

Advances in UAV Avionics Systems Architecture, Classification and Integration: A Comprehensive Review and Future Perspectives

Hashim A. Hashim

Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Carleton University,
Ottawa, ON, K1S-5B6, Canada (e-mail: Hashim.Mohamed@carleton.ca)

Abstract—Avionics systems of an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) or drone are the critical electronic components found onboard that regulate, navigate, and control UAV travel while ensuring public safety. Contemporary UAV avionics work together to facilitate success of UAV missions by enabling stable communication, secure identification protocols, novel energy solutions, multi-sensor accurate perception and autonomous navigation, precise path planning, that guarantees collision avoidance, reliable trajectory control, and efficient data transfer within the UAV system. Moreover, special consideration must be given to electronic warfare threats prevention, detection, and mitigation, and the regulatory framework associated with UAV operations. This review presents the role and taxonomy of each UAV avionics system while covering shortcomings and benefits of available alternatives within each system. UAV communication systems, antennas, and location communication tracking are surveyed. Identification systems that respond to air-to-air or air-to-ground interrogating signals are presented. UAV classical and more innovative power sources are discussed. The rapid development of perception systems improves UAV autonomous navigation and control capabilities. The paper reviews common perception systems, navigation techniques, path planning approaches, obstacle avoidance methods, and tracking control. Modern electronic warfare uses advanced techniques and has to be counteracted by equally advanced methods to keep the public safe. Consequently, this work presents a detailed overview of common electronic warfare threats and state-of-the-art countermeasures and defensive aids. Furthermore, UAV safety occurrences are analyzed in the context of national regulatory framework and the certification process. Lastly, databus communication and standards for UAVs are reviewed as they enable efficient and fast real-time data transfer.

Index Terms—Avionics systems, Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, navigation and control, regulation and certification, communication and energy, electronic warfare and identification.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Motivation

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) are commonly referred to as drones, Uninhibited Aircraft Systems (UASs), or remotely piloted aircrafts, and these terms will be used interchangeably. In broad terms, a UAV is a flying vehicle with no human presence on board, which can be either remotely piloted by a human operator or partially or fully

autonomous without remote human intervention. In recent years, there has been a boom in UAV use in a variety of fields, including, but not limited to, wildfire detection, civil infrastructure inspections, precision agriculture, transportation, delivery, and Intelligence, Security, and Reconnaissance (ISR) missions [1]–[5]. Majority of the UAVs can be broadly classified into two categories: fixed-wing and rotary-wing. Although fixed-wing UAVs allow for high speed and heavy payloads, they are not suitable for stationary-like missions that require prolonged hovering (e.g., filming industry and building inspection). Rotary-wing UAVs (e.g., quadcopters), on the other side, are perfectly fit for stationary-like missions, but they are disadvantaged by low speed and smaller payloads. Consequently, the most suitable type of UAV is application-dependent. The first generation of UAVs, that date back to World War I (WW-I), were controlled through simple inertial mechanical systems [6]. However, lack of complete aerodynamics understanding in addition to the absence of the pilot to manually compensate for unmodelled dynamics and sensor drifts led to poor performance. In the period between WW-I and WW-II, the first radio-controlled aircraft were tested, and the UAV aviation electronics (AVIONICS) packages were born [6].

Over the past decades, complex comprehensive avionics systems have been developed and perfected through iterative improvement resulting in modern cutting-edge UAVs able to execute sophisticated missions for a multitude of industries and day-to-day tasks. UAV applications are diverse and can require a single-agent UAV mission [7], a homogeneous multi-agent UAV mission [8], or a mission involving multiple heterogeneous agents (UAVs and ground vehicles) [7], [9]. While some UAV missions are entirely dependent on a remote human operator others are either partially or fully autonomous independent of remote human control. Lack of onboard human operator necessitates precise and reliable UAV avionics systems. Considering the fact that the number of UAVs carrying out missions in the civil airspace is increasing exponentially, safe navigation achieved through effective and standardized procedures is paramount. Thus, it is crucial to ensure seamless and harmoniously operation of all the UAV avionics systems that include the flight control surfaces, UAV sensors, navigation and planning systems, communication systems and power systems. Furthermore, safe and responsible UAV use by general public, government bodies, and

This work was supported in part by the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), under the grants RGPIN-2022-04937.

H. A. Hashim is with the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON, K1S-5B6, Canada (e-mail: Hashim.Mohamed@carleton.ca).




Fig. 1: Illustrative diagram of UAV avionics elements.

professional operators is enforced by transportation agencies worldwide through rigorous certification process and strict regulations. UAVs have powerful communication capabilities, not only can they be connected to cellular networks, but they also can enable terrestrial wireless communications by forming an assisted communication system and acting as aerial base stations (BSs) or communication access points [10]. Air-to-air communication between UAVs and air-to-ground communication between UAVs and ground stations are critical elements of UAV networks since they provide the necessary means of identification and communication to achieve the required tasks.

UAV's compact size and payload constraints make the energy resource it carries in short supply. Consequently, the key component of mission planning is optimization of the energy consumption and performance. UAVs can use a variety of energy systems, such as batteries, fuel, or renewable energy cells, and selecting the optimal energy system and focusing of energy management allows to achieve extended UAV flight duration and increased operational range [2]. Optimal selection of the energy source and its efficient management allow to minimize landing frequency for refueling or battery replenishment enhancing UAV versatility. Successful completion of a scheduled mission is highly dependent on the UAV's perceptual capabilities and the resulting awareness of its current navigation states (starting point) in three-dimensional (3D) space including location (position and orientation) in the six degrees-of-freedom (6 DoF), speed, heading direction, and target destination. Successful perception and navigation is built on four key pillars: sensor selection, multi-sensor fusion, navigation techniques selection (map-based and mapless), and robust estimator design. Finding a collision free path in a cluttered environment requires careful path planning from initial location to the final destination in 3D space while tackling kinematic and dynamic constraints [11]–[13]. Locating the suitable obstacle free path in 3D space requires solving the multi-objective Nondeterministic Polynomial-time (NP)-hard problem that has no single optimal solution. Once the collision free path is identified, trajectory control techniques are applied to track the UAV along the desired route. Another critical

component of UAV avionics are the defense systems used to confront electronic warfare threats, such as destructive and non-destructive cyberattacks, transponder attacks and jamming threats, using state-of-the-art countermeasures and defensive aids.

Scope: The central objective of this review paper is to present to the UAV research community with a comprehensive overview of the UAV avionics systems architecture and classification including key characteristics of each taxonomy. This work covers UAV communication systems along with persistent challenges, as well as common warfare threats and respective defense strategies. Another crucial UAV component is its power source, hence this paper presents different energy sources, energy-densities, power densities and their associated challenges. Furthermore, typical identification systems used in UAVs and their respective roles in communication systems, obstacle avoidance, and electronic warfare are covered. The paper overviews perception sensors, the role of sensor-fusion to building the navigation state, navigation reliant on onboard sensors with and without external communication, and navigation state estimation. Taxonomy of path planning techniques, common methods applied for collision avoidance, and different control approaches for trajectory techniques are presented. Finally, the UAV regulations, safety protocols, airspace classification, and the certification process necessary for an operator to carry out UAV missions are discussed. Fig. 1 provides a conceptual illustration of UAV avionics components.

Structure: The remainder of the paper is structured into nine sections. Section II presents communication control systems, UAV antennas, communication of the UAV location (position and orientation), and UAV-aided wireless communications. Section III discusses UAV identification systems. Section IV summarizes different types of energy systems used by UAVs. Section V discusses UAV perception and navigation systems including sensor-fusion, map-based and mapless approaches, and estimator design. Section VI presents path planning, obstacle avoidance, and trajectory tracking. Section VII overviews UAV electronic warfare including destructive and non-destructive cyberattacks, attacking transponders, jamming and anti-jamming, and countermeasures and defensive

aids. Section VIII discusses databases and their role in the UAV avionics systems. Section IX presents the regulations governing the use of UAVs and the associated certifications. Finally, Section XI summarizes the work.

II. UAV COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS

Practically, successful UAV missions rely on wireless communication with the ground. UAV wireless communication is composed of sensor communication (e.g., positioning), live image and video feeds, messages to/from ground base station(s), connection with cell networks and satellites, and collaboration with other air/ground vehicles where communication links are established by means of commands. This section reviews UAV communication systems, antennas, localization tracking, and the use of UAV as aided-communication system. Fig. 2 presents illustrative diagram of UAV communication systems including wired and wireless communication links, vehicle-to-vehicle, vehicle-to-infrastructure, and vehicle-to-human operator.

A. Communication Control Systems

Robust communication network for UAVs requires a variety of communication modules and protocols. Communication control systems of UAVs are challenged by multiple factors, such as high speed of UAV maneuvering, fuel/energy consumption, air traffic density, UAV position and orientation, and others. The essence of UAV external communication is the transmission and reception of information in the form of data. Multiple antennas distributed over the UAV body provide means of communication for military and civilian applications. These antennas propagate information at different frequencies of the electromagnetic spectrum complicating the UAV communication [1], [14]. UAV antennas communicate using the radio spectrum (30 Hz to 3,000 GHz), where the typical ranges include Extremely Low Frequency (ELF) 30-300 Hz, Ultra Low Frequency (ULF) 300-3000 Hz, Very Low Frequency (VLF) 3-30 kHz, Low Frequency (LF) 30-300 kHz, Medium Frequency (MF) 0.3-3 MHz, High Frequency (HF) 3-30 MHz, Very High Frequency (VHF) 30-300 MHz, Ultra High Frequency (UHF) 0.3-3 GHz, Super High Frequency (SHF) 3-30 GHz, Extra High Frequency (EHF) 30-300 GHz, and Tremendously High Frequency (THF) 300-3,000 GHz. A significant amount of microwaves travel through the sky, and therefore, to avoid interference, UAV communication is enabled by allocating specific frequency ranges and modulation patterns to each UAV antenna. Modulation, the process of converting low-frequency periodic signals to/from high-frequency periodic signal, is commonly employed to (i) reduce signal wavelength and in turn the required size of an antenna, and (ii) minimize signal interference. Two main types of modulation are utilized in UAV communications: analog (continuous) and digital [15], [16]. Analog modulation is exemplified by Amplitude Modulation (AM), Phase Modulation (PM), and Frequency Modulation (FM). Popular digital modulation approaches include Amplitude Shift Keying (ASK), Phase Shift Keying (PSK), and Frequency Shift Keying (FSK). UASs use Control and Non-Payload Communication

(CNPC) links to guarantee safety of their missions [17]. CNPC links support secure two-way communications, low-latency, low data rate, and reliable information propagation necessary for the exchange of safety-critical data between UASs, manned aircrafts, and Ground Control Stations (GCSs). The data transmitted using CNPC links typically include control commands from GCSs, air traffic control near airports, UAV status report to GCSs, and object avoidance information. Datalinks facilitate telecommunication between two or multiple nodes, including, gateway nodes, mobile terminals, terrestrial BSs, wireless sensors, and others. In the event of complete BS malfunction or BS offloading, datalinks can enable direct mobile-UAV communication. Furthermore, datalinks support UAV-UAV and UAV-gateway wireless backhaul [18], [19].

B. UAV Antennas

Antennas Role and Tracking Systems: UAVs without antennas would be flying blind, unable to take advantage of any information except for its pre-coded instructions and data garnered by the onboard sensors. Consequently, antennas are integral to the UAV platform, and are responsible for transmitting and receiving signals to and from the ground stations or other aircraft in the form of electromagnetic waves. Modern UAVs utilize a wide variety of antennas, such as wire, aperture, and microstrip antennas. UAV communication network is affected by a variety of factors, including antenna design, resource management platform, network architecture, software complexities, and others. Successful UAV tracking from a GCS requires three components: (a) azimuth angle (angle between the north vector and the UAV on the horizontal plane); (b) elevation angle (angle between a horizontal line and the UAV starting from the GCS); and (c) absolute range. In GPS-denied regions, the azimuth can be defined via the compass bearing system [20]. The tracking antenna system maximizes the radio communication between a UAV and a GCS. In the telemetry communication systems for UAVs, ground-to-air antenna tracking systems are more popular for UAV tracking. These located on the ground systems adjust their position to achieve optimal elevation and azimuth for seamless communication and employ two different antennas, such as Yagi-Uda (parasitic array antenna composed of two types of parasitic elements acting as a reflector and a director), a bi-quad (modified dipole antenna with the wire shaped as a diamond or a square), and/or a double bi-quad antenna [21]. Simplicity and power efficiency of the ground-to-air tracking antenna systems explain their widespread use for UAV missions. Furthermore, these systems do not necessitate knowledge of the air vehicle attitude which is a significant benefit [22]. Another antenna type is a circularly polarized microstrip antenna array that operates in the microwave frequency range and is commonly employed to enhance the bandwidth for UAV ground-to-air transmission [23]. Microstrips, planar in design, represent advancement in antenna technology and are heavily used [24]. They are perfectly fit for aircraft and UAVs due to their planar design, allowing for microstrip incorporation into the aircraft surface [25].




Fig. 2: UAV communication systems: Wired, wireless, vehicle-to-vehicle, vehicle-to-infrastructure, and vehicle-to-operator.

Air-to-Ground Communication and Modulation: Air-to-ground communication systems are rarely used for UAV missions. UAVs typically utilize directional antennas to transmit signals which help to focus and amplify signals over long distances, prevent interference, and reduces the burden for detecting the Angle of Arrival (AoA) of the arrived signal [26]. In air-to-ground communication, the tracking antenna positioned on-board of aircraft persistently maintains track of the GCS. Air-to-ground communication can use single carrier modulation, such as Quadrature Phase Shift Keying (QPSK), Amplitude and Phase-shift Keying (APSK), Minimum Shift Keying (MSK), Orthogonal Frequency Division Multiplexing (OFDM), M-ary Quadrature Amplitude Modulation (MQAM), Gaussian Minimum Shift Keying (GMSK), Shaped-offset Quadrature Phase-shift Keying (SOQPSK), and Single-Carrier Frequency Domain Equalization (SC-FDE) [27]. Furthermore, air-to-ground communication can use multi carrier modulation, such as OFDM. All of the above-discussed antennas can enable UAV tracking when used in conjunction with several techniques, such as monopulse, Global Positioning System (GPS), Received Signal Strength (RSS) Indicator (RSSI), and Time Difference of Arrival (TDOA) [27].

