reveal the abnormal flight performance caused by icing. For practical reasons, the detection is not done on the absolute value of the equivalent drag increase but on a relative value with the zero-lift drag coefficient as base. In a nominal case, the additional drag coefficient is zero and there is no relative change to the normal drag condition. During normal operation flight there is a constant fluctuation of measured flight performance, which has to be considered by the detection algorithm through providing a suitable low-pass filtering function. In addition, the implementation of a confirmation time allows to further prevent false alarms caused by short-time threshold exceeding if set large enough. The confirmation time is chosen in accordance with the modeling accuracy of the whole IIDS system chain and quality of flight data, where high quality and accuracy of flight data measurements can lead to relatively short confirmation times and vice versa. For the detection, the confirmation time frame is chosen relatively short to ensure

**TAB 1. Detection threshold values and confirmation time for the IIDS implementation: Phenom 300 prototype flight test bench for North America flight test campaign.**

detection threshold as relative drag coefficient increase	10 %
confirmation time frame for detection (threshold exceeded more than 50%)	20 s
confirmation time for reset (threshold undershot more than 50%)	180 s

fast response behavior, but for reset that confirmation time must be much longer to guarantee the threshold is reliably undershot and the icing-related performance degradation is not present anymore. The corresponding values are given in Table 1.


The IIDS is designed to run continuously during the whole flight and to monitor the aircraft flight performance including a potential degradation, independently from any specific flight phase or maneuver, as discussed in Ref. [5]. The SENS4ICE implementation is experimental and therefore limited to one aircraft-specific configuration defined for the flight test in icing conditions. Hence, other aircraft configurations (e.g., extended gear, deployed high-lift devices or the usage of speed brakes) will be detected and the IIDS is designed to freeze and set an unreliability flag allowing the HIDS to discard the current IIDS output. A more detailed description is given in Ref. [6].

#### 4. EXEMPLARY RESULTS FROM SENS4ICE NORTH AMERICA FLIGHT TEST CAMPAIGN

This paper presents initial and preliminary results from one flight of the North America icing flight test campaign. The selected flight took place on February 23rd, 2023, departing from Chicago O'Hare Airport at 17:18 UTC (11:18 local) and searching for icing conditions on the way back south to St. Louis Regional Airport in Alton, Illinois. After around 1h of flight, the aircraft landed on St. Louis Regional Airport having successfully encountered App. C icing conditions two times during flight. Note that for the first analysis of the IIDS response to icing encounters during the SENS4ICE flight test campaign, there is no need to specifically focus on SLD icing cases, which are very rare and also only encountered a few times during the campaign. An overview of the flight is given in Fig. 8 including the flight track and icing encounters. Note that the information about the icing conditions found is resulting from the evaluation of atmospheric conditions measured with the reference probes during flight.

##### 4.1. Indirect Ice Detection System Performance


The IIDS performance during this example is evaluated for the two major icing encounters in the middle of the flight. These are visualized as time



**FIG 8. Flight track from SENS4ICE North America icing campaign flight on February 23rd, 2023 (Chicago O'Hare, KORD, to St. Louis Regional Airport, KALN): geodetic position and altitude with indication of icing encountered.**

history plots in Figs. 9 and 10. The top plot contains the altitude and indicated airspeed for each flight segment respectively icing encounter. It is clearly visible that the aircraft was intentionally descending into the (expected) icing conditions and climbing again out of these after a certain encounter time. The second plot (from top) shows the nominal drag estimation (based on clean aircraft zero-lift drag) and gives a direct impression about the performance degradation. In parallel, the IIDS detection output is given allowing a direct comparison of drag increase and IIDS detection performance. Note that the shown data are a result of the online IIDS calculation within the HIDS system implementation directly fed with aircraft data/measurements. The third plot (from top) contains the information about the encountered icing conditions. The measured droplet size (MVD) and liquid water content (LWC) describe the atmospheric icing conditions, in the presented case classical App. C conditions with smaller droplets. The bottom plot contains the measured static air temperature as well as the averaged engine fan speed (left and right, assuming symmetric thrust conditions). During the descend into the icing conditions the temperature decreases significantly and increases again after leaving the conditions, indicating an atmospheric inversion layer. This allows a direct assessment about the icing encountered leading to airframe ice accretion and hence a performance degradation, together with the possibility to cross-check the detection reset with the flight through warm air and consequently de-icing. The averaged engine fan speed is directly linked to the total engine thrust and therefore gives an information about the forces applied to the aircraft in combination with the aerodynamic performance degradation.

