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Abstract: In this paper, a cooperative platoon-based gap opening controller is developed. The intended application is gap creation in cooperative platoons to accommodate merges with spatial restrictions. Therefore, the main objective is to execute the maneuver in a predefined time. The controller design is based on a regular cooperative adaptive cruise control algorithm with an additional feedforward term for a desired gap. Experimental validation of the controller is performed with small mobile robots. The proposed control strategy is capable of opening the gap in a predefined time. In future work, this strategy can be used in the design of a merging algorithm specifically for CACC platoons.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Connected automated vehicles (CAV) can play an important role in tackling some current transportation challenges. For example, CAVs may reduce fuel consumption, emissions, and traffic congestion by using cooperative adaptive cruise control (CACC) (Rios-Torres and Malikopoulos (2016)). Vehicles utilizing CACC can drive closely together in a string while communicating their control input. Such a string of vehicles is often referred to as a platoon. The advantage of communication is that vehicles can drive closer together while string stability is maintained. String stability is a notion describing the mitigation of disturbances down the string. If disturbances dampen, the platoon is said to be string stable. Without this property, longitudinal disturbances of the leader vehicle cause larger excitations at the back of the string.

Loss of string stability may be caused by communication delays between the vehicles. String stability despite these delays can be achieved by using a velocity-dependent inter-vehicle distance. In essence, the desired inter-vehicle distance is a headway time multiplied by the vehicle’s velocity. A constant stand still distance may be added, which essentially is a coordinate transformation and does not effect the dynamics. Experimental results using this control strategy have been presented in Ploeg et al. (2011). Due to the proven practical capabilities, this controller will be the basis of the controller design in this paper.

For practical implementation of CACC, the platoon formation needs to be controlled. Adding a new vehicle to the platoon while driving has been a topic of interest in recent research. An overview of the current research can be found in the survey of Rios-Torres and Malikopoulos (2016). Platooning-specific techniques are discussed but are not the main focus of this survey. The examples of platooning in the survey do not employ a velocity-dependent inter-vehicle distance. However, two platoons utilizing a velocity-dependent inter-vehicle distance were merged during the Grand Cooperative Driving Challenge (GCDC). The platoons employed a heuristic control strategy in which the vehicles linearly switch their target vehicle (Hult et al. (2018)). At the end of this maneuver all vehicles thus drove at a correct distance from their new preceding vehicle. However, during this alignment the following of the desired trajectory cannot be guaranteed. This may affect the timely opening alignment of the vehicles.

This paper focuses on the gap creation in a platoon as it is a fundamental part of the merging maneuver. Previous research regarding gap creation often focused on the desired longitudinal trajectory rather than the vehicle control (Ntousakis et al. (2016), Wang et al. (2017)). However, to accommodate scenarios with spatial constraints, such as highway on-ramps, a timely execution of the maneuver is required. Therefore, a longitudinal controller is designed. The proposed controller maintains the benefits of a regular CACC controller while opening the gap in a timely fashion. The controller was experimentally validated using small robots. The vehicle model and controller designs are discussed in Section 2, which is concluded with simulations. Section 3 elaborates on the design of the experiments and shows their results. The paper is concluded in Section 4.

* This work is part of the research program i-CAVE with project number 14893, which is partly financed by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).
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2. CONTROL STRATEGY

The proposed control strategy is based on the vehicle model and controller of Ploeg et al. (2011). This strategy can be used for regular CACC driving and varying the inter-vehicle distance. The vehicle model and controller design are both discussed in this section. Furthermore, the controller is analyzed and simulations are performed.

2.1 CACC and Inter-vehicle Distance Control

The longitudinal dynamics of each vehicle is described using

\[ \dot{q}_i(t) = v_i(t) \quad (1) \]

\[ \dot{v}_i(t) = a_i(t) \quad (2) \]

\[ \dot{a}_i(t) = \frac{1}{\tau} u_i(t) - \frac{1}{\tau} a_i(t). \quad (3) \]

Where \( q_i, v_i \) and \( a_i \) are the 1-D position, velocity and acceleration of the \( i \)-th vehicle. The control input is denoted with \( u_i \) and the driveline dynamics are represented using time constant \( \tau \). It is assumed that \( \tau \) is equal for all vehicles.

An example of a platoon is shown in Figure 1 which consists of vehicle \( i \) and \( i-1 \). The distance between the front bumper of vehicle \( i \) and the rear bumper of vehicle \( i-1 \) is denoted with \( d_i \). The vehicles are equipped with radar therefore vehicle \( i \) can measure \( d_i \) and its derivative \( \dot{d}_i = v_{i-1} - v_i \). Wireless communication allows for data transfer between the vehicles.