C. Position and Orientation Communication Tracking

Safety of the airspace is highly dependent on the ability to accurately track position and orientation of aircraft. In this subsection we will discuss RSSI, TDOA, GPS and monopulse methods utilized together with the data communicated via antennas to localize the aircraft of interest. Firstly, let us look at RSSI - a measure of how well a device hears a signal. Consequently, RSSI can be employed to calculate the distance between the UAV and the tracking antenna using signal strength. Moreover, RSSI allows to determine UAV flight direction, namely, a UAV antenna transmits signal to the base stations and the direction is established based on the progression of signal strength at the receiver nodes [28]. Use of RSSI in conjunction with tracking antennas is characterized

by such advantages as low cost, energy consumption, and computational and memory requirements. However, the main disadvantage is potentially unreliable position estimation. [29]. TDOA is another tracking method that estimates transmitter location based on the differences in arrival times by correlating signals received at different ground modes [1], [30]. The TDOA approach calculates the time difference in wave arrival at various sensor locations by utilizing signal and clock timing, along with wave comparisons [1], [31]. In this approach, the UAV is typically equipped with a tag antenna, whose position is unknown and requires estimation, while the tag communicates with anchor antennas, which are usually fixed with known positions. TDOA UAV tracking benefits from: simplicity in implementation, low cost, and compact sensor size. Nonetheless, TDOA performance could degrade if the signal bandwidth reduces [32]. Moreover, TDOA has another limitation which is the necessity for highly accurate time synchronization. This is a serious limitation due to the trade-off between accurate time synchronization and signal bandwidth [30].

UAVs can also be tracked using a GPS module, very popular among ground vehicles [20]. GPS communication between satellites and an onboard antenna provide the UAV with its position and linear velocity with respect to a reference coordinate while the orientation can be extracted using the onboard Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU). Note that various approaches (e.g., haversine distance and bearing formula), several parameters can be calculated such as spherical trigonometry, azimuth and elevation angles, and the absolute distance of the UAV from the tracking station [33]. Common challenges associated with the use of GPS for UAV tracking are multipath ranging errors, interference, and signal loss (e.g., indoors) [20], [34]. To ensure success of every UAV mission, onboard computers are typically loaded with backup algorithms reliant on sensor fusion (e.g., IMU and camera) to estimate UAV navigation until strong GPS signal is restored. The final tracking method discussed in this subsection is monopulse, widely deployed in radar technology. Monopulse can be used

to find angular displacement of a UAV via array antennas and beam forming [35]. These antennas create a beam and the signal reflected from the UAV becomes stronger as the UAV approaches center of the beam and weaker as the UAV moves farther away from the center of the beam.

D. UAV-aided Wireless Communications

High-speed wireless communication systems are essential for efficient use of UAVs. UAVs can be employed as a *UAV-aided wireless communication system* to provide wireless connectivity to other UAVs or devices located in zones without infrastructure coverage, for instance, areas devastated by natural disasters or areas that experience shadowing by urban or mountainous terrain [19], [36]. This type of communication is known as UAV-based Low-altitude Platforms (LAPs) often utilized as a backup solution for High-altitude Platforms (HAPs). An HAP system consists of an aircraft operating in the stratosphere and transmitting signals to the Earth over long distance. This means of communication offers a wider coverage and longer endurance when compared to UAV-based LAPs [37]. Nevertheless, UAV-based LAPs are cost effective, can enhance the performance of short-distance communication, and could allow for adaptive communication [19], [38]. The use of UAV-aided wireless communications can be divided into three distinct categories: (i) UAV-aided ubiquitous coverage [10], (ii) UAV-aided relaying [39], and (iii) UAV-aided information dissemination and data collection [19]. UAV-aided ubiquitous coverage employs UAVs to ensure that an established communication infrastructure provides seamless wireless coverage. To illustrate, a UAV could act as a backup station for a malfunctioning or overloaded Base Station (BS). In UAV-aided relaying, UAVs are used to enable wireless communication between distant users or user groups that lack a direct communication link (e.g., military applications). In UAV-aided information dissemination and data collection, one or more UAVs are deployed to collect or transmit information through a network of wireless devices (e.g., precision agriculture).

III. IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS

Common Identification Systems: An identification system is critical for the safe operation of both manned and unmanned vehicles serving in civilian and military applications. An identification system consists of a transponder, a radio frequency device that transmits a signal in response to receiving an interrogating signal, and ensures safe navigation and collision avoidance. More specifically, transponders in aircraft are responsible for three tasks: localization (absolute distance and azimuth angle), separation, and identification of aerial vehicles [40], [41]. Radar-like techniques are typically employed to locate an aircraft. Typically, once a manned the aircraft is in the radar's range for interrogation, identification is accomplished by assigning a special code to the aircraft via Air Traffic Control (ATC) which is afterwards transmitted to the ground station in addition to any other necessary information [42]. In this case, directional antennas are employed to broadcast interrogation signals and receive responses. Time of of signal

transmission and return enables aircraft range measurement while the direction in which the antenna is pointing when the signal is received is used to determine the aircraft azimuth angle. For the purposes of separation and identification of aerial vehicles, communication-like techniques are utilized. The aircraft communication responses include identifying information, including aircraft altitude [42]. According to the NATO definition, the transponder is a transmitter/receiver device that is designed to transmit a response signal when legitimately interrogated [40]. Typical aircraft identification system employs a number of different interrogators and transponders that work together to guarantee safe mission completion: Distance Measurement Equipment (DME) with UHF range, Tactical Air Navigation (TACAN) with UHF range, ATC with LF range, Traffic Collision Avoidance System (TCAS) with UHF range, Automatic Dependent Surveillance-broadcast (ADS-B) with UHF range, and Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) with UHF range [43].

Function of Identification Systems: DME provides the user aircraft with distance from the station measurement. TACAN supplies the aircraft with bearing (azimuth angle) and distance to the ground or a vessel navigation through the water. ATC assists in aircraft identification on air traffic control radars. TCAS reduces the incidence of Mid-air Collisions (MACo) between aircrafts, monitors the airspace and aircraft equipped employing a transponder, and warns the pilot of other aircraft navigating in the vicinity and presenting a risk. ADS-B helps with tracking aerial vehicles by defining the vehicle position using satellite navigation or other positioning sensors. IFF is one of the earliest identification systems involving a transponder that was developed by the Germans during WW-II around 1941 to distinguish friendly and hostile aircraft and the device was called German FuG 25A Erstling [44]. Since then, transponder research and technology for aerial vehicles have expanded to produce a variety of transponders designed for a variety of applications, such as DMEs, ADS-B, TACAN, and TCAS. IFF employs a transponder to listen for an interrogation signal and then sends a signal which identifies the broadcaster. Nowadays, IFF is essential for both civil and military identification and is compatible with ATC. The ADS-B allows to broadcast messages containing UAV location obtained by the GNSS along with other information collected by the on-board measurement units to ATC and other aerial vehicles. ADS-B has two operation modes, ADS-B In and ADS-B Out. The ADS-B Out mode periodically reports UAV position, velocity, and altitude to the ATC and the nearby aircraft. The transmitted data acts as an equivalent of a radar display and no external action is required. The ADS-B In mode allows for information exchange with the other vehicles and ATC related to Flight Information Service - Broadcast (FIS-B) [41].

RID Systems and Network Broadcasting Technologies: There exist many methods of UAV identification and the country of operation determines the approach used. Radio frequency is a growing technology that UAVs can utilize to broadcast their Remote Identification (RID) [45]. In the USA, RID modules consisting of a transceiver are utilized to broadcast location, speed, altitude, and other important




Fig. 3: RID Communication Technologies.

information to the ground stations. Furthermore, it is important to note that since March 2024 UAVs weighing 250 grams or more and all UAVs used for commercial purposes must be compliant with RID requirements. RID can be either built-in or can come a separate module, either way it should be able to broadcast UAV ID, emergency status, velocity, UAV location and altitude, control station location and elevation, and a time stamp. RID not only ensures safe sharing of skies with other aircraft, but also allows to achieve UAV swarm formations (see Fig. 3). As part of RID, radio-frequency transmitters can be used to broadcast periodical messages to advertise UAV presence for other devices in the network. Network broadcasting is a popular data transmission technique of the internet and services. Devices can access UAV ID through distributed data where the most popular network broadcasting technologies are cellular and satellite networks (SATCOM) [46] approximately UHF range. UAV RID is still to be implemented with SATCOM technology. The currently employed network broadcasting model requires the drone to be subscribed in the network of a mobile service or mobile services, normally cellular network [47]. The user must provide information about the UAV by registering with an embedded Subscriber Identification Module (eSIM) service by transmitting a request to the Mobile Network Operator (MNO). Next, the MNO verifies the provided information and communicates it to the Government Telecommunication Authority (GTA), requesting activation code and PIN to finalize the UAV registration [48]. In China and Russia, ADS-B system takes care of this function [4], [49]. Identification of UAVs is critically important since it allows to manage the controlled airspace by preventing unauthorized entrances which in turn ensures safety. UAVs can employ TCAS and ADS-B to realize the collision avoidance system [50] necessary for UAV swarm formations.

Identification and Positioning with UWB Radio Technology: Ultra-wideband (UWB) radio with SHF range is another method of UAV identification, which is increasingly researched and used for UAV positioning in 3D space [1], [8], [31], [51]. UWB transceiver technology, in addition to its low-cost implementation, has multiple advantages making it an optimal fit for a variety of applications (e.g., smartphones and smart watches) [1], [52], [53]. UWB signal is characterized with large bandwidth and short life-time resulting in good positioning accuracy (10 centimeters in a range of 100 meters) [1]. Moreover, UWB signal is distinguished by power efficiency, fast communication speed, short wavelength, robustness against multipath interference which enables UAV positioning in GPS-denied regions, and ability to penetrate obstacles facilitating Line-of-Sight (LOS) and Non-Line-of-Sight (NLOS) communication [1], [31]. Using UWB technology for UAV identification requires two main elements: anchors and tags [1]. UWB anchors constitute fixed (e.g., attached to structures or walls) or mobile (e.g., attached to smartphones or UAVs that have access to GPS) sensors whose position is known [1]. Tags, on the other hand, represent moving sensors whose position is unknown, such as a UAV equipped with a UWB unit. Each UWB-tag communicates with multiple UWB-anchors to establish the tags position in 3D space by transmitting messages containing UAV identification and a timestamp recorded using the clock of the transceiver that is transmitting the signal [1].

IV. ENERGY STORAGE SYSTEMS

Energy generation and management in UAVS is not only a technical consideration, but rather a fundamental element that shapes the operational viability and sustainability. Hence, Energy Storage Systems (ESSs) are one of the central components of UAV avionics. The market offers multiple different power sources and ESSs for UAVs, such as petrol and diesel combustion engines, Fuel Cells (FCs), batteries, solar cells, and/or battery hybrid systems. ESSs and the power sources that comprise them are evaluated and compared with respect to their energy and power densities.

A. Combustion Engine

Powerful unmanned aerial transportation systems characterized with long duration flight are in great demand and petrol-powered UAVs have been developed to fill this niche [54]–[56]. However, it should be noted that gasoline-powered UAVs has not been developing at the same pace as electric-powered UAVs which have seen significant growth in both research and application. Petrol and diesel engines both belong to the family of internal combustion engines. An internal combustion engine is a well-established system composed of a combustion chamber, an intake valve, fuel injectors, pistons, and an exhaust valve. Note that petrol engines requires spark plugs, while diesel fuel self-ignites under extreme pressure and does not require spark plugs [57]. Furthermore, petrol engines have lower efficiency than diesel engines [57]. Meanwhile, diesel engines could be challenging to start in cold temperatures creating a need for heating up the diesel before

entering the chamber [58]. Petrol-powered vehicles utilize Ethanol, Methanol, Kerosene, or Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) Propane, which allow the UAV to fly for more than 24 hours [2]. The main advantages of combustion engines are the gradual reduction of UAV weight during flight due to fuel consumption, high energy density, and longer flight time when compared to electric-powered UAVs. On the other hand, combustion engines are large in size rendering them unsuitable for smaller UAVs, they are also environmentally unfriendly, and require continuous maintenance.

B. Hydrogen Fuel Cells

A FC is a device that converts chemical energy into electrical energy. Notably, a FC ESS is capable of producing energy for a longer period of time than batteries. FCs that use chemical energy of hydrogen can be employed by UAVs and come in a variety of forms, for instance, an Alkaline FC (AFC), a Phosphoric Acid FCs (PAFC), a Proton Exchange Membrane (PEM) FC (PEMFC), a Solid Acid FC (SAFC), a High Temperature FC (HTFC), and an Electric Storage FC (ESFC) [59]. The AFCs are distinguished by simple structure and high energy efficiency. However, AFCs have short operating life-cycle because of the eroding and have environmental impacts [60]. The principal of operation of the PEMFC is similar to that of a battery system. More specifically, the PEMFC consists of two electrodes, an anode and a cathode, separated by an electrolyte membrane. This way electron flow is generated by delivering fuel to the anode and supplying oxidant to the cathode leading to an electrochemical reaction. One of the key benefits of hydrogen FCs, is the fact that they use hydrogen as fuel and air as the oxidant, resulting in only two process byproducts: water and air. Using PAFCs, the fuel is hydrogen while the electrolyte is liquid phosphoric acid [61]. PEMFCs could maintain high efficiency of both energy and power densities provided that they operate at low temperatures [62]. Consequently, PEMFCs are the preferred choice for electric vehicle applications due to their compact size, light weight, and rich power source, making them a potential fit for UAVs. Overall, FCs are marked by a significantly higher energy density than batteries. Curiously, in a recent study a fixed-wing UAV using a FC was able to complete a flight of 24 hours [59].

To summarize, the main advantages of using FCs as an ESS for UAVs are the high energy and power densities, absence of noise, no direct pollution, and fast refueling. Furthermore, similarly to combustion engines, the weight of the UAV reduces gradually during the flight allowing for longer flight time. Meanwhile, the persistent challenges of FC use for UAVs are their large size and heavy weight.