Figure 9 shows the first icing encounter during the flight after descend to an altitude of 3,500 ft. The encounter starts at 17:42 UTC leading to a noticeable performance degradation due to ice accretion




**FIG 9. Time history of IIDS system performance during specific icing encounter from the example flight (17:41:49 UTC to 17:55:29 UTC): altitude and indicated airspeed (top), nominal drag estimation and IIDS detection output (second plot), and MVD and LWC of encountered icing conditions (third plot), and static air temperature and average engine fan speed (bottom); detection threshold at 10 % relative drag increase.**

at around 17:44 UTC. The detection threshold was constantly exceeded at 17:45:50 UTC causing a confirmed detection 10 s later (17:46 UTC). This means that the IIDS icing indication was present within 2 min after the performance degradation was starting. The performance degradation and drag was further increased during the whole encounter and reached a maximum of more than 30 % before leaving the conditions and starting the full airframe de-icing in warmer air with higher speed, leading to a detachment of all ice formation on the airframe. During climb, the reference performance of the flight test aircraft with SENS4ICE modifications was restored and the monitored degradation decreased leading to a reset of the IIDS at around 17:55:05 UTC. Between 17:52:30 UTC and 17:53:10 UTC, a significant peak in the drag estimation is visible. At first sight, it seems very unrealistic that this is a consequence of the performance degradation caused by icing. Looking to the averaged engine fan speed, it becomes clear that this peak in performance degradation is directly linked to the increase of engine fan speed and therefore thrust (including the applied filtering in the IIDS). Knowing that the engine thrust information embedded in the IIDS originates from an approximation of the Pratt & Whitney PW535E en-

gine behavior leads directly to the conclusion that the used model is not capable of correctly representing the engine thrust at the given flight condition: thrust increase at low altitude, low speed and significant negative temperature offset  $\Delta ISA$  (lower temperature compared to normal conditions in the given altitude). A detailed evaluation of this behavior was part of the initial post-flight data analysis and subject to a proposal for the IIDS implementation modification given below in section 4.3.

A similar time history plot for the second encounter of the example flight is given in Fig. 10. The aircraft descended into icing conditions and reached the target altitude of 3,500 ft at 18:01:40 UTC. The encounter started already during the descent leading directly to a noticeable performance degradation of around 5 % when leveling off. The drag was constantly increasing during the encounter exceeding the detection threshold at around 18:03:10 UTC. This caused a confirmed ice detection within less than two minutes after the beginning of the icing encounter. The performance degradation further increased during the flight in the icing clouds reaching again a maximum of around 30 % before the aircraft was accelerated again for climbing out the cloud layer. After reaching 6,000 ft with warmer air, the airframe was de-iced and the





**FIG 10. Time history of IIDS system performance during specific icing encounter from the example flight (18:00:19 UTC to 18:11:39 UTC): altitude and indicated airspeed (top), nominal drag estimation and IIDS detection output (second plot), and MVD and LWC of encountered icing conditions (third plot), and static air temperature and average engine fan speed (bottom); detection threshold at 10 % relative drag increase.**


nominal flight performance was restored resetting the IIDS detection output at 18:11:30 UTC. With full engine thrust applied between 18:08:00 UTC and 18:08:40 UTC, a similar peak in the nominal drag estimation to the first encounter could be observed underpinning the above discussed finding.

#### 4.2. Aerodynamic Degradation due to icing


Figure 11 shows the aircraft drag polar calculated from the measured data for the whole flight (flaps retracted, gear up and no spoiler deflection). For each data point available in the measurement, the lift and drag coefficient is calculated based on the available inertial and inflow measurements as well as the given engine thrust model (see, e.g., Ref. [18] for detailed information on the equations). The plot further contains the aerodynamic reference used for the flight test reflecting the Phenom300 prototype characteristics with all SENS4ICE modifications (red line). Furthermore, the drag polar data includes an indication of the corresponding IIDS calculated nominal drag estimation (normalized with base aircraft zero-lift drag). Blue marks indicate a nominal drag, which means that there is no increase detected. The more the aircraft is degraded, the more the drag increases

and the marks are moving to the right getting lighter. Orange marks indicate the maximum calculated drag increase, which has to be taken with caution in the presented case for the already mentioned reasons. Anyway, the cyan marks show a drag increase of around 30 % (compared to the nominal value) which was approximately the maximum present during the icing encounters as shown in Figs. 9 and 10. Without any further modifications of the IIDS, it can be already stated that the IIDS is capable of reliably and correctly indicating the current aircraft performance degradation caused by airframe icing.

