THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF THE DESIGN PHASE FOR A SINGLE SKIN TEXTILE WING

ADRIAN SALISTEAN, CARMEN MIHAI, DOINA TOMA, SABINA OLARU

*INCDTP - National R&D Institute for Textile and Leather, Lucretiu Patrascanu No.16, Bucharest
- Romania, office@incdtp.ro*

This paper depicts the early phase in the research development for an integrated support system tailored for emergency response actions and remote sensing. The support system is envisioned as an integrated Unmanned Aerial System (UAS) system that consists of one or more ultralight multifunctional aerial units with a configuration that can be adapted to the nature of the intervention: monitoring, mapping, observation and logistics etc. These aerial units comprise of para-motor type UAVs that use textile paraglider wings of a special design. The paper summarizes the basic materials used in the construction of parachutes, as well as it depicts the design phase for the main material used on the wing construction. Starting from wing airfoil and materials selection, a design phase is ongoing for a single sail paraglider wing that can meet the operational demands for emergency response situations. The wing is designed mainly to have an easy handling and to have a predictable deployment at all times. The entire system and the aerial units are designed with increased modularity in order to be tailored for specific operational requirements of the intervention. A numerical model is under development and rigorous testing to validate the theoretical aspects and the design choices.

Keywords: Unmanned Aerial System (UAS), Single Sail Paraglider, Technical Textiles.

INTRODUCTION

The laws of mechanics and aerodynamics apply to the performance and stress analysis of parachute systems. However, the textile fabrics used in parachute construction have distinctly different mechanical and environmental characteristics than metals or composites.

This paper depicts the early phase in the research development for an integrated support system tailored for emergency response actions and remote sensing. In this phase we try to develop a fabric that is tailored for use in the manufacturing process of a paraglider type wing design (Knache, 1992) that utilizes a single skin construction (Poynter, 1984) and solid reinforcements in the sewing for shape stability.

In order to achieve this we used as a baseline several commercial fabrics and tried to determine the best combination of yarn, weave and finishing method in order to best suite our paraglider wing. Please keep in mind that this is a preliminary work and is subject to change if the prototype performances will not fall within the projected limits.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In order to establish a baseline for the fabric characteristics several readily available fabrics were analysed. The fabrics used in the testing were selected so they cover a wide array of parachute types.

Therefore we selected as material one (S1), a fabric commonly used in paraglider manufacturing. This fabric is a rather heavy fabric having polyurethane and silicone coating for UV protection.

The second material (S2) is a fabric used in most of the Ram-Air parachutes available today. It's a light fabric with polyurethane coating for zero air permeability.

The third material (S3) is a fabric with similar structure as S2 but without polyurethane coating. This fabric is only calendered and it is commonly referred to as

F111 type fabric. This type of fabric has some air permeability therefore is mainly used in reserve ram-air parachutes or partially on the intrados side of main parachutes.

Testing of the tear resistance of the samples was done on the Tinius Olsen Dynamometer H5KT dynamometer (Figure 1). The device is designed to test a wide range of materials (yarns, fabrics, leather) for traction, flexion, and assembly strength (made by sewing, thermofusion, etc.).

Figure 1. H5KT dynamometer

Further on we extracted yarns from the fabrics in order to determine the yarn characteristics. The values of the structural parameters of the fabrics (air permeability, mass, thickness, etc.) were used in conjunction with the extracted yarn test results to determine the multivariate regression equations in which the independent variables were considered the breaking strengths in warp and weft (Figure 2). In this figure on x-axis we have the displacement of the clamping device, in mm. We notice a very inconsistent reading, as if the yarn is partially slipping, compared with the clean regular Nylon 6.6 yarn. We suspect this to be because of the residual polyurethane coating present on the extracted yarns. S3 sample, that was not coated, had smaller reading spikes. A statistical smoothing of the readings puts the breaking strength of the extracted yarns roughly on a value that is double than that of the regular Nylon 6.6 yarn. This is the tell-tale sign that we are dealing with HT Nylon 6.6 yarns. At the time of the testing we did not have stocked HT Nylon 6.6 to make a direct comparison.

Figure 2. Breaking strength and trend line for each analysed yarn

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Further on we try to assess the strength transfer coefficient (Cristian *et al.*, 2012) given mathematically as:

$$C = \frac{Tf_2}{Tf_1} \quad (1)$$

where Tf_1 - yarn tenacity before its integration in fabric expressed in N/Tex calculated with the equation:

$$Tf_1 = \frac{F_{bkg(t)}}{Tex} \quad (2)$$

Tf_2 is theoretical yarn tenacity after its integration in woven structure, including the influence of the weave structure/finishing treatments and is expressed also in N/Tex:

$$Tf_2 = \frac{F_{bkg(t)}}{P \times b \times Tex} \quad (3)$$

The strength transfer coefficient C for the given samples has the following values:

- S1 sample: Warp 1.14; Weft 0.97;
- S2 sample: Warp 0.78; Weft 1.03;
- S2 sample: Warp 1.16; Weft 1.56.

Closer these coefficients are from unity the more linear is the transfer rate, above one means the existing woven structure and treatment strengthens the yarn properties. From this we observed S1 and S3 structures to be superior in this regard.

One of the most important properties for these fabrics is the air permeability (Buyuk *et al.*, 2019) and we tried to reduce this by catering several aspects:

- Yarn torsion of the two systems;
- The use of specially designed connections like ripstop or double ripstop type, with a binding segment of maximum two which interrupt the tendency of the wires of one system to slide towards the wires of the other system (not recommended to use the connections D2 / 1, R2 / 1, R1 / 2 or P2 / 2).

- Finishing treatment, polyurethane coating.