C. Batteries

Analogously to fuel cells, batteries are devices that convert chemical energy to electrical energy. However, while fuel cells use fuel to generate energy, batteries store the energy they require. Different types of batteries are utilized for UAVs, for instance, Alkaline, Lithium Ion (Li-Ion), Lithium Polymer

(Li-Po), Lithium-air (Li-air), Lithium-sulfur (Li-S), Lithium-Thionyl-chloride (Li-SoCl₂), Lead acid (Pb-acid), Nickel cadmium (NiCad), Nickel Metal Hydride (NiMH), and Zinc Oxide (Zn-O₂) [63]. One of the most popular choices for UAVs are Li-Ion and Li-Po batteries due to their low-cost value per unit [64]. Moreover, Li-Ion batteries are compact, light-weight, and capable of supplying reasonable amount of energy and power per unit of battery mass when compared with other rechargeable batteries [65]. Given same weight and volume, Li-air batteries could provide higher energy density (~ 5-10 times) than the Li-Ion batteries [66], [67]. However, the significant shortcomings of the Li-air batteries are the limited number of discharge cycles, the slow rate of recharge, and the high risk of damage in presence of water vapor. Li-S and Li-SoCl₂ batteries are known for their higher energy density per kilogram (kg) [68]. However, the Li-SoCl₂ type is more expensive than the Li-Ion and Li-Po. It is worth noting that Li-S batteries are more cost-effective and are expected to receive wider application in UAV ESSs in the near future. Battery suitability can be evaluated and compared based on a multitude of factors, for example, weight, volume, energy density, power density, cost per unit, life-cycle, safety and maintenance, available power management techniques (state of health and charge), and others. Each of the above-listed characteristics plays a critical role for selecting the best option for optimal UAV operation. Energy density defines the maximum UAV range, while power density specifies the UAV acceleration capabilities. Life-cycle measures the number of times that the battery can be used before replacement. Weight and volume affect the UAV flight range. Cost per unit plays a critical role of battery production, availability, and affordability (will it be affordable for the public? will it be cost-effective and of interest for certain industries?). Table I presents the main features of different types of batteries. The compared characteristics include nominal cell voltage (V), life-cycle, unit cost in terms of US dollars to watt hour (\$US/Wh), efficiency, power density watt per kg (W/kg), and energy density (Wh/kg). The information used for the comparison was collected from [66], [67], [69], [70].

Use of batteries for UAVs is very common due to multiple advantages of this ESS, namely absence of noise and direct pollution, ease of replacement of faulty parts due to multiple cell structure, and ease of transport and recharge. Nonetheless, disadvantages are also present, namely, limited number of recharge cycles and low energy density when compared to FCs and petrol sources.

D. Solar Cells and Solar Power

Power as an ESS for aircraft and UAVs in particular is still in its infancy, solar energy has significant potential for offering carbon-free solutions for aerospace. There are three main technologies employed for converting energy of the sun into electricity, namely, photovoltaic (PV) cell, solar thermal collectors for heating and cooling (SHC), and concentrated solar power (CSP). Thus far, PV cells are the only technology utilized by aerospace applications. PV cells are devices that directly convert sun rays into electrical energy which is used

TABLE I: Comparison between different type of batteries in terms of nominal cell voltage, life-cycle, cost, power and energy density, and charge/discharge efficiency.

Type	Alkaline	Li-Ion	Li-Po	Li-air	Li-S	Li-SoCl ₂	Pb-acid	NiCad	NiMH	Zn-O ₂
Nominal cell voltage (V)	1.3-1.5	3.6-3.8	2.7-3	2.91	2.5-2.6	3.5	2.1	1.2	1.2	1.45-1.65
Life-cycle	500	400-1,200	500	700	N/A	N/A	350	2000	180-2,000	100
Cost (\$US/Wh)	2.2-2.4	0.9-1	2.2-2.4	N/A	0.6-0.9	0.5-0.6	0.6-0.7	2.5-3	0.8-0.9	0.3-0.4
Charge/Discharge efficiency (%)	90	80-90	90	93	N/A	6-94	50-95	70-90	66-92	60-70
Power density (W/kg)	50	250-340	245-430	11,400	2,600	18	180	150	250-1,000	100
Energy density (Wh/kg)	89-190	100-265	100-265	11,000	2,510	500-700	30-40	40-60	60-120	442

for propulsion, powering of on-board systems, and the excess is used to recharge batteries employed in the absence of or low sunlight conditions. Particles of solar energy known as photons are absorbed by the semiconductor material composing the PV cell [71]. The structure of a PV cell is made up of a positive and a negative layer, forming a junction between them known as the p-n junction. Once a sufficient amount of photons is absorbed by the semiconductor material of the PV cell, electrons are forced to flow in one direction creating an electric field at the p-n junction resulting in a flow of electricity. In this simple and direct manner sunlight is converted into electric current, which can be stored in a battery. The first solar powered aircraft carried out a flight in 1974 [72] where the fuel system was composed of 4096 silicon PV cells and the operating efficiency was near 11%. The Airbus Zephyr, the most advanced solar powered UAS, operates in the stratosphere flying at an altitude close to 70,000 feet [73]. The wingspan of the Zephyr is 25 meters which allows it to carry a large number of solar panels, in turn, enabling continuous flight for long periods of time. Typically, solar cells are installed on UAV fixed wings [74], and in order to achieve energy maximization a large surface of solar panels is needed. This requirement makes PV cells unfit for small scale UAVs. Furthermore, the solar panels require sunlight to operate which is challenging in the event of limited exposure or complete absence of direct sunlight. To summarize, although solar cells have no direct operating costs like fuel or battery power, they require complicated support systems, have a relatively high upfront integration cost, and add a significant weight load to the UAV system.

V. PERCEPTION AND NAVIGATION SYSTEMS

UAV navigation is a process of self-vehicle localization which helps the UAV to plan on how to safely and quickly proceed from the current location to the target destination (motion planing and control). Successful navigation mission completion requires the UAV to have access to its own location, heading angle, and navigation speed which are commonly referred to as UAV motion state (composed of attitude commonly known as orientation, position, and linear velocity) in 3D space. The earliest navigation methods included piloting, celestial navigation, and dead-reckoning. Piloting method of navigation utilizes visual natural and human-made landmarks (e. g., towns, rivers, lighthouses, or buoys) to enable the vehicle's position determination. Celestial navigation relies on

position determination using sun, moon, stars, and planets. Dead reckoning, classified as an inertial navigation approach, calculates vehicle's current position based on the last known position, and advancing it considering known or estimated linear velocity (integrated using position information) over elapsed time and course. Modern navigation has come a long way, and UAVs commonly rely on GNSS and SATCOM for routing (for determining their position). State-of-the-art UAV navigation techniques include: satellite navigation, inertial navigation, and vision-based inertial navigation. While some methods are used as main navigation techniques, others are employed as backup solutions. Safe completion of a UAV mission is paramount, as such, employing multiple navigation techniques at the same time ensures that reliable navigation data can be obtained in all traveling conditions.

A. Navigation Sensors and Multi-sensor Fusion

A typical UAV is equipped with exteroceptive (for the external environment) and proprioceptive (vehicle status and operation) sensors that enable estimation of the UAV motion states. Commonly used sensors are GPS, IMU (3-axis accelerometer, 3-axis gyroscope, and optional 3-axis magnetometer), UWB tags and anchors, laser lightning and Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR), vision units (monocular, stereo, or RGB-D cameras), magnetic, and ultrasonic sensors [1], [34], [75]. GPS is a satellite-based sensor that supplies vehicle's position, speed, heading/direction, and time information provided that signals from at least four satellites are available [1], [34]. Although GPS is widely used as a standard positioning system, GPS is unavailable indoors and is subject to signal obstructions, multipath, fading, and denial [1], [34]. Furthermore, GPS does not provide vehicle's orientation. Other common well-researched GPS shortcomings include satellite clock error, receiver clock error, Ionospheric delay, Tropospheric delay, satellite orbital (ephemeris) errors, receiver noise, and errors attributed to satellite geometry. IMU is typically employed for the vehicle's orientation determination. Although the use of IMU in conjunction with dead reckoning can prove useful for short-path navigation, it is unreliable for long-path navigation due to error drift and accumulation. UWB technology previously discussed in Section III has a concept of operation similar to that of satellite-based positioning. UWB tag(s) can enable the vehicle to localize its position in 3D space given known fixed or moving anchors [1]. However, UWB sensors are susceptible to measurement noise. Vision units




Fig. 4: Conceptual diagram of perception, motion planning and control.

determine vehicle's position given earth-frame by tracking feature points using two different instantaneous frames (stereo camera) or two consecutive frames (monocular camera) [34]. It is worth noting that vision units could face challenges in low-texture environments and positioning accuracy degradation during high-altitude flights. LiDAR is a distance measurement sensor, whose principal of operation is analogous to that of radar but rather than using radio waves LiDAR employs laser pulse (distance is calculated by recording the time elapsed between emitting a pulse and receiving its reflection). LiDAR is distinguished by high speed and accuracy. However, the high accuracy is achieved by collecting large data volume that can cause UAV on-board computer to overload, especially in unstructured areas (e.g., machinery zones or shelving). Furthermore, the high cost of the LiDAR unit makes it unfit for low-cost UAVs.

Combining information from multiple sensors allows to obtain comprehensive knowledge of vehicle's motion state. It is achieved through multi-sensor fusion, the process of data integration between different types of sensors to enable state estimation of an augmented kinematical system while improving the estimation accuracy. In navigation, multi-sensor fusion is employed along with estimator or filter design to enable full navigation determination. For instance, GPS cannot provide vehicle's orientation information, while IMU cannot provide reliable information of vehicle's position and linear velocity. Integrating GPS with IMU (GPS-IMU fusion) results in an augmented kinematical system referred to as navigation kinematics which allows for collecting reliable navigation data. Examples of multi-sensor fusion include GPS-IMU [76], vision-based navigation (vision unit + IMU) [34], LiDAR-based IMU [77], UWB-IMU [1], and others. The estimation accuracy and reliability can be further improved by combining multiple types of multi-sensor fusion. One of the challenges of integrating data from multiple sources is the varying frequency of data measurements. For instance, a typical IMU will supply gyroscope and accelerometer measurements at a rate of 200 Hz, while low-cost vision unit could supply images at a rate of 20 Hz [20], [34]. Therefore, multi-sensor fusion data collection and processing algorithms must account for frequency variations between different sensors.

B. Map-based vs Mapless Navigation

Map-based navigation involves determining location of a vehicle within a predefined map or environment. A most common type of map-based navigation is satellite-based navigation that involves fusion of onboard sensors, namely, GPS and a 6-axis IMU (3-axis accelerometer and 3-axis gyroscope). The fused data are forwarded to an estimator to identify the navigation state of a vehicle, for instance, a UAV. The onboard GPS mounted at the top of the UAV requires persistent access to the signal from at least four different satellites [1]. GPS receiver onboard a UAV listens to the radio signals broadcast by GPS satellites. Distance from each satellite is accurately determined using precise transmission time t_1 measured by satellite on-board atomic clocks using the following formula:

$$\text{Distance} = \text{velocity of light} \times \text{transit time}$$

where transit time = $t_2 - t_1$ with t_1 being time signal at transmission and t_2 being the exact time of arrival. Note that the GPS system is composed of three segments, namely space segment, control segment, and user segment, where the U.S. Space Force develops, maintains, and operates the space and control segments [43]. Satellite-based navigation considers a predefined mapped areas. To address indoor navigation missions and GPS-signal loss, Inertial-based Navigation Systems (INS) can be adopted, such as UWB-IMU-based navigation, LiDAR-based IMU, or vision-aided inertial navigation (vision unit and a 6-axis IMU) [1], [20], [34], [77]. The above-listed techniques consider unknown UAV localization problem. In the event of a UAV traveling through an unknown environment mapless navigation techniques are needed, for instance, Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM) could be considered. SLAM is a challenging process involving concurrent estimation of an unknown UAV state and an unknown map of the environment (navigation via mapless system) [78]–[80]. If a vision-unit is involved in the estimation process, the localization and mapping problem is denoted as Visual SLAM (VSLAM) [79], [80].

C. Estimator Design from Sensor Fusion

Unfortunately, full-state UAV navigation cannot be achieved by using multi-sensor fusion measurements directly. Although

UAV navigation state can be reconstructed algebraically, it has been proved unreliable due to measurement uncertainties [20]. Moreover, navigation state is essential for controlling UAV motion and using its direct algebraic reconstruction from multi-sensor fusion measurement can lead to actuator failure and UAV destabilization due to sensor reading drifts and noise [1], [20], [34]. Consequently, an estimator design crucial for combining measurements from multiple sensors, establishing error criteria, adaptively correcting and smoothly estimating UAV navigation state, estimating UAV navigation hidden-state (e.g., linear velocity), and robustly rejecting sensor measurement uncertainties. Navigation estimators can be classified as either deterministic or stochastic. Deterministic navigation estimators are a good option when high-quality sensors are used, and examples include state-space linear observer design or nonlinear complementary filters [78], [80]. Stochastic navigation estimators can be linear and nonlinear. Linear-type stochastic estimators include Kalman filters (KFs) [81]–[83]. Nonlinear-type stochastic navigation estimators include extended Kalman filters (EKFs) [84] which require linearization around nominal point, unscented Kalman filters (UKFs), Particle filters (PFs) [85], [86], and Lyapunov-based nonlinear complementary stochastic filters which use Stochastic Differential Equations (SDEs) and adopt Ito’s or Stratonovich’s integrals to mitigate noise stochasticity and address navigation nonlinearity [1], [20], [34]. Ito’s approach addresses white noise, while Stratonovich’s approach is applicable for colored noise [87], [88]. Lyapunov-based SDE Ito and Stratonovich-based filters are more computationally-efficient and produce better results than KF, EKF, UKF, and PFs. The above-listed estimators are model-based. Model-free based estimators include learning based approaches (Lyapunov-based Adaptive Neural Observer (LyANO) or Reinforcement Learning-based Observer (RL-O)) [89]. Fig. 5.(a) illustrates estimator design classification.