Figure 12 shows the similar illustration of calculated lift and drag data, but now only for a certain selection of flight data excluding high engine fan speeds and larger negative temperature offsets ( $\Delta ISA < -5 \text{ degC}$ ). It is directly visible that the large calculated drag increase has vanished. Now a clear discrimination of clean (blue marks) and iced aircraft (cyan marks) is visible in the plot (only some orange marks indicating very large drag increase left). Hence, this underpins the above presented assumption that the used (approximated) engine thrust model over-predicts the true engine thrust in certain parts of its envelope, i.e., high engine fan speeds and large negative temperature offsets.



**FIG 11.** Aircraft drag polar from SENS4ICE North America icing campaign flight on February 23rd, 2023 from Chicago O’Hare to Alton: calculated lift and drag coefficient from flight data measurements and drag polar reference (red line) for the Phenom300 prototype with SENS4ICE modifications (high-lift devices and gear retracted); drag coefficient data including the indication of nominal drag estimation calculated by IIDS.



**FIG 12.** Aircraft drag polar from example flight (selected data from Fig. 11): calculated lift and drag coefficient from flight data measurements and reference for the Phenom300 prototype with SENS4ICE modifications (high engine fan speeds  $N_1$  and significant negative temperature offsets  $\Delta ISA$ ; drag coefficient data including the indication of nominal drag estimation calculated by IIDS.

### 4.3. Post-Flight IIDS Evaluation and Initial Adjustment

With the first flight test data analysis available, the IIDS performance is further evaluated post-flight using the design model and replayed flight test data. The IIDS model is available for MATLAB®/Simulink including an emulation of the interface to the HIDS used during flight test. Furthermore, the IIDS design model allows to directly access individual signals within the IIDS to further evaluate the system behavior and performance to specific influences, like the full thrust scenario which is of main concern for the initial evaluation. It also enables changes of the detection parameters, e.g., threshold and confirmation times in Table 1.


After finding that the used engine thrust model might overpredict the engine thrust sometimes, simple model adjustments were introduced to verify the assumption. It is clear that the engine thrust is strongly dependent on the engine fan speed and normally shows a highly nonlinear behavior for high fan speeds. Exactly this behavior must be modified by a reduction of the maximum values without changing the engine thrust for lower fan speeds or idle. Figure 13 visualizes this required model adjustment schematically. Note that the engine thrust is further dependent on other parameters like airspeed, altitude/pressure, temperature offset etc., which are not included in this simple figure, but expand the curve to a multi-dimensional space. The dashed line for the adjusted model indicates the slight reduction of the nonlinear behavior and maximum thrust value is reduced while preserving the low fan speed behavior.

A simple linear formulation of the adjustment function allows to directly achieve the new engine thrust model behavior using the original model output  $T_{\text{model}}$ :

$$(5) \quad T_{\text{adjusted}} = T_{\text{model}} \cdot f_T + b_T.$$

During the preliminary post-flight evaluation, it was found that a few percent of reduction (values for  $f_T \geq 0.95$ ) and an offset  $b_T$  of several hundred Newton is enough to achieve much better results. Furthermore, as the data was gathered in flight from different aircraft buses with different sample rates, a suitable synchronization and therefore collinearity of data might not be given. This means that the acceleration and engine state measurement might be shifted against each other. Hence, it was further checked if the consideration of such shift in the IIDS process will additionally enhance the results, especially in the high thrust scenario. But it was found that such shift has no significant impact if considered to be between 0 and 100 ms in both directions.