Two woven types of fabrics were developed accordingly to the following weave diagrams and general characteristics:

- Yarn fiber composition: 100% PA6.6HT;
- Yarn linear density: 30 den/32 f;
- Yarn count warp: 495 threads/10 cm;
- V1 Yarn count weft: 504 threads/10 cm (Figure 3);
- V2 Yarn count weft: 508 threads/10 cm (Figure 4).

Figure 3. Programming card for weave structure V1 (Ripstop weave)

Figure 4. Programming card for weave structure V2 (Double ripstop weave)

Four fabric variants were developed as follows:

- a fabric with ripstop connection (V1 and V3) and
- another double-ripstop (V2 and V4).

<https://doi.org/10.24264/icams-2020.III.16>

Each connection variant was made in two finishing variants:

- calendering (V1 and V2) and
- polyurethane coating (V3 and V4) thus resulting in four variants of finished fabrics.

Table 1. Finished fabrics test results

Test Name		Fabric V1	Fabric V2	Fabric V3	Fabric V4	Testing method
Fabric mass (g/m ²)		40	51	47	59	SR EN 12127:2003
Yarn count (threads/10cm)	Warp	495	495	495	495	SR EN 1049-2:2000
	Weft	504	508	504	508	
Fabric breaking strength (N)	Warp	440	554	422	541	SR EN ISO 13934-1:2013
	Weft	445	484	410	480	
Fabric elongation at breaking force (%)	Warp	28.6	23.6	26.7	24.9	
	Weft	32.7	26.2	38.4	29.1	
Fabric tearing strength (N)	Warp	34.4	21.3	65.2	20.7	SR EN ISO 13937-2:2001
	Weft	32.7	22.5	65.5	20.7	
Fabric bursting strength (KPa)		330.3	368.4	330.2	370.8	EN ISO 13938-2:2002
Fabric bursting strength (mm)		35.4	36.3	42.5	43.2	
Fabric air permeability (l/m ² /sec) at 200Pa		10.53	10.34	0	0	SR EN ISO 9237:1999
Raw material		100%	100%	100%	100%	SR 13231-95
Coating		PA66HT Calendered	PA66HT Calendered	PA66HT PU coating	PA66HT PU coating	SR ISO 1833-95
Link type		Ripstop	Double-ripstop	Ripstop	Double-ripstop	-

CONCLUSIONS

The fabric breaking strength is in line with the breaking strength of the yarn, this validates the testing methods and yarn extraction method. A strength transfer coefficient greater than one means the woven structure has higher theoretical tenacity than all the yarns combined. This means that the calendered fabric S3 woven structure amplifies better the yarn tenacity than coated fabrics; however the S1 fabric is not far behind and has way better breaking strength, lower elongation and also lower air permeability, probably because of the double-ripstop structure.

The highest yarn elongation of S2 influences in an interesting way the tearing behaviour and tearing strength results. The S2 fabric gets the highest tearing resistance due to this but is not necessarily the correct one since the fabric torn incompletely. Some threads remained in structure and influenced the results.

Due to the nature of the single sail wing, the amount of fabric used in the manufacture is almost halved therefore the fabric can be a little heavier and also can have a less than perfect air permeability because the shape is maintained by several rigid members. Thus we conclude that the fabric must use yarn of high tenacity Nylon 66; then make use of the rip-stop weave link and polyurethane coating.

The fabric variants obtained were tested and these conclusions were drawn:

- Regarding the air permeability, the most performing variants were the coated ones (V3 and V4)
- Considering the specific mass, the lightest fabric is the V1 variant.
- Considering the breaking resistances, all variants are in the same performance class

but with significantly higher values in the case of double-ripstop variants V2 and V4. However, increased tear strength is observed in the case of the V3 variant, this is due to the tearing mode which opposes the propagation of the rupture. This type of tearing behaviour is presented by both V1 and V3.

- Further testing is required to decide if the fabric can be functionalized with hydrophobic (Toma *et al.*, 2018) properties in order to expand the operational capabilities of the UAV for rainy weather or with applied heating elements (Buhu *et al.*, 2019) for use on sub-zero temperatures or high altitude flying.

- Analysing the results and given the desirable tearing behaviour of the V3 variant, we choose this working variant for the UAV textile structure prototype manufacturing in the next stages of system design.

REFERENCES

- Buhu, L., Negru, D., Loghin, E.C. and Buhu, A. (2019), "Analysis of tensile properties for conductive textile yarns", *Industria Textila*, 70(2), 116-119, <https://doi.org/10.35530/IT.070.02.1517>.
- Buyuk, F.M., Adnan, M., Antonin, H. and Karel, A. (2019), "Theoretical model: analysing theoretically the air flow through car seatfoam material", *Industria Textila*, 70(4), 324-330, <https://doi.org/10.35530/IT.070.04.1559B>.
- Cristian, I., Nauman, S., Boussu, F. and Koncar, V. (2012), "A Study of Strength Transfer from tow to Textile Composite Using Different Reinforcement Architectures", in: *Appl. Compos. Mater.*, 19(3-4), 447-458, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10443-011-9215-x>.
- Knache, T.W. (1992), "*Parachute Recovery Systems – Design Manual*", Para Publishing, Santa Barbara, California, 230-231
- Poynter, D. (1984), *The Parachute Manual - A Technical Treatise on Aerodynamic Decelerators*, vol. 2, Santa Barbara, California, 184-185.
- Toma, D., Chirila, L., Popescu, A., Chirila, C. and Iordache, O. (2018), "Multifunctional finishing treatments applied on textiles for protection of emergency personnel", *Industria Textila*, 69(5), 357-362, <https://doi.org/10.35530/IT.069.05.1585>.