Fig. 4 presents the process diagram of perception, motion planning, and control of UAVs. On-board sensors (e.g., GPS, IMU, LiDAR, camera) collect measurements corrupted with noise and constant drifts. Next, sensor fusion algorithms combine different sensor measurements and supply data to the filter (e.g., KF, EKF, UKF, or nonlinear stochastic filter). The filter typically completes three different tasks: filtering out measurement noises and drifts, estimating UAV current location or navigation state, and observing hidden states (e.g., UAV linear velocity in the 3-axis motion is typically not available). At the next step, the guidance process completes motion planning and generates the shortest obstacle-free trajectory. The final link in the process is the controller that accesses the UAV current state with respect to the desired state determined based on the desired trajectory and thereafter applies the trajectory tracking approach to guide the UAV to the desired destination.

VI. PATH PLANNING, COLLISION AVOIDANCE, AND CONTROL

A. Path Planning

Path planning and Collision Avoidance (CA) are the key elements of UAV communication and trajectory control auton-




Fig. 5: Classification of estimator and trajectory control design.

omy. Optimal selection of a UAV path can reduce communication distance (see Section II), in turn enhancing the capacity performance (fly time and energy management). Identifying the best UAV path is a complicated task due to the fact that a large number of variables have to be optimized to produce the most suitable trajectory from the current UAV pose to the desired destination which is challenging making it NP hard problem. Also, path planning is subject to a finite transition constraints. Additionally, planning the optimal UAV path involves considering such crucial elements as fuel status and limitations, nearby obstacles (potential collision hazards and terrain type), obstacle avoidance strategies, path length, optimality and robustness of the solution, cost and time-efficiency, and system connectivity [90]. These elements could be time-variant and challenging to model. It is worth noting that the planning process is further complicated by the fact that UAVs navigate in 3D space as opposed to ground vehicles traveling in 2D. Unfortunately, an exact algorithm for identifying the optimal path exists for neither 2D nor 3D space navigation. Consequently, path planning of the UAV environment is typically investigated through one of the three strategies: cell decomposition, roadmap, and potential field. Cell decomposition techniques represent the environment space as a series of non-overlapping cells creating a navigable structure for the UAV [11]. Commonly applied cell decomposition approaches include exact, approximate, and adaptive [91]. Exact cell decomposition approach structures the environment space into non-overlapping polygon regions applying either trapezoidal or boustrophedon decomposition [92]. This approach has a

limitation of not possessing uniform shape or structure of the environment. Approximate cell decomposition, on the other hand, divides the environment into a group of structured cells such that every cell is described using a Cartesian coordinate form [91]. Finally, adaptive cell decomposition formulates the environment only in zones where obstacles are present by applying decomposition recursively once an obstacle is identified [93].

Trajectory planning can be broadly categorized into two main types: global trajectory planning and local trajectory planning. Global trajectory planning typically uses either classical algorithms or AI-based methods. Classical algorithms include A-star (A*), Voronoi Diagrams, Probabilistic Roadmaps (PRM), Rapidly-exploring Random Trees (RRT), RRTstar (RRT*), the Fast Marching Method (FMM), Dijkstra's Algorithm, and Dubins Curves. AI-based approaches encompass evolutionary algorithms and neural networks. Examples of evolutionary algorithms are Genetic Algorithms (GA), Simulated Annealing, Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO), Artificial Bee Colony (ABC), Ant Colony Optimization (ACO), the Equilibrium Optimizer (EO), and the Grey Wolf Optimizer (GWO). Neural network techniques include artificial neural networks, Reinforcement Learning (RL), and Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL). In contrast, local trajectory planning focuses on real-time adaptability using mathematical optimization techniques, the Dynamic Window Approach (DWA), Model Predictive algorithm, and Artificial Potential Fields (APF). Fig. 6 illustrates the taxonomy of these common trajectory planning methods.

Cell decomposition techniques result in an unbounded range of movement for UAVs resulting in a very large search space. Roadmap approaches consist in creating a connectivity graph built of linked nodes that represent key unoccupied space [94]. Popular roadmap approaches include visibility graph, Voronoi diagram, PRM, RRTs, RRT*, A*, and evolutionary techniques [95]. Visibility graph consists in forming a graph representation of all potential visible connections in the environment which is tedious in the construction process [12]. Voronoi diagram offers an alternate faster approach than visibility graph as it decomposes the space into a set of polygon regions such that each region is formed around a single environment [12]. PRM is a probabilistic approach that deconstructs the space into a group of randomly placed connectivity nodes where environment knowledge is needed in the process of path construction [94]. Similar to the PRM, RRTs approach requires highly detailed knowledge of the environment to design an explorative branching strategy originating from a root node to the target destination [94]. Artificial intelligence evolutionary techniques can also be utilized for path planning and examples include ACO (e.g., salesman problem), PSO, ABC, and Optimization Equilibrium algorithms [96]–[98]. Both cell decomposition and roadmap techniques construct an environment representation based on prior knowledge of the environment. Finally, APF method focuses on calculating directional attractive forces in the direction of the target location, whereas obstacles generate repulsive forces. APF techniques are computationally efficient and allow the UAV to travel accurately and quickly to the desired destination.




Fig. 6: Illustration of common trajectory planning techniques.

B. Collision Avoidance

CA techniques are typically incorporated into the planning algorithms either using a reactive or a deliberative approach [13], [99]–[101]. The reactive approach relies on real-time information about the surroundings gathered by local on-board sensors allowing for fast response to sudden environment changes with the limitation of possible stuck in local minima. Deliberative planning, on the other hand, requires an accurate updated map of the environment to perform the path planning calculation and identify the optimal collision free route to the target location. Consequently, deliberative planning is challenged with higher computational power needs and unsuitability for dynamic environments. Perception is an indispensable step towards obstacle detection and forms the basis for CA approaches. Popular perception and CA sensors include stereo or monocular cameras, thermal or infrared cameras, infrared devices, ultrasonic systems, LiDAR, solid-state systems, or optomechanical devices. For commercial aircraft, TCAS offers resolution advisories, however it is sensitive to jamming as will be discussed later. A UAV can use TCAS in conjunction with ADS-B to achieve CA [50]. Once obstacles have been located, there are three popular control maneuver actions that can be applied to avoid a conflict. These actions that can be applied alone or in combination and include “climb/descent” (altitude control maneuver), “turn right/left” (heading control maneuver), and acceleration/deceleration (speed control maneuver) [50]. Popular CA algorithms are as follows: geometric approach (relies on distance between UAV and obstacle) [13], force-field (relies on attractive (final destination) or repulsive forces (obstacles)) [99], optimization-based [100], sense-and-avoid (deviates the UAV from its original route and return it back to reduce computation cost) [101].

C. Trajectory Control

Trajectory tracking control executes the planned path. One of the major challenges of controlling a UAV is the fact that in most cases it is an underactuated system. For example, quadrotor UAVs have a total of six outputs (three rotational angles (Roll-Pitch-Yaw angles) and translational position in x-y-z axes) but only total of four inputs (thrust and three rotational torques) [7]. Thus, the strong interdependence between UAV position and attitude overcomplicates the control system design. To address the underactuation issue, typical controllers are designed in a cascaded manner with an outer and an inner control [7], [102]. The outer control receives the desired (reference) and actual UAV positions and based on the position error generates the required thrust and the desired UAV orientation (rotational angles). The inner control receives the desired and actual UAV orientation and generates the required rotational torques. Given the required thrust and rotational torques, the necessary rotor speed can be calculated [7], [102]. Note that to ensure UAV stability, the inner control (attitude control) must be designed faster in terms of control and response than the outer control (position control) [7]. Fig. 5.(b) presents classification of trajectory control design. Common controllers include linear control [103], optimal control [104], feedback linearization [105], Lyapunov-based [7], [102], backstepping [106], Sliding Mode Control (SMC) [106], Model Predictive Control (MPC) [105], Fuzzy Logic Control (FLC) and Adaptive Fuzzy Neural (AFN) [107], and learning based approaches (Lyapunov-based Adaptive Neural Control (LyANC) or reinforcement learning (RL)) [89], [108]. The UAV model is highly nonlinear and is typically described with respect to the Special Euclidean Group $SE(3)$. Hence, the linear control design relies on linearizing the UAV model around multiple nominal points where each point represents certain UAV pose configuration. Afterwards, a gain scheduling approach that switch between different proportional-integral-derivative PID controllers is designed such that the PID control parameters change with respect to the linearized UAV model at its current nominal point [109]. The gain scheduling-based PID controller is a standard for tracking control of UAVs and airplanes due to the simplicity of its design and implementation. However, it is not suitable for fast maneuvers.

Optimal control minimizes control inputs which, in turn, reduces the energy used by rotors as well as limits the tracking trajectory error. Optimal control approaches include Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) and Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG) [104]. Feedback Linearization (FBL) starts with formulating the UAV model in a state-space form. It is worth noting that for FBL the model has to be restructured into a fully-actuated form which is typically satisfied around nominal points. The advanced version of FBL can be merged with a Control Barrier Function (CBF) to enhance the tracking control while ensuring collision avoidance [105]. The nonlinear family includes such controllers as Lyapunov-based, backstepping, and SMC which use the UAV nonlinear model directly [7], [102] allowing for fast maneuvers. By extracting the nonlinear control algorithm from a Lyapunov candidate function it becomes possible to guarantee error reduction

toward zero or to the neighborhood of the origin [7], [102]. Moreover, tracking control algorithms can be combined for optimal performance. For instance, it is common to merge backstepping control with SMC-type controllers [106] or with FBL. SMC subfamily consists of classic SMC [110], fast terminal SMC (FTSMC) [106], nonsingular terminal SMC (NTSMC) [111], fractional terminal SMC (FrTSMC) [112], and super twisting SMC (STSMC) [113] where each type has its own characteristics. MPC is an optimization-based control approach also known as a receding horizon control since the prediction horizon is shifted over the processing time [105]. MPC is extracted from a custom-built objective function that penalizes components, such as tracking error, control effort, uncertainties, and disturbances, among others [105]. Although MPC is able to handle constraints on states and inputs, its shortcoming is higher computational cost when compared to the above-mentioned controllers. Finally, learning-based controllers are model free and they operate using either Lyapunov-based neural adaptive or reinforcement learning [89], [108]. Learning-based controllers utilize an approximated UAV model that is tuned iteratively until reasonable performance is achieved.

VII. ELECTRONIC WARFARE AND UAVS

Warfare has long been studied by adversaries to assess the strengths and weaknesses of their opponents, with the aim of minimizing risks. Key factors on the battlefield include military planning, which ensures communication between all forces, both on the battlefield and at staff headquarters; air defense, which utilizes radar to detect incoming airborne threats and processes intelligence received through landlines or data links; air-superiority aircraft, which employ quick reaction alerts to disrupt or slow enemy air patrols; defense suppression, which uses radar for terrain-following and target acquisition; and offensive operations, which rely on radar to locate targets and guide missiles [114]. The electromagnetic (EM) spectrum, along with directed energy, constitutes a fundamental component of electronic warfare. Electronic warfare can therefore be defined as the science of maintaining friendly use of the EM spectrum while denying its use to the enemy. Specifically, it seeks to control the EM spectrum, potentially disrupting or blocking enemy radar signals and data communications, thereby rendering their systems inoperative. The research community is actively working on developing advanced strategies and techniques that leverage the EM spectrum to protect friendly UAVs from adversarial threats while disrupting or neutralizing hostile UAV operations [114], [115]. The rapid growth of digitally-operated aerial vehicles further positions cyberattacks as a crucial domain within electronic warfare. Common electronic warfare cyberattack threats targeting UAVs can be categorized into three main areas: UAV-to-command center coordination, UAV-to-UAV coordination, and UAV functionality. UAV-to-command center coordination threats include eavesdropping attacks, Man-in-the-Middle (MITM) attacks, jamming attacks, and Wi-Fi-based attacks. UAV-to-UAV coordination threats involve dispatch system attacks, ADS-B (Automatic Dependent Surveillance-




Fig. 7: Taxonomy of UAV electronic warfare attacks and countermeasures.

Broadcast) attacks, TCAS (Traffic Collision Avoidance System) induced collisions, and TCAS-specific attacks. UAV functionality threats typically focus on the exploitation of recorded video feeds, Denial-of-Service (DoS) attacks, and GPS spoofing. Countermeasures against these threats fall into three categories: prevention, detection, and mitigation. Prevention countermeasures involves measures such as access control, information protection, and careful equipment selection. Detection countermeasures relies on identifying anomalies or detecting the presence of attack agents. Mitigation countermeasure strategies include neutralizing or avoiding the attack, adding redundancy, implementing fail-safe protocols, and addressing uncertainties. For more details visit [116]. Fig. 7 illustrates the taxonomy of these common UAV cyberattack threats and countermeasures.

A. Destructive and Non-destructive Cyberattacks

Cyberattacks can be broadly classified as destructive and non-destructive [117]. Non-destructive cyberattack approaches refers to the situation when there is no direct destruction of the affected system. For instance, non-destructive cyberattack methods can be seen in a form of protected information leakage, use of unlawful information, integrity violation, and/or denial of a service. Leakage of protected information can occur when UAV downlink channel information is accessed [118]. An example of unlawful information use includes accessing non-public services without lawful authorization [118]. Destroying or changing UAV's data represent an incident of integrity violation [119]. Non-destructive cyberattacks can be done via Denial-of-Service (DoS) attacks or Distributed DoS (DDoS) attacks through disabling real-time activities by systematically sending requests. Further examples of non-destructive cyberattacks include malware, an active attack (e.g., MITM), Address Resolution Protocol (ARP) spoofing, multi-layered jamming, blockhole, and deauthentication attacks [120]. MITM attacks secretly intervene into multi-UAV system communication links penetrating the communication channel between the legitimate sender and the receiver to steal or modify information packets. Spoofing attacks bypasses

the predefined access control rules of communication network in response to a specific target request [121]. In other words, spoofing occurs when an unknown unsafe source of communication is disguised as a known trusted source. In case of GPS spoofing, forged location information is entered into a program to produce false signals, which in turn are broadcast with Universal Software Radio Peripheral (USR) [122]. As a result, UAV receives false location and time information invalidating all of its GPS functions. Multi-layered jamming targets radio communication and disturbs information transmission and reception. Blockhole attack is a routing cyber warfare threat, that presents itself as a route node, projects false optimized real-time routing path to the target node (in response to a request), and instead of relaying information packets, absorbs them. De-authentication attack consists in the adversary transmitting de-authentication packets to interrupt or disconnect the target UAV connection and gain control over the system.