Figure 14 contains the flight test aircraft drag polar for the whole flight including the icing encounters, now calculated with the adjusted engine thrust, similar to Fig. 11. It further contains again the flight test reference polar and an indication of the IIDS estimated nominal drag, this time also from a post-flight replay with the adjusted engine thrust characteristics in the performance state calculation. The maximum drag change as well as the maximum predicted performance degradation from the IIDS are both significantly reduced compared to the online flight test results presented in Fig. 11 as a direct consequence of the model adjustment. The maximum drag increase is limited to around 35% which is the assumed impact of the ice formation on the airframe on




**FIG 13. Schematic illustration of engine thrust model adjustment to counteract non-linear behavior with high engine fan speeds: reduction of max. thrust with fan speeds near  $N_{I,max}$  while maintaining the same thrust level for idle and medium fan speeds which correspond to the engine state for icing encounters.**

the aerodynamics during the icing encounters (with still some larger values present but not affecting the IIDS behavior). These preliminary results give a good confidence that the source of the unreliably large drag increase is related to the full thrust scenarios.

In addition to the evaluation of the aircraft aerodynamics the time histories of the IIDS performance during the encounters were analyzed. Figure 15 shows the IIDS output for the replayed flight test data of the first icing encounter (see Fig. 9) with the given adjustments. The calculated drag increase has changed compared to the flight test implementation by removing some peaks in the time histories correlated with high engine fan speeds: at around 17:45:55 UTC, the engine is spooled up for a few seconds causing a small peak in the nominal drag estimation in Fig. 9 which is not existing anymore. Also, the large predicted increase starting from 17:52:30 UTC while climbing out of the icing cloud is now removed and the maximum degradation predicted by the IIDS remains at around 35% which is more reasonable.

All in all, the preliminary evaluation and IIDS implementation adjustment revealed a very good, reliable and relatively fast detection behavior. Note that the simple adjustment allows preventing some unreliable IIDS behavior but does not necessarily work for all conditions during all test flights. Anyway, it could be shown that the adaptation of the performance reference, of which the engine thrust model is part of, allows to enhance the IIDS performance and reliability if required. Despite the specific implementation of the performance reference, e.g., multi-dimensional table for  $\dot{E}_{tot,ref}$  or separated aerodynamics and engine thrust, the modification to a specific aircraft is very simple and can be easily made over its lifetime in service. Hence, it is no impediment for using such




**FIG 14. Aircraft drag polar from example flight (same data as in Fig. 11) after engine thrust model adjustment: calculated lift and drag coefficient from flight data measurements and reference for the Phenom 300 prototype with SENS4ICE modifications; drag coefficient data including the indication of nominal drag estimation calculated by IIDS with adjusted engine thrust during data replay.**

a performance-based method for applications on existing aircraft or future aircraft developments.

## 5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The SENS4ICE project is a big step towards successful and reliable detection of different icing conditions including SLD (Appendix O conditions). One key to achieve this goal is the so-called indirect ice detection methodology based on an aircraft performance degradation providing several advantages compared to direct detection (ice sensors), which are mainly complementary. These are for example the retrofit capabilities, a simple software solution or the highly beneficial information about the remaining aircraft capabilities for safe aircraft operations. In addition, the indirect ice detection represents a second pillar for ice detection redundancy when hybridized and hence reduces the risk for common cause failures. It is based on the reliable measurement of the aircraft flight condition normally available through modern aircraft avionics. Furthermore, this methodology opens new possibilities for ice detection, e.g., on small unmanned aerial vehicles which could not be equipped with large or complex direct ice detection methods, but would directly benefit from a reliable and relatively fast software-based IIDS.

The first results of the SENS4ICE North America flight test campaign with a specially equipped and modified Embraer Phenom 300 prototype are very promising in order to validate the indirect ice detection methodology and evaluate its performance during flight through natural icing conditions. After adaption of the performance reference, i.e. reference drag polar, based on flight data from the Phenom 300 aircraft with all



**FIG 15. Replay of IIDS system performance during specific icing encounter from the example flight (17:41:49 UTC to 17:55:29 UTC, see Fig. 9): altitude and indicated airspeed (top), nominal drag estimation and IIDS detection output (second plot), and MVD and LWC of encountered icing conditions (third plot), and static air temperature and average engine fan speed (bottom); adjusted engine thrust model behavior.**