Destructive cyberattack methods focus on lower layers of the Open Systems Inter-connection (OSI) mainly targeting individual hardware elements necessary to the use of multiple systems and mechanical systems [123]. Moreover, destructive cyberattack can focus on overheating the UAV battery system [123]. UAVs heavily rely on wireless communication, and as a result, the most common electronic warfare threats for UAVs include service disruption, hijacking, data integrity damage, and remote code execution [124]. Besides, GCSs can be targeted as part of the electronic warfare. Fig. 8 illustrates multiple electronic warfare attack techniques and anti-jamming mitigation. Furthermore, malware is a dangerous tool of electronic warfare. Malware, software designed to cause disruption, can infect one or more UAVs by spreading through a networked group or arriving from a GCS with the objective of taking control over the UAVs. Another common destructive threat are the Hardware Trojans that focus on hardware level malicious modifications to the flight controller circuit [125]. The underlying systems that comprise the flight controller are complex, and thereby the Trojans are commonly used. Introduction of the imitation hardware to the supply chain forms a security breach of the circuit itself resulting in




Fig. 8: UAVs in the middle of electronic warfare illustrating spoofing, MITM, jamming attacks, and anti-jamming reactions.

permanent failure of components potentially leading to UAV destruction [125].

B. Attacking Transponders

Identification systems discussed in Section III are crucial for the safe operation of UAVs and transponders are their essential component. Due to their importance, UAV transponders are an key target of electronic warfare. ADS-B can be attacked through unprotected messages transmitted in plain text format [126] with no authentication methods used to prevent message tampering [127]. This type of attack can be classified as message elimination, spoofing-based message infusion, and message fabrication [127]. Message elimination utilizes external transmitters to introduce constructive or destructive interference into the ADS-B signal. Constructive interference involves introduction of bit errors into the ADS-B message causing the UAV's receiver to disregard the detected messages, and therefore, weakening the UAV's transmitter awareness [126]. On the other side, destructive interference involves sending an attacking signal which constitutes an inverse of the original ADS-B signal causing complete or partial destruction of the message [126]. Spoofing-based message infusion focuses on injecting malicious messages into the airspace, causing ADS-B receivers to perceive appearance of illegitimate aircraft. Note that ADS-B does not use any authentication methods in messages. Hence, message infusion can be applied using commercially available devices. Furthermore, the broadcast false messages could target either the UAVs themselves which is commonly known as "aircraft target ghost injection" or target the ground command center which is termed "command center ghost injection". The targeted ADS-B receiver will see an illusive aerial vehicle in the airspace as the attacker anonymously manipulates the air traffic [128]. Message fabrication represents manipulation of ADS-B signals by introducing false information which ADS-B receivers regard it as interpret. In contrast to message infusion, message fabrication manipulates real messages transmitted by legitimate UAVs. Consequently, the level of tampering varies in accordance with the intention. The attacker has to broadcast a very high-powered ADS-B

signal in order to substitute parts or the whole of the ADS-B message, which is commonly known as overshadowing [128]. All of the three types of ADS-B message attacks pose a serious threat since they can allow enemies to masquerade as potential allies.

TCAS resolution advisories do not predict long term effects resulting in a challenging issue commonly known as TCAS induced collision, where the suggested resolution advisories presented by TCAS could cause a collision [129]. Moreover, TCAS is known to pose a safety concern as it is not designed to withstand cyberattacks (e.g., jamming [130]). The bad actors could take advantage of this weakness and jam the 1090 MHz channel to stop the aerial vehicle from tracking potential intruders. Nonetheless, these attacks can be spotted and addressed [130]. Popular and challenging to counteract jamming attacks are known as "All-Call Flood" and "Squitter Flood". The "All-Call Flood" attacks leverage All-call interrogation and use the 1030 MHz channel to trigger all nearby Mode S transponders to respond with their 24-bit International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) code flooding 1090 MHz reply channel [130]. The "Squitter Flood" attack represents spoofing actions to the nearby transponders in the form of transmitted replies on the 1090 MHz channel which forces the transponders to continuously track a "false" aerial vehicle [131]. These two types of attacks increase the chances of Near Midair Collision (NMACo) events. Nonetheless, the attacker might not gain full control over the NMACo occurrence. Other types of transponder attacks unrelated to channel flooding are termed "Phantom Aircraft" attacks. In these cases the attacker may succeed to generate accurate Mode S replies and to be perceived as a moving airplane by the TCAS transponders [129]. Consequently, the TCAS will assume that these replies are received from an actual aircraft and will be forced into tracking it.

C. Jamming and Anti-jamming

UAVs can be subject to constant jamming attacks [130], where malicious equipment is dedicated to broadcasting a continuous high power interference signal occupying the

channel and impeding the legitimate UAV's packet reception [132]. Reactive jamming attacks are energy efficient techniques since malicious signal is sent only when transmission of legitimate data packets is detected [132]. Deceptive, random and periodic jamming attacks are commonly employed but are less effective [133]. Man-in-the-middle attacks and spoofing are typical attacks that affect reconnaissance data confidentiality and integrity with the aim of causing loss of wireless connection for vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) and vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) communications in vehicular ad-hoc networks (VANETs) [134]. In VANETs, counteracting jamming attacks are critically important, since any connection loss could potentially lead to vehicle collision or loss. This may not only result in mission failure but also pose a public safety risk. When targeting wireless connection loss in V2V and V2I communications in VANETs, jamming attackers could utilize a variety of strategies, such as constant, reactive, and deceptive jamming discussed above [5]. Therefore, anti-jamming mitigation actions are an essential component of electronic warfare. Jamming attacks can be minimized using Packet Delivery Ratio (PDR) and RSS metrics in application to master and slave UAVs. Furthermore, anti-jamming can employ classical wireless techniques, such as channel hopping and spectrum spreading [132]. The anti-jamming techniques used depend on the type of jamming they aim to counteract. For instance, power control game modeling technique is applicable for constant jamming [135], Bayesian Stackelberg game modeling [136], and learning based frequency which is more applicable to multi-agent UAVs [137]. Synchronization, modulation, demodulation, channel equalization and estimation are key factors that must be considered when investigating jamming and anti-jamming methods.

D. Countermeasures and Defensive Aids

Countermeasures and defensive aids is the science of protecting information handled by UAVs with regard to confidentiality, authenticity, and integrity in addition to ensuring service availability for each of civilian and military applications [138]. Based on different types of attacks to UAVs discussed above, countermeasures strategies to these attacks are involved to respond to gaining control over the spectrum, software issue, vulnerabilities found on hardware, and network layers. Countermeasure are broadly classified into three categories: prevention, detection, and mitigation [114]. Prevention can be achieved through the following three methods: access control, information protection, and component selection. Access control ensures that the UAV can receive communication only from authorized personnel or authorized software via password-based node authentication schemes (e.g., Media Access Control (MAC) address) [139]. Information protection focuses on message interception, elimination, or infusion (e.g., cryptography) [139]. Component selection involves anti-tampering technologies employed onboard of the UAVs to prevent entry points from getting potential attacks [140]. If the prevention methods failed, detection countermeasure is applied and the popular approach is presence of anomaly (detecting abnormal patterns such as radio signals, communication traffic,

and/or flight behavior) [140]. Mitigation is applied to overcome the attack through neutralize/avoid, redundancy (e.g., switching the GNSS constellation), and fail-safe (e.g., UAV returns to the home base or self-destruct in case of connection loss).

VIII. DATABUS IN UAVS

Efficient data transfer and communication are critically important to UAV operation which relies on real-time data transfer and databus facilitates this process. Modern databuses replace point-to-point wiring with centralized and streamlined connections [141]. However, majority of aircrafts are still using point-to-point wiring databuses (e.g., Aeronautical Radio Incorporated (ARINC) 429) introduced in 1960s which simply connect components together using individual wires. Common bus topologies used with ARINC 429 include star topology, bus-drop topology, and multiple bus topology [43]. Star topology involve a single Line Replaceable Unit (LRU) transmitter that sends data to one or more different receivers. Bus-drop topology incorporates multiple receivers positioned along a physical path. However, the bus-drop topology faces several challenges related to aerial vehicles weight and maintenance due to bulky onboard cabling [142]. Faster and lighter bi-directional databuses present an alternative solution. In case of a two-way LRU's communication, multiple bus design is typically utilized. The military standard MIL-STD-1553 was developed as a bi-directional data communication bus system for avionics applications to address the increasing complexity of point-to-point wiring in avionics systems [143]. MIL-STD-1553 incorporates the following major components: transmission media (databus), remote terminals (RTs), bus controllers (BCs), and bus monitors (BMs) [143]. A typical RT is composed of an encoder/decoder transceiver, transceivers, a buffer or memory, a protocol controller, and a subsystem interface. BCs manage and control data-flow through the databus by sending commands to RTs [144]. BMs, on the other hand, are tasked with monitoring the data transmission, maintenance, and flight-test recording and BMs can be used as a backup system for the BC. MIL-STD-1553 provides reliable operation in the harsh physical and electromagnetic environments for both military and commercial applications. MIL-STD-1553 has been deployed on fixed and rotary wing aircraft, ground vehicles, spacecrafts, satellites, and unmanned aircraft [144].

Controlled Area Network (CAN) is a standard UAV databus that facilitates communication between sensors, cameras, actuators, the main controller. CAN bus is a message-based protocol that enables Electronic Control Units (ECUs) to communicate with each other by using a priority mechanism [145] through node communication. With the rise of automobile industry, CAN bus was born out of a collaboration between Bosch, Intel, and Mercedes Benz in 1986 to promote faster communication between the large number of ECUs present in a car [145]. Bosch published CAN 2.0 around 1991 which was standardized (International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 11898) around 1993. Later in 2003, the data link layer was separated from the physical layers, and in 2015

Flexible Data-Rate (CAN FD) was developed. As opposed to previous databus standards, CAN FD enables more flexible and greater volume data transfer at a higher speed ranging between 1 and 8 Mbps. CAN FD permits 64 bits messages in contrast to 8 bits short messages used by its predecessor. This enables the ECU's to decide on the message size as well as dynamically change their data transmission speed [146]. A typical data transfer involves the following steps: decoding, start-of-frame (node is intended to talk), standard identifier (refers to priority level), remote-transmission request (whether to talk to another node or not), control commands, actual data message, error detection and correction, acknowledgment (data received correctly), cyclic redundancy (ensure data integrity), and end-of-frame. Nowadays, a variety of databuses and data transmission protocols are used in UAV applications, such as CAN Bus, MIL-STD-1553, ARINC 429, ARINC 814, universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter (UART), Recommended Standard (RS) serial communication RS-232, Ethernet, Avionics Full-Duplex Switched Ethernet (AFDX), Fiber optics, Bluetooth, IEEE 802.15.3, Wireless LAN, and many others.

In terms of redundancy, ARINC-429 does not inherently provide a redundancy feature. MIL-STD-1553, on the other hand, incorporates built-in redundancy by including two built-in twisted shielded pairs in addition to a monitor which automatically activates when the bus controller is down [147]. Although CAN bus does not have any built-in redundancy components, it uses the cyclic redundancy check (CRC) to detect errors in case an issue arises. Signal reliability and robustness are critical requirements in harsh electromagnetic environments. With regard to signal interference (e.g., electromagnetic waves), MIL-STD-1553 has higher immunity when compared to CAN Bus and ARINC [148]. As to encoding/decoding, ARINC-429 uses bi-phase modulation often referred to as bipolar return to zero (BRZ), whereas MILSTD-1553 relies on Manchester encoding using Non-Return-to-Zero (NRZ) encoding [144]. Likewise, CAN bus and UART use NRZ encoding where low-to-high transition represents a 1, and a high-to-low refers to a 0, similar to Manchester. Considering day-to-day avionics advancements, legacy protocols ARINC-429 and MIL-STD-1553 are insufficient to address the increased bandwidth demands. Nonetheless, their legacy networks are highly reliable for the current applications. Although the CAN bus can provide high data rates, it is not regarded as reliable as ARINC-429 and MIL-STD-1553.

IX. REGULATIONS, SAFETY, CLASSIFICATION, AND CERTIFICATION

A. Failure Classification and Design Philosophies

Regulations and reliability of UAV solutions must keep pace with rapid growth of UAV industry to guarantee continued success and public safety. Therefore, all potential sources of accidents should be identified and the probability of failure minimized through redundant and/or fail-safe UAV avionics systems made up of reliable components. Failure types can be classified into four groups: catastrophic, hazardous, major, and minor. Catastrophic classification is the event that prevent

continued safe flight and/or landing and the expected consequence is multifatal accident (e.g., death). The probability of occurrence of a catastrophic failure is 1×10^{-9} FH (per flight hour), in other words, such incidents should be extremely improbable. Hazardous failure could result in a serious incident (some injuries or loss of life) and its probability is 1×10^{-7} FH. Major failure conditions, on the other hand, may lead to difficulties, but the aircraft will be able to fly and land safely, and its probability is 1×10^{-5} FH. Minor failure implies that the UAV intelligent systems and/or the human operator will be able to take the necessary mitigating actions and its probability should not be greater than 1×10^{-3} FH. Design of different UAV avionics systems must carefully account for the above-discussed failure classification probabilities. The avionics systems are typically created following one of the two design philosophies: Safe-Life or Fail-Safe. The Safe-Life philosophy designs each component or structure to operate free from failure during its lifetime accurately estimated through research analysis. By contrast, the Fail-Safe philosophy has the assumption that failure will eventually occur and it incorporates various techniques to handle losses based on system/component failures in a safe manner.

B. Incidents and Safety

The International Air Transport Association (IATA) documented an increase of UAVs safety risks caused by unpredictable nature of UAV operators and inability to determine their location [4], [149]. The IATA's safety report [149] also illustrated that 50% of UAV related incidents between 2014 and 2018 were documented in Europe. However, in recent years the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) reported a significant drop in UAV safety occurrences (from minor to catastrophic) [4], [150]. Furthermore, in 2021, severe incidents, defined as occurrences resulting in injury or fatalities, were near zero [4], [150]. EASA attributed the drop in UAV safety occurrences to the introduction of UAV pilot certification requirements and technology advancement (e.g., obstacle detection and avoidance). In line with IATA and EASA reports, in recent years, Canada has seen a significant improvement in terms of the number of recorded UAV safety occurrences. Using the Civil Aviation Daily Occurrence Reporting System (CADORS) database from Transport Canada Civil Aviation (TCCA), the aviation safety occurrences involving UAVs were recorded between January 2013 and March 2023. Fig. 9 illustrates the annual number of Canadian UAV safety occurrences where pilots of civil and military aircraft spotted UAVs entering their flight path. The data reveals that the Canadian UAV safety occurrences reached their peak in 2017, the same year that an incident was reported at Quebec City's Jean Lesage airport involving a collision between a small drone and a passenger airplane causing minor damage. In spite of the fact that the incident caused only minor damage, the potential for a catastrophic outcome was recognized leading to major revisions and new interim rules and regulations by Transport Canada. As a result, to date, no severe safety occurrences involving UAVs have been recorded in Canada [151].




Fig. 9: Total number of UAV Safety Occurrences in Canada between 2013 and 2023 [151].

C. Airspace Classification

A common cause for safety incidents is a UAV entering a class of airspace that they are not permitted to fly in. For instance, Canada subdivides the airspace into seven classes (A, B, C, D, E, F, and G) where each class has its own rules (e.g., type of aircraft and communication equipment) [4]. NAV CANADA provides ATC and flight information to every class of the airspace to ensure air safety. Class A and B are referred to as controlled high-level (over 18,000 ft) and low-level (12,000 to 18,000 ft) airspace, respectively. Class A and B involve pilot clearance signals and instructions for maintaining safe distance from other aircraft. Class C, D, and E refer to terminal areas for busy airports, control zones and terminal areas for moderate traffic airports, and control zone for airports without towers, respectively. Class F describes a restricted and advisory airspace (no aircraft is allowed to enter without a permission from the controlling agency). Class G represents uncontrolled airspace and it reaches an altitude of 18,000 ft [4], [152]. In Canada, UAVs must complete their activities in within Class G airspace as well as obey rules put in place by Transport Canada. A UAV can fly in Class A to E airspace only provided that (i) it is registered with Transport Canada, (ii) the UAV operator holds a Pilot Certificate - Advanced Operations, and (iii) the operator has a written authorization from NAV CANADA [153]. Unfortunately, UAV safety occurrences tend to take place when UAV operators do not follow the above-listed rules.

D. Certification

A pilot operator wishing to fly a UAV weighing between 250 gm and 25 kg must possess a pilot certificate under the Canadian regulations 901.54 and 901.62 [4]. Transport Canada defines two UAV certificates: Pilot Certificate Basic Operations and Pilot Certificate Advanced Operations where one or both them can be obtained through an online exam administered by Transport Canada. Pilot Certificate Advanced Operations requires the examinee to demonstrate a much higher understanding of concepts similar to other forms of transportation exams (e.g., automobiles) [154]. Examinations for both basic

and advanced certificates cover almost the entirety of Canadian Aviation Regulations (CARs), General Provisions, and General Operating Flight Rules. Candidates must demonstrate proper knowledge of Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS) airframes, powerplants, and propulsion and systems, and ability to handle and secure electrical systems, launch and recovery systems, datalinks, batteries, autopilots, electrical motors, payloads, ground control stations, redundancies and critical items, and other systems onboard UAVs [154]. Furthermore, candidates must demonstrate understanding of other crucial concepts, such as air traffic rules, air law, human factors, navigation, flight theory, radiotelephony, procedures, flight operations, and meteorology [43], [154]. Both basic and advanced pilot certifications require the operators to register their UAVs with Transport Canada in compliance with regulation 901.06 using the Transport Canada's Drone Management Portal [155].

X. PERSISTING CHALLENGES AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Autonomy: Deploying a single UAV or a fleet of UAVs to autonomously perform complex tasks without human intervention may currently seem like a utopian concept. While this level of autonomy has not yet been fully realized, significant advancements in the field indicate that this vision could become a reality in the near future. Constrained and predictive adaptive real-time controllers and estimators (e.g., navigation, SLAM, and pose estimation), which are pillar components for achieving full autonomy, require substantial development efforts to ensure system stability, efficient trajectory planning, and energy optimization. These advancements contribute to maximizing flight duration and enhancing payload capacity. Moreover, managing the heavy real-time data streams associated with autonomous UAV operations necessitates integrating advanced Artificial Intelligence (AI) techniques such as machine learning (including supervised, unsupervised, neural adaptive, and reinforcement learning), evolutionary algorithms (for single and multi-objective optimization), and fuzzy logic expert systems. These techniques are essential for enhancing decision-making in autonomous missions, e.g., trajectory planning, navigation and control, battery/energy scheduling, obstacle avoidance, detection and classification, and resource allocation. Processing large volumes of real-time data using diverse decision-making algorithms (e.g., path planning layer, control layer, communication layer, obstacle avoidance layer, and perception layer) requires high-speed onboard processing units with substantial memory capacity to support these complex computations.

Advanced Technology: Future efforts should focus on developing advanced, high-quality, and higher-speed but compact and low-cost sensing devices, including LiDAR, infrared, thermal cameras, specialized cameras, multispectral imaging, RFID, UWB, bluetooth low energy, IMU, magnetic, multi-decision-making algorithms, UAVs antennas and integrating edge/fog computing systems. Additionally, exploring hybrid power supply systems (such as fuel cells, solar cells, and batteries) and solar energy harvesting will be crucial for maximizing UAV flight duration effectively. There is a growing

interest in integrating cellular networks with UAV networks to support future wireless technologies. Research opportunities include efficient handovers for mobile UAVs and joint sensing and communication for mmWave and UWB sensors. While initial simulations show promise, this field is still emerging. Enhancing joint sensing with AI techniques, considering UAV resource limits, and developing power-efficient routing protocols for varying channel conditions are also key future directions. Implementing state-of-the-art communication technologies such as 6G, cloud and fog computing could lead to faster communication, allow for higher levels of autonomy and promote mission success. Moreover, improving hardware platforms (e.g., FPGA-based (OcPoC-Zynq Mini), ARM-based (Pixhawk), GPU-based platforms (Nvidia Jetson)) will significantly enhance embedded processing units and flight controller capabilities. Developing high-speed onboard processing units with substantial memory capacity will be vital for handling the complex computations required in autonomous UAV operations.

Planning and Perception: Perception and UAV path planning remain complex, multi-faceted challenges. Perception is enabled using multi-sensor fusion. However, multi-sensor fusion faces three main challenges, namely, sensor failure, synchronizing heterogeneous signals and updating state localization using sensor measurements obtained at varying frequencies. Therefore, future research should focus on fault management and redundancy architectures to address signal denial or sensor failures. Although the sensor fusion algorithms mentioned above demonstrate high accuracy in object detection and classification, their performance and reliability under extreme weather conditions and varying lighting require further evaluation. Additionally, future efforts should develop perception techniques capable of synchronizing heterogeneous signals and handling varying sensor measurement frequencies. Most reported environment modeling techniques are applied primarily to simpler types of environments, mostly known and static with centralized control. Centralized models raise concerns about the scalability of planning approaches, even in the absence of a centralized topology. This can lead to each UAV waiting for its peers to finish their planning, creating a potential computational bottleneck in large UAV systems. Game theory will gain more popularity for routing, optimizing energy consumption, network coverage, resource management, coordinated control in UAV networks, and UAV cluster path planning.

Onboard UAV Limited Computational Resources: Perception, estimation, path planning, control, communication, and classification algorithms that rely on advanced machine learning techniques and computationally intensive training can present significant challenges due to the limited computational resources available on the UAV's onboard system. This issue of lengthy computational training can be addressed by outsourcing the training phase to the ground, which simplifies the algorithm to a basic mapping function. However, this approach is limited because it prevents any new learning from being introduced online. As a result, the development of computationally efficient machine learning algorithms that can be implemented onboard a drone as well as outsource

training becomes a crucial research direction for UAVs. In case of outsourcing, ensuring privacy and security is essential to prevent breaches, adversarial attacks, theft, or unauthorized access.

Data Securing: As UAV networks expand, the volume of real-time data streaming exchanged between UAVs and ground stations also increases. Hence, large volumes of data must be securely aggregated to protect against malicious threats. Robust encryption methods are essential to ensure confidentiality during data transmission between GCS and UAVs. Implementing secure and efficient data aggregation techniques can lower communication costs and energy use while safeguarding data privacy. Ongoing research and innovation are crucial to strengthen UAV systems' resilience against potential attacks. While this is an area of ongoing development, it continues to be a challenging open problem. Blockchain technology, as a decentralized solution, is emerging as a transformative tool expected to revolutionize privacy protection for UAV systems by providing enhanced security and adaptability. Aerial blockchain can safeguard UAV communication privacy and ensure the integrity of data collected by UAVs. Additionally, integrating blockchain into UAV softwarization can enable dynamic, flexible, and real-time communication services within UAV networks.

Regulation: Current UAVs feature diverse hardware and software, but their success relies heavily on local regulations and faces challenges related to global collaboration and standardization. Initiatives like Joint Authorities for Rule-making on Unmanned Systems (JARUS) and Single European Sky ATM Research (SESAR) play crucial roles in shaping UAV development globally. Autonomy is a major innovation, offering benefits such as pilot-free operations, greater efficiency, and lower costs. Technologies like UAV traffic management and Beyond Visual Line of Sight (BVLOS) piloting are gaining traction, potentially transforming the industry. SESAR, a key European regulatory body, aims to enhance airspace safety, efficiency, and environmental impact through advanced technologies, positioning itself as a leader in autonomous drone development. There is a growing need for flexible, risk-based UAV regulations that consider factors like area, purpose, and visibility. In Canada, UAVs between 250g and 25 kg must be registered, and pilots certified. Operations with UAVs over 25 kg in Canada require a Special Flight Operations Certificate (SFOC), adding administrative burdens that can deter hobbyists and commercial users. In contrast, EASA adopts a risk-based approach with fewer regulations for low-risk operations. Balancing the needs of stakeholders, regulators, manufacturers, and users, is crucial. Future regulations should account for UAV weight, payload, and operational parameters beyond just weight, reflecting their diverse applications.

More Dataset: Traditional machine learning methods rely on a centralized data source for model training, whereas Federated Learning (FL) and Federated Deep Learning (FDL) involves multiple entities collaboratively training a model. FL and FDL are areas of active research in the context of UAVs due to its potential to enhance data privacy and support network scalability as the number of UAVs increases. However, a significant challenge hindering the immediate deployment

of FL models on UAVs is the limited availability of relevant datasets for training, such as network traffic and malware datasets. As a result, future research is likely to focus on generating more datasets to facilitate effective model training which are helpful for various UAV avionics systems, including electronic warfare countermeasures (e.g., explainable cyberattacks and spoofing detection). For instance, cyberattacks may not be properly classified due to insufficient training datasets. Moreover, while trained models often detect cyberattacks, their classifications are not always explainable. Understanding and explaining these attacks is crucial for designing robust countermeasure techniques.

XI. CONCLUSION

The advancement of avionics systems for Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) has a direct impact on enhancing UAV decision making and autonomous mobility capabilities. This paper provides a detailed overview of the most crucial components of UAV avionics. The role of UAV communication systems, antennas characteristics and selection, and techniques for sharing UAV's location have been reviewed. Identification systems and their role in responding to interrogating signals have been discussed. Power sources taxonomy and selection based on UAV size have been covered. Perception sensors, sensor fusion, navigation techniques, and the importance of filter design for UAV autonomy have been studied. Common path planning techniques and their interrelation with the collision avoidance methods, and state-of-the-art tracking control techniques have been presented. Electronic warfare threats and methods including destructive and non-destructive cyberattacks, transponder attacks, jamming threats, countermeasures and defensive aids approaches have been explored. Moreover, the role that different types of databases play in enabling efficient and fast real-time data transfer has been discussed. This overview has been concluded by outlining how safety is incorporated into the UAV design, safety occurrence trends, and the associated national regulations along with the certification process.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), under the grants RGPIN-2022-04937. The author would like to thank **Maria Shaposhnikova** for proofreading the article.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. A. Hashim, A. E. Eltoukhy, and K. G. Vamvoudakis, "UWB ranging and IMU data fusion: Overview and nonlinear stochastic filter for inertial navigation," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2023.
- [2] X. Yang and X. Pei, "Hybrid system for powering unmanned aerial vehicles: Demonstration and study cases," in *Hybrid Technologies for Power Generation*. Elsevier, 2022, pp. 439–473.
- [3] A. V. Jonnalagadda and H. A. Hashim, "SegNet: A segmented deep learning based convolutional neural network approach for drones wild-fire detection," *Remote Sensing Applications: Society and Environment*, vol. 34, p. 101181, 2024.
- [4] D. Wanner, H. A. Hashim, S. Srivastava, and A. Steinhauer, "UAV avionics safety, certification, accidents, redundancy, integrity, and reliability: a comprehensive review and future trends," *Drone Systems and Applications*, vol. 12, pp. 1–23, 2024.