SENS4ICE modifications, the IIDS was ready for implementation and testing during the natural icing flight test campaign. The paper presents certain preliminary results from the evaluation of one specific test flight on February 23rd, 2023, from Chicago O'Hare airport back to Alton, Illinois, where the aircraft was stationed for the campaign. During two App. C icing encounters the IIDS was able to reliably detect the aircraft flight performance degradation caused by ice accretion on the aircraft after the icing conditions were encountered. One additional result of the evaluation is the finding that the IIDS implementation was very sensitive to high engine fan speeds during the flight test leading to an overprediction of the flight performance degradation. It could be shown that a simple and minor adjustment of the used engine thrust model approximation for high engine fan speeds and significant temperature offsets reduced this overpredictive behavior. In this way, it could be directly shown that an adaption of the IIDS to the special characteristics of one specific aircraft could be easily done based on the flight data recorded. It also revealed that the predefined structure and performance reference was successfully used to reliably indicate an abnormal aircraft performance caused by icing, even without having a perfect representation of the reference performance

for all parts of the potential flight envelope. Hence, this validates the assumption that the IIDS can also be implemented for new aircraft designs with maybe limited information on its specific flight performance. Future work on the analysis of the SENS4ICE North America flight test campaigns and the IIDS performance will first be dedicated to a complete evaluation of all test flights conducted in February/ March 2023. In addition, a comparison of the IIDS performance during the European and North America campaign will further reveal the IIDS performance for icing encounters with different conditions and the corresponding performance degradation for a business jet and turboprop aircraft. The analysis will specifically focus on the performance degradation characteristics related to SLD ice accretion. Also, the minimal reliably detectable ice formation through performance degradation on the different aircraft will be assessed.

#### DISCLAIMER

The Phenom 300 flight test data analyzed is based on an experimental prototype. This aircraft prototype has embedded additional flight test instrumentation and features that do not represent any certified Phenom 300 aircraft model. Therefore, the analysis and

performance estimations assessed in this study and within the SENS4ICE project do not represent the Phenom 300's certified performance.

## FUNDING INFORMATION

The "SENSors and certifiable hybrid architectures for safer aviation in ICing Environment" (SENS4ICE) project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement N° 824253.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wants to specially thank the SENS4ICE North America campaign flight test team for its structured and professional work to conduct the flight tests, especially Daniel Martins da Silva for coordinating with the SENS4ICE project group. Furthermore, the author wants to specially honor the work of Bruno Thillays and Annagrazia Orazzo from SAFRAN Aerosystems on developing the HIDS implementation for the SENS4ICE flight tests.

## Contact address:

[christoph.deiler@dlr.de](mailto:christoph.deiler@dlr.de)

## References

- [1] Steven D. Green. A study of u. s. inflight icing accidents and incidents, 1978 to 2002. Number AIAA 2006-82, Reno, Nevada, USA, January 9th - 12th, 2006. 44th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. (AIAA). DOI: [10.2514/6.2006-82](https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2006-82).
- [2] Steven D. Green. The icemaster database and an analysis of aircraft aerodynamic icing accidents and incidents. Technical Report DOT/FAA/TC-14/44, R1, Federal Aviation Administration, Atlantic City, NJ, USA, Oct. 2015.
- [3] Anon. *Final Report (BFU 5X011-0/98)*. German Federal Bureau of Aircraft Accident Investigation, Braunschweig, Germany, April 2001.
- [4] Anon. *Aircraft Accident Report (NTSB/AAR-96/01, DCA95MA001), Safety Board Report*. National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), Washington, DC, USA, July 9th 1996.
- [5] Christoph Deiler and Nicolas Fezans. Performance-based ice detection methodology. *Journal of Aircraft*, 57(2):209–223, March 2020. DOI: [10.2514/1.C034828](https://doi.org/10.2514/1.C034828).
- [6] Christoph Deiler and Falk Sachs. Design and testing of an indirect ice detection methodology. Vienna, Austria, June 20th - 22nd 2023. SAE International Conference on Icing of Aircraft, Engines, and Structures, SAE International, Paper 2023-01-1493.
- [7] Carsten W. Schwarz. The sens4ice eu project – sensors and certifiable hybrid architectures for safer aviation in icing environment – project overview and initial results. Stockholm, Sweden, September 4th - 9th 2022. 33th Congress of the International Council of the Aeronautical Sciences (ICAS).
- [8] Carsten W. Schwarz. Sens4ice eu project preliminary results. Vienna, Austria, June 20th - 22nd 2023. SAE International Conference on Icing of Aircraft, Engines, and Structures, SAE International, Paper 2023-01-1496.
- [9] Tina Jurkat-Witschas, Johannes Lucke, Carsten W. Schwarz, Christoph Deiler, Falk Sachs, Simon Kirschler, Deniz Menekay, Christiane Voigt, Ben Bernstein, Olivier Jaron, Frank Kalinka, Alessandra Zollo, Lyle Lilie, Johanna Mayer, Christian Page, Benoit Vié, Aurelien Bourdon, Rogerio Pereira Lima, and Luiz Vieira. Overview of cloud microphysical measurements during the sens4ice airborne test campaigns: Contrasting icing frequencies from climatological data to first results from airborne observations. Vienna, Austria, June 20th - 22nd 2023. SAE International Conference on Icing of Aircraft, Engines, and Structures, SAE International, Paper 2023-01-1491.
- [10] Anon. Ice accretion simulation. AGARD Advisory Report 344, Advisory Group for Aerospace Research & Development (AGARD) - Fluid Dynamics Panel Working Group 20, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Neuilly-Sur-Seine, France, December 1997.
- [11] Michael B. Bragg, William R. Perkins, Nadine B. Sarter, Tamer Başar, Petros G. Voulgaris, Holly M. Gurbacki, James W. Melody, and Scott A. McCray. An interdisciplinary approach to inflight aircraft icing safety. Number AIAA 98-0095, Reno, Nevada, USA, January 12th-15th 1998. 36th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. (AIAA). DOI: [10.2514/6.1998-95](https://doi.org/10.2514/6.1998-95).
- [12] Thomas T. Myers, David H. Klyde, and Raymond E. Magdaleno. The dynamic icing detection system (dids). Reno, Nevada, USA, January 10th - 13th, 1999. 38th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. (AIAA). DOI: [10.2514/6.2000-364](https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2000-364).
- [13] James W. Melody, Tamer Başar, William R. Perkins, and Petros G. Voulgaris. Parameter identification for inflight detection and characterization of aircraft icing. *Control Engineering Practice*, 8(9):985–1001, September 2000. DOI: [10.1016/S0967-0661\(00\)00046-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0661(00)00046-0).