- [5] Z. Ren, K. Hussain, M. Faheem *et al.*, "K-means online-learning routing protocol (K-MORP) for unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) adhoc networks," *Ad Hoc Networks*, vol. 154, p. 103354, 2024.
- [6] R. M. Clark, *Uninhabited Combat Aerial Vehicles*. Air University Press, 2000.
- [7] H. A. Hashim, "Exponentially stable observer-based controller for VTOL-UAVs without velocity measurements," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 96, no. 8, pp. 1946–1960, 2023.
- [8] K. Guo, X. Li, and L. Xie, "Ultra-wideband and odometry-based cooperative relative localization with application to multi-UAV formation control," *IEEE transactions on cybernetics*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 2590–2603, 2019.
- [9] Y. Cui, Y. Liang, Q. Luo, Z. Shu, and T. Huang, "Resilient consensus control of heterogeneous multi-UAV systems with leader of unknown input against byzantine attacks," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2024.
- [10] S. Soni and *et al.*, "Performance analysis of UAV-aided wireless communication systems with ubiquitous coverage," in *2019 IEEE 90th Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC2019-Fall)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [11] J. Chen, C. Du, Y. Zhang, P. Han, and W. Wei, "A clustering-based coverage path planning method for autonomous heterogeneous UAVs," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 25 546–25 556, 2021.
- [12] H. Niu, A. Savvaris, A. Tsourdos, and Z. Ji, "Voronoi-visibility roadmap-based path planning algorithm for unmanned surface vehicles," *The Journal of Navigation*, vol. 72, no. 4, pp. 850–874, 2019.
- [13] A. Prasad, B. Sharma, J. Vanualailai, and S. A. Kumar, "A geometric approach to target convergence and obstacle avoidance of a nonstandard tractor-trailer robot," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 30, no. 13, pp. 4924–4943, 2020.
- [14] K. Meng and *et al.*, "UAV-enabled integrated sensing and communication: Opportunities and challenges," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 2023.
- [15] M. C. Tacstan and H. Ilhan, "Performance analysis of SSK modulation for UAVs communication," *Vehicular Communications*, vol. 31, p. 100375, 2021.
- [16] W. Li, Z. Dou, L. Qi, and C. Shi, "Wavelet transform based modulation classification for 5g and UAV communication in multipath fading channel," *Physical Communication*, vol. 34, pp. 272–282, 2019.
- [17] D. Darsena, G. Gelli, I. Iudice, and F. Verde, "Equalization techniques of control and non-payload communication links for unmanned aerial vehicles," *IEEE Access*, vol. 6, pp. 4485–4496, 2018.
- [18] P. Li and J. Xu, "Placement optimization for UAV-enabled wireless networks with multi-hop backhauls," *Journal of Communications and Information Networks*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 64–73, 2018.
- [19] Y. Zeng, R. Zhang, and T. J. Lim, "Wireless communications with unmanned aerial vehicles: Opportunities and challenges," *IEEE Communications magazine*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 36–42, 2016.
- [20] H. A. Hashim, "GPS-denied navigation: Attitude, position, linear velocity, and gravity estimation with nonlinear stochastic observer," in *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1146–1151.
- [21] J. Fusselman and *et al.*, "Long-range single-target tracking with UWB soc: further development," in *Radar Sensor Technology XXVII*, vol. 12535. SPIE, 2023, pp. 21–33.
- [22] J. Fusselman, M. Gilliam, Y. Shrestha, Y. R. Zhang, and K. Kelly, "Ultra-compact ultra-wideband radar for high-speed target tracking," in *Radar Sensor Technology XXV*, vol. 11742. SPIE, 2021, pp. 56–64.
- [23] A. H. Kelechi and *et al.*, "The recent advancement in unmanned aerial vehicle tracking antenna: A review," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 16, p. 5662, 2021.
- [24] Z. Liang and *et al.*, "Reconfigurable microstrip magnetic dipole antenna with switchable conical beams for aerial drone applications," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 31 043–31 054, 2019.
- [25] W. Zhang, Y. Li, Z. Zhang, and Z. Feng, "A pattern-reconfigurable aircraft antenna with low wind drag," *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation*, vol. 68, no. 6, pp. 4397–4405, 2020.
- [26] J. Guo, P. Walk, and H. Jafarkhani, "Optimal deployments of UAVs with directional antennas for a power-efficient coverage," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 5159–5174, 2020.
- [27] W. Khawaja and *et al.*, "A survey of air-to-ground propagation channel modeling for unmanned aerial vehicles," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 2361–2391, 2019.

- [28] I. U. Khan and et al., "Rssi-controlled long-range communication in secured iot-enabled unmanned aerial vehicles," *Mobile information systems*, vol. 2021, pp. 1–11, 2021.
- [29] Y. Spyridis and et al., "Modelling and simulation of a new cooperative algorithm for UAV swarm coordination in mobile rf target tracking," *Simulation Modelling Practice and Theory*, vol. 107, p. 102232, 2021.
- [30] X. Ouyang and et al., "Cooperative navigation of UAVs in GNSS-denied area with colored rssi measurements," *IEEE sensors journal*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 2194–2210, 2020.
- [31] H. A. Hashim, A. E. Eltoukhy, K. G. Vamvoudakis, and M. I. Abouheaf, "Nonlinear deterministic observer for inertial navigation using ultra-wideband and IMU sensor fusion," in *2023 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 3085–3090.
- [32] C. Xu, Z. Wang, Y. Wang, Z. Wang, and L. Yu, "Three passive tdoa receivers-based flying-UAV positioning in extreme environments," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 20, no. 16, pp. 9589–9595, 2020.
- [33] U. Shah, R. Khawad, and K. M. Krishna, "Detecting, localizing, and recognizing trees with a monocular MAV: Towards preventing deforestation," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1982–1987.
- [34] H. A. Hashim, M. Abouheaf, and M. A. Abido, "Geometric stochastic filter with guaranteed performance for autonomous navigation based on IMU and feature sensor fusion," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 116, p. 104926, 2021.
- [35] H.-L. Song and Y.-C. Ko, "Robust and low complexity beam tracking with monopulse signal for UAV communications," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 3505–3513, 2021.
- [36] A. Merwady and I. Guvenc, "UAV assisted heterogeneous networks for public safety communications," in *2015 IEEE wireless communications and networking conference workshops (WCNCW)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 329–334.
- [37] Y. Xu, G. Gui, H. Gacanin, and F. Adachi, "A survey on resource allocation for 5g heterogeneous networks: Current research, future trends, and challenges," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 668–695, 2021.
- [38] M. U. Akram, U. Saeed, S. A. Hassan, and H. Jung, "UAV-based air-to-ground channel modeling for diverse environments," in *2020 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference (WCNC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [39] S. I. Alnagar, A. M. Salhab, and S. A. Zummo, "Q-learning-based power allocation for secure wireless communication in UAV-aided relay network," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 33 169–33 180, 2021.
- [40] R. Tiron, "Nations seek NATO-compatible ID systems," *Archived from the original on 2014-04-08*, 2012. [Online]. Available: http://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/archive/2002/October/Pages/Nations_Seek4006.aspx
- [41] S. Sciancalepore and R. Di Pietro, "Sos: Standard-compliant and packet loss tolerant security framework for ADS-B communications," *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 1681–1698, 2019.
- [42] K. Dönmez, S. Demirel, and M. Özdemir, "Handling the pseudo pilot assignment problem in air traffic control training by using NASA tlx," *Journal of Air Transport Management*, vol. 89, p. 101934, 2020.
- [43] I. Moir, A. Seabridge, and M. Jukes, *Civil avionics systems*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- [44] G. Scott and T. Gane, "Aviation archaeology offshore: the recovery of a rare ju88 aircraft wreck during work for the new london gateway port," *Journal of Conflict Archaeology*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 75–95, 2015.
- [45] H. Lv, F. Liu, and N. Yuan, "Drone presence detection by the drone's RF communication," in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, vol. 1738, no. 1. IOP Publishing, 2021, p. 012044.
- [46] P. Whitley, "Unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) traffic management (utm) concept of operations, v2. 0," *Federal Aviation Administration*, 2020.
- [47] A. Shoufan, C. Yeob Yeun, and B. Taha, "esim-based authentication protocol for UAV remote identification," *Security and Privacy in the Internet of Things: Architectures, Techniques, and Applications*, pp. 91–122, 2021.
- [48] K. Belwafi, R. Alkadi, S. A. Alameri, H. Al Hamadi, and A. Shoufan, "Unmanned aerial vehicles' remote identification: A tutorial and survey," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 87 577–87 601, 2022.
- [49] S. Michaelides-Mateou, "Challenges and trends in the aviation industry: Integrating UAVs in non-segregated airspace," *Unmanned Aerial Vehicles Applications: Challenges and Trends*, pp. 377–409, 2023.
- [50] B. N. Chand, P. Mahalakshmi, and V. Naidu, "Sense and avoid technology in unmanned aerial vehicles: A review," in *2017 International Conference on Electrical, Electronics, Communication, Computer, and Optimization Techniques (ICEECCOT)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 512–517.
- [51] N. Dwek, M. Birem, K. Geebelen, E. Hostens, A. Mishra, J. Steckel, and R. Yudanto, "Improving the accuracy and robustness of ultra-wideband localization through sensor fusion and outlier detection," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 32–39, 2019.
- [52] Y. Liu and Y. Bao, "Real-time remote measurement of distance using ultra-wideband (UWB) sensors," *Automation in Construction*, vol. 150, p. 104849, 2023.
- [53] A. Ramirez-Arroyo, A. Alex-Amor, P. Padilla, and J. F. Valenzuela-Valdes, "Joint direction-of-arrival and time-of-arrival estimation with ultra-wideband elliptical arrays," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2023.
- [54] FlyAbility, "Gas powered drones: A guide," *FlyAbility*, pp. 1–20, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.flyability.com/gas-powered-drone>
- [55] M. A. Abdulsada and et al., "Design and simulation of air-fuel percentage sensors in drone engine controlling," *Trends in Sciences*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1713–1713, 2022.
- [56] S. Koley, "Electrochemistry of phase-change materials in thermal energy storage systems: A critical review of green transitions in built environments," *Trends in Sciences*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 8538–8538, 2024.
- [57] K. Zangana and et al., "Investigated kerosene-diesel fuel performance in internal combustion engine," *Cleaner Engineering and Technology*, vol. 12, p. 100591, 2023.
- [58] B. K. Selvan and et al., "Utilization of biodiesel blended fuel in a diesel engine–combustion engine performance and emission characteristics study," *Fuel*, vol. 311, p. 122621, 2022.
- [59] E. Taylor and J. Rivera, "Hydrogen fuel cell-powered drone ambulance for the emergency medical services," *Future Energy*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 6–11, 2022.
- [60] N. S. Hazri, S. Basri, S. Kamarudin, and A. M. Zainoodin, "Critical review on development of magnesium alloy as anode in mg-air fuel cell and additives in electrolyte," *International Journal of Energy Research*, vol. 45, no. 11, pp. 15 739–15 759, 2021.
- [61] S. Oh, T. Kim, S. Kim, and S. Kang, "Energetic, exergetic, economic, and exergoeconomic analysis of a phosphoric acid fuel cell-organic rankine cycle hybrid system," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 284, p. 116993, 2023.
- [62] L. Fan, Z. Tu, and S. H. Chan, "Recent development in design a state-of-art proton exchange membrane fuel cell from stack to system: Theory, integration and prospective," *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*, vol. 48, no. 21, pp. 7828–7865, 2023.
- [63] S. Ci, N. Lin, and D. Wu, "Reconfigurable battery techniques and systems: A survey," *IEEE Access*, vol. 4, pp. 1175–1189, 2016.
- [64] X. Zhang, Z. Li, L. Luo, Y. Fan, and Z. Du, "A review on thermal management of lithium-ion batteries for electric vehicles," *Energy*, vol. 238, p. 121652, 2022.
- [65] C. Vidal, O. Gross, R. Gu, P. Kollmeyer, and A. Emadi, "xev lithium battery low-temperature effects," *IEEE transactions on vehicular technology*, vol. 68, no. 5, pp. 4560–4572, 2019.
- [66] T. Kim, W. Qiao, and L. Qu, "Power electronics-enabled self-x multi-cell batteries: A design toward smart batteries," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 27, no. 11, pp. 4723–4733, 2012.
- [67] A. Townsend, I. N. Jiya, C. Martinson, D. Bessarabov, and R. Gouws, "A comprehensive review of energy sources for unmanned aerial vehicles, their shortfalls and opportunities for improvements," *Heliyon*, vol. 6, no. 11, 2020.
- [68] G. Zhou, H. Chen, and Y. Cui, "Formulating energy density for designing practical lithium–sulfur batteries," *Nature Energy*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 312–319, 2022.
- [69] K. Rajashékara, "Present status and future trends in electric vehicle propulsion technologies," *IEEE journal of emerging and selected topics in power electronics*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–10, 2013.
- [70] K. Zhu and et al., "How far away are lithium-sulfur batteries from commercialization?" *Frontiers in Energy Research*, vol. 7, p. 123, 2019.
- [71] R. Dhaouadi, M. Takroui, S. Shapsough, and Q. A. Bashayreh, "Modelling and design of a large solar quadcopter," in *Proceedings of the Future Technologies Conference (FTC) 2021, Volume 1*. Springer, 2022, pp. 451–467.
- [72] R. J. Boucher, "Sunrise, the world's first solar-powered airplane," *Journal of Aircraft*, vol. 22, no. 10, pp. 840–846, 1985.
- [73] M. S. Hasan and et al., "Conceptual design and fluid structure interaction analysis of a solar powered high-altitude pseudo-satellite (haps) UAV wing model," in *Digital Conversion on the Way to Industry 4.0*. Springer, 2021, pp. 93–105.