- [14] Michael B. Bragg, Tamer Başar, William R. Perkins, Michael S. Selig, Petros G. Voulgaris, James W. Melody, and Nadine B. Sater. Smart icing systems for aircraft icing safety. Reno, Nevada, USA, January 14th - 17th 2002. 40th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. (AIAA). DOI: [10.2514/6.2002-813](https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2002-813).
- [15] Rahmi Aykan, Chingiz Hajiyev, and Fikret Caliskan. Aircraft icing detection, identification and reconfigurable control based on kalman filtering and neural networks. San Francisco, California, USA, August 15th - 18th 2005. AIAA Atmospheric Flight Mechanics Conference and Exhibit, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. (AIAA). DOI: [10.2514/6.2005-6220](https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2005-6220).
- [16] David R. Gingras, Billy P. Barnhart, Richard J. Ranuado, Thomas P. Ratvasky, and Eugene A. Morelli. Envelope protection for in-flight ice contamination. Orlando, Florida, USA, January 5th - 8th, 2009. 47th Aerospace Sciences Meeting, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. (AIAA). DOI: [10.2514/6.2009-1458](https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2009-1458).
- [17] Christoph Deiler. Evaluation of aircraft performance variation during daily flight operations. Friedrichshafen, Germany, Sept. 2018. Deutscher Luft- und Raumfahrtkongress, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Luft- und Raumfahrt (DGLR). DOI: [10.25967/480025](https://doi.org/10.25967/480025).
- [18] Christoph Deiler. A smart data approach to determine an aircraft performance model from an operational flight data base. National Harbor, Maryland, USA, January 2023. AIAA Scitech Forum, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc. (AIAA). DOI: [10.2514/6.2023-0797](https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2023-0797).
- [19] Christoph Deiler. Engine thrust model determination and analysis using a large operational flight database. *CEAS Aeronautical Journal*, 14(1):29–45, January 2023. DOI: [10.1007/s13272-023-00659-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13272-023-00659-w).
- [20] Christoph Deiler. Aerodynamic model adjustment for an accurate flight performance representation using a large operational flight data base. *CEAS Aeronautical Journal*, 14(2):527–538, Mar. 2023. DOI: [10.1007/s13272-022-00625-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13272-022-00625-y).
- [21] Christoph Deiler and Nicolas Fezans. Method and assistance system for detecting a degradation of flight performance, 2017. Patent Numbers: US11401044B2, EP3479181B1, WO2018002148A1, FR3053460B1, CA3029467A1, ES2919573T3.