- [74] L. Girlevicius, "Evaluation of solar powered systems in small scale UAV designs," 2022.
- [75] N. El-Sheimy and A. Youssef, "Inertial sensors technologies for navigation applications: State of the art and future trends," *Satellite Navigation*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 2, 2020.
- [76] V. Girbes-Juan and et al., "Asynchronous sensor fusion of GPS, IMU and CAN-based odometry for heavy-duty vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 70, no. 9, pp. 8617–8626, 2021.
- [77] Y. Zhang, "Lilo: A novel lidar-IMU slam system with loop optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 2649–2659, 2022.
- [78] H. A. Hashim and A. E. E. Eltoukhy, "Nonlinear filter for simultaneous localization and mapping on a matrix lie group using IMU and feature measurements," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 2098–2109, 2022.
- [79] H. A. Hashim, "A geometric nonlinear stochastic filter for simultaneous localization and mapping," *Aerospace Science and Technology*, vol. 111, p. 106569, 2021.
- [80] H. A. Hashim and A. E. E. Eltoukhy, "Landmark and IMU data fusion: Systematic convergence geometric nonlinear observer for SLAM and velocity bias," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 3292–3301, 2022.
- [81] D. Feng, C. Wang, C. He, Y. Zhuang, and X.-G. Xia, "Kalman-filter-based integration of IMU and UWB for high-accuracy indoor positioning and navigation," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 3133–3146, 2020.
- [82] A. Odry, R. Fuller, I. J. Rudas, and P. Odry, "Kalman filter for mobile-robot attitude estimation: Novel optimized and adaptive solutions," *Mechanical systems and signal processing*, vol. 110, pp. 569–589, 2018.
- [83] Á. Odry, "An open-source test environment for effective development of marg-based algorithms," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 4, p. 1183, 2021.
- [84] F. Pei, S. Yang, and S. Yin, "In-motion initial alignment using state-dependent extended kalman filter for strapdown inertial navigation system," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 70, pp. 1–12, 2020.
- [85] K. Ghanizadegan and H. A. Hashim, "Quaternion-based Unscented Kalman Filter for 6-DoF Vision-based Inertial Navigation in GPS-denied Regions," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. PP, no. P, pp. 1–14, 2024.
- [86] T.-s. Lou, N. Chen, Y. Jiao, H. Zhao, and L. Zhao, "A consider unscented particle filter with genetic algorithm for UAV multi-source integrated navigation," *Measurement Science and Technology*, vol. 34, no. 9, p. 095105, 2023.
- [87] H. A. Hashim, L. J. Brown, and K. McIsaac, "Nonlinear stochastic attitude filters on the special orthogonal group 3: Ito and Stratonovich," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 1853–1865, 2019.
- [88] H. A. Hashim, "Systematic convergence of nonlinear stochastic estimators on the special orthogonal group SO(3)," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 30, no. 10, pp. 3848–3870, 2020.
- [89] H. A. Hashim and K. G. Vamvoudakis, "Adaptive neural network stochastic-filter-based controller for attitude tracking with disturbance rejection," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 1217–1227, 2024.
- [90] M. Jones, S. Djahel, and K. Welsh, "Path-planning for unmanned aerial vehicles with environment complexity considerations: A survey," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 55, no. 11, pp. 1–39, 2023.
- [91] P. T. Kyaw and et al., "Coverage path planning for decomposition reconfigurable grid-maps using deep reinforcement learning based travelling salesman problem," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 225 945–225 956, 2020.
- [92] T. H. Pham, D. Ichalal, and S. Mammam, "Complete coverage path planning for pests-ridden in precision agriculture using UAV," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Networking, Sensing and Control (ICNSC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [93] C. Xiong, D. Chen, D. Lu, Z. Zeng, and L. Lian, "Path planning of multiple autonomous marine vehicles for adaptive sampling using voronoi-based ant colony optimization," *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 115, pp. 90–103, 2019.
- [94] G. Chen, N. Luo, D. Liu, Z. Zhao, and C. Liang, "Path planning for manipulators based on an improved probabilistic roadmap method," *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing*, vol. 72, p. 102196, 2021.
- [95] R. Kumar, A. Mandalika, S. Choudhury, and S. Srinivasa, "Lego: Leveraging experience in roadmap generation for sampling-based planning," in *2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1488–1495.
- [96] u. Orozco-Rosas, O. Montiel, and R. Sepulveda, "Mobile robot path planning using membrane evolutionary artificial potential field," *Applied soft computing*, vol. 77, pp. 236–251, 2019.
- [97] Z. Yu, Z. Si, X. Li, D. Wang, and H. Song, "A novel hybrid particle swarm optimization algorithm for path planning of UAVs," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 22, pp. 22 547–22 558, 2022.
- [98] F. Xu and et al., "A new global best guided artificial bee colony algorithm with application in robot path planning," *Applied Soft Computing*, vol. 88, p. 106037, 2020.
- [99] D. Nister, H.-L. Lee, J. Ng, and Y. Wang, "The safety force field," *NVIDIA White Paper*, vol. 15, 2019.
- [100] Y. He, M. Wu, and S. Liu, "An optimisation-based distributed cooperative control for multi-robot manipulation with obstacle avoidance," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 9859–9864, 2020.
- [101] S. Ramasamy, R. Sabatini, A. Gardi, and J. Liu, "Lidar obstacle warning and avoidance system for unmanned aerial vehicle sense-and-avoid," *Aerospace Science and Technology*, vol. 55, pp. 344–358, 2016.
- [102] H. A. Hashim, A. E. Eltoukhy, and A. Odry, "Observer-based controller for VTOL-UAVs tracking using direct vision-aided inertial navigation measurements," *ISA transactions*, vol. 137, pp. 133–143, 2023.
- [103] B. Kamel and et al., "Dynamic modeling, simulation and PID controller of unmanned aerial vehicle UAV," in *2017 Seventh International Conference on Innovative Computing Technology (INTECH)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 64–69.
- [104] O. Arifianto and M. Farhood, "Optimal control of a small fixed-wing UAV about concatenated trajectories," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 40, pp. 113–132, 2015.
- [105] A. M. Ali, H. A. Hashim, and C. Shen, "MPC based linear equivalence with control barrier functions for VTOL-UAVs," in *2024 IEEE American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2024, pp. 1–6.
- [106] H. Naser, H. A. Hashim, and M. Ahmadi, "Aerial Assistive Payload Transportation using Quadrotor UAVs with Nonsingular Fast Terminal SMC for Human Physical Interaction," *Results in Engineering*, p. 102497, 2025.
- [107] J. Rao, B. Li, Z. Zhang, D. Chen, and W. Giernacki, "Position control of quadrotor UAV based on cascade fuzzy neural network," *Energies*, vol. 15, no. 5, p. 1763, 2022.
- [108] A. M. Ali, A. Gupta, and H. A. Hashim, "Deep reinforcement learning for sim-to-real policy transfer of VTOL-UAVs offshore docking operations," *Applied Soft Computing*, p. 111843, 2024.
- [109] P. Shao, J. Wu, and S. Ma, "Robust gain-scheduled PID control: A parameter dependent BMI solution," *Cybernetics and Information Technologies*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 156–167, 2020.
- [110] O. Bingol and H. Guzey, "Neuro sliding mode control of quadrotor UAVs carrying suspended payload," *Advanced Robotics*, vol. 35, no. 3–4, pp. 255–266, 2021.
- [111] M. Labbadi, H. A. Hashim, A. E. Eltoukhy, and M. Djemai, "Barrier function-based adaptive nonsingular fast terminal sliding mode control for disturbed UAVs," in *2022 European Control Conference (ECC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 975–980.
- [112] Z. Yu, Y. Qu, C.-Y. Su, and Y. Zhang, "Distributed fractional-order finite-time control for multiple unmanned aerial vehicles," in *2018 IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications (CCTA)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1058–1063.
- [113] A.-R. Babaei, M. Malekzadeh, and D. Madhkhan, "Adaptive super-twisting sliding mode control of 6-dof nonlinear and uncertain air vehicle," *Aerospace Science and Technology*, vol. 84, pp. 361–374, 2019.
- [114] I. Moir and A. Seabridge, *Military avionics systems*. John Wiley & Sons, 2019.
- [115] P. Cevik, I. Kocaman, A. S. Akgul, and B. Akca, "The small and silent force multiplier: a swarm UAV—electronic attack," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 595–608, 2013.
- [116] A. Yu, J. Kolotylo, H. A. Hashim, and P. Rennison, "Electronic Warfare Cyberattacks, Countermeasures and Modern Defensive Strategies of UAV Avionics: A Survey," *Green Energy and Intelligent Transportation*, vol. PP, pp. 1–16, 2024.
- [117] M. Kratky and V. Minarik, "The non-destructive methods of fight against UAVs," in *2017 International conference on military technologies (ICMT)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 690–694.
- [118] Q. Wu, W. Mei, and R. Zhang, "Safeguarding wireless network with UAVs: A physical layer security perspective," *IEEE Wireless Communications*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 12–18, 2019.
- [119] C. M. Bramlette, "Cyber-attack drone payload development and geolocation via directional antennae," 2019.

- [120] S. Seo, S. Han, and D. Kim, "D-CEWS: DEVS-based cyber-electronic warfare m&s framework for enhanced communication effectiveness analysis in battlefield," *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 9, p. 3147, 2022.
- [121] K.-W. Huang and H.-M. Wang, "Combating the control signal spoofing attack in UAV systems," *IEEE transactions on vehicular technology*, vol. 67, no. 8, pp. 7769–7773, 2018.
- [122] L. Meng and et al., "An approach of linear regression-based UAV GPS spoofing detection," *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing*, vol. 2021, no. 1, p. 5517500, 2021.
- [123] S. Dahiya and M. Garg, "Unmanned aerial vehicles: Vulnerability to cyber attacks," in *Proceedings of UASG 2019: Unmanned Aerial System in Geomatics 1*. Springer, 2020, pp. 201–211.
- [124] T. Ghosh, I. Rasheed, N. Toorchi, and F. Hu, "UAV security threats, requirements and solutions," in *UAV Swarm Networks: Models, Protocols, and Systems*. CRC Press, 2020, pp. 193–206.
- [125] M. Asif, M. A. Rahman, K. Akkaya, and A. Mohammad, "Confide: A PWM-driven control-fused intrusion detection system for hardware security in unmanned aerial vehicles," in *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, 2024, pp. 886–901.
- [126] Z. Wu, T. Shang, and A. Guo, "Security issues in automatic dependent surveillance-broadcast (ADS-B): A survey," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 122 147–122 167, 2020.
- [127] X. Zhang, Y. Meng, C. Mao, Y. Xu, and N. Bai, "A design of a developable automatic avoidance system of UAV based on ADS-B," *Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing*, vol. 2021, no. 1, p. 3072606, 2021.
- [128] H. Yang, Q. Zhou, M. Yao, R. Lu, H. Li, and X. Zhang, "A practical and compatible cryptographic solution to ADS-B security," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 3322–3334, 2018.
- [129] A. Weinert, L. Alvarez, M. Owen, and B. Zintak, "Near midair collision analog for drones based on unmitigated collision risk," *Journal of Air Transportation*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 37–48, 2022.
- [130] E. Habler, R. Bitton, and A. Shabtai, "Assessing aircraft security: A comprehensive survey and methodology for evaluation," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 1–40, 2023.
- [131] M. T. Mohen, V. L. Stouffer, P. Kostiuk, and H. Kang, "Cybersecurity in aerospace services," in *AIAA Scitech 2021 Forum*, 2021, p. 0772.
- [132] D. Darsena, G. Gelli, I. Iudice, and F. Verde, "Detection and blind channel estimation for UAV-aided wireless sensor networks in smart cities under mobile jamming attack," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 9, no. 14, pp. 11 932–11 950, 2021.
- [133] F. Alrefaei and et al., "A survey on the jamming and spoofing attacks on the unmanned aerial vehicle networks," in *2022 IEEE International IOT, Electronics and Mechatronics Conference (IEMTRONICS)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–7.
- [134] H. Pirayesh and H. Zeng, "Jamming attacks and anti-jamming strategies in wireless networks: A comprehensive survey," *IEEE communications surveys & tutorials*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 767–809, 2022.
- [135] S. Lv, L. Xiao, Q. Hu, X. Wang, C. Hu, and L. Sun, "Anti-jamming power control game in unmanned aerial vehicle networks," in *GLOBECOM 2017-2017 IEEE Global Communications Conference*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [136] Y. Xu and et al., "Joint power and trajectory optimization in UAV anti-jamming communication networks," in *ICC 2019-2019 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–5.
- [137] J. Peng, Z. Zhang, Q. Wu, and B. Zhang, "Anti-jamming communications in UAV swarms: A reinforcement learning approach," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 180 532–180 543, 2019.
- [138] H. P. D. Nguyen and D. D. Nguyen, "Drone application in smart cities: The general overview of security vulnerabilities and countermeasures for data communication," *Development and Future of Internet of Drones (IoD): Insights, Trends and Road Ahead*, pp. 185–210, 2021.
- [139] M. A. Khan and et al., "A dual-mode medium access control mechanism for UAV-enabled intelligent transportation system," *Mobile Information Systems*, vol. 2021, no. 1, p. 5578490, 2021.
- [140] P.-Y. Kong, "A survey of cyberattack countermeasures for unmanned aerial vehicles," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 148 244–148 263, 2021.
- [141] A. KORNECKI and J. Zalewski, "Avionics databus safety criteria and certification," in *Proceedings of ESREL*, vol. 5, pp. 1149–1155.
- [142] N. E.-D. Safwat, M. El-Dakroury, and A. Zekry, "The evolution of aircraft data networks," *International Journal of Computer Applications*, vol. 94, no. 11, pp. 27–32, 2014.
- [143] D. De Santo, C. Malavenda, S. P. Romano, and C. Vecchio, "Exploiting the MIL-STD-1553 avionic data bus with an active cyber device," *Computers & Security*, vol. 100, p. 102097, 2021.
- [144] C. Spitzer, U. Ferrell, and T. Ferrell, *Digital avionics handbook*. CRC press, 2017.
- [145] C. E. Lin and H. Yen, "Reliability and stability survey on CAN-based avionics network for small aircraft," in *24th Digital Avionics Systems Conference*, vol. 2. IEEE, 2005, pp. 8–pp.
- [146] D. H. Pohlen and et al., "An analysis of the impact of transient faults on the performance of the CAN-FD protocol," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 2440–2449, 2019.
- [147] E. C. Gangl, "A case study on us government military standard development," *IEEE Aerospace and Electronic Systems Magazine*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 40–45, 2013.
- [148] D. Bracknell, "The MIL-STD-1553b data bus: What does the future hold?" *The Aeronautical Journal*, vol. 111, no. 1118, pp. 231–246, 2007.
- [149] L. Werfelman, "Rising risks," *Flight Safety Foundation*, vol. 13, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://flightsafety.org/asw-article/rising-risks/>
- [150] B. Crumley, "Drone incidents drop in the EASA 2022 annual safety report," *Drone DJ*, vol. 1, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://dronedj.com/2022/09/05/easa-drone-incident/>
- [151] T. Canada, "The civil aviation daily occurrence reporting," *Government of Canada, Montreal, QC, Canada*, vol. 1, 2021.
- [152] M. Grote and et al., "Sharing airspace with uncrewed aerial vehicles (UAVs): Views of the general aviation (ga) community," *Journal of Air Transport Management*, vol. 102, p. 102218, 2022.
- [153] N. CANADA, "Canada's airspace," *Government of Canada*, vol. 1, 2021.
- [154] T. Canada, "Knowledge requirements for pilots of remotely piloted aircraft systems 250 g up to and including 25 kg, operating within visual line-of-sight (VLOS) - tp 15263," *Government of Canada*, vol. 4, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://tc.canada.ca/en/aviation/publications/knowledge-requirements-pilotsremotely-piloted-aircraft-systems-250-g-including-25->
- [155] —, "Drone management portal," *Government of Canada*, vol. 50, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://tc.canada.ca/en/aviation/drone-safety/drone-management-portal?redirect=/eng/apply-pilotcertificate/service>