A controller aims to keep the vehicle at a desired inter-vehicle distance

\[ d_{r,i}(t) = h v_i(t) + r + \gamma(t). \quad (4) \]

Where \( h \) and \( r \) denote the headway time and the stand still distance. The purpose of \( r \) is to maintain a safe distance at low velocities. The additional gap is denoted with \( \gamma \), which is zero during normal driving. The error is defined as \( e_i = d_i - d_{r,i} \), with the corresponding error states \([e_{1,i}, e_{2,i}, e_{3,i}] = [e_i, \dot{e}_i, \ddot{e}_i]\). This yields the error dynamics

\[ e_{1,i} = d_i - r_{i,i}, \quad (5) \]

\[ e_{2,i} = v_{i-1} - v_i - \gamma - h a_i, \quad (6) \]

\[ e_{3,i} = a_{i-1} - a_i \left(1 - \frac{h}{\tau}\right) - \dot{\gamma} - h u_i. \quad (7) \]

\[ \dot{e}_{3,i} = -\frac{1}{\tau} e_{3,i} + \frac{1}{\tau} u_{i-1} - \frac{1}{\tau} \dot{\gamma}, \quad (8) \]

where

\[ \xi_i = h \dot{u}_i + u_i + \dot{\gamma} + \tau \ddot{\gamma}. \quad (9) \]

Based on (8) a function of \( \xi \) is designed that controls the error dynamics and compensates for \( u_{i-1} \), such that

\[ \xi_i = \left[ k_p, k_d \right] ^T e_i + u_{i-1}. \quad (10) \]

Where scalars \( k_p \) and \( k_d \) are control parameters. Now (9) and (10) yield the control law

\[ \dot{u}_i = \frac{1}{h} \left[ k_p, k_d \right] ^T e_i + u_{i-1} - u_i - \dot{\gamma} - \tau \ddot{\gamma}. \quad (11) \]

This control law can be used for gap opening. However, the designed trajectory of gap distance \( \gamma \) must have \( C^2 \) continuity such that \( \ddot{\gamma} \) can be obtained at all times.

The stability of the individual vehicle’s error dynamics is investigated. These dynamics are investigated by writing them in the form

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \dot{e}_{1,i} \\ \dot{e}_{2,i} \\ \dot{e}_{3,i} \\ \dot{u}_i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -k_p & -k_d & -1 & 0 \\ k_p & k_d & h & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} e_{1,i} \\ e_{2,i} \\ e_{3,i} \\ u_i \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \left( \begin{bmatrix} u_{i-1} \\ \dot{\gamma} + \tau \ddot{\gamma} \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (12) \]

This system has an equilibrium in the origin for \( u_i = 0 \) and \( \ddot{\gamma} + \tau \dddot{\gamma} = 0 \). Similar to Ploeg et al. (2011) the Routh-Hurwitz stability criterion can be applied to the state matrix. It follows that the error dynamics are stabilized for \( h > 0 \) and any \( k_p > 0 \) and \( k_d > 0 \) that satisfy \( k_d > k_p \tau \).

2.2 Controller Analysis

The proposed controller is compared to two feedback control strategies, which do not consider \( \ddot{\gamma} \) and \( \dddot{\gamma} \) in the computation of \( u_i \). The feedback controllers differ in their computation error \( e_{2,i} \). One controller uses the derivative \( \ddot{\gamma} \) in the error computation. The other assumes \( \gamma \) constant and computes \( e_{2,i} \) by only using measurements \( v_{i-1} - v_i \) and \( a_i \). The three controllers are referred to as feedback controller, feedback controller assuming a differentiable \( \gamma \), and feedback controller assuming a constant \( \gamma \) respectively. They will be discussed separately in this section.

**Feedforward controller (FF)** The feedforward controller is designed in the previous section. It is subject to control law (11) and requires a \( \gamma \)-trajectory with \( C^2 \) continuity. To isolate the influence of the gap opening maneuver, it is assumed that the preceding vehicle is driving at a constant velocity \( v_{nom} \). In essence, \( v_{i-1} = v_{nom}, a_{i-1} = 0, \) and \( u_{i-1} = 0 \). Now define states \( x \) and outputs \( y \) as

\[ x = [e_i, v_i - v_{i-1}, a_i, u_i, \dot{\gamma}, \ddot{\gamma}]^T \]

\[ y = [e_i, v_i - v_{i-1}, a_i]^T \]

the system can be written in the form

\[ \dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -h & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & \tau & 0 \\ k_p & -k_d & -1 & k_d & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -\frac{1}{h} \ddot{\gamma} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ y = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x. \]

Using this linear time invariant model, the system can be analyzed in frequency domain. First, the frequency domain transfer function between the requested \( \gamma \) and error \( e_i \) is investigated. The influence of \( \gamma \) rather than input \( \dot{\gamma} \) is examined because the units of \( \gamma \) and \( e_i \) are both meters. The relation is described using transfer function
It can thus be concluded that $\epsilon_i$ is not influenced by changing $\gamma$ if this control law is used if the initial conditions are all zero. Therefore, the vehicle will maintain the requested inter-vehicle distance for any $C^2$ continuous $\gamma$-trajectory without creating an error.

The inter-vehicle distance ($d_i$) of the vehicle in relation to the desired gap $\gamma$ is another performance indicator. This shows the longitudinal behavior for changes in $\gamma$. It can be noted that $\frac{d_i(s)}{\gamma(s)} = -\frac{v_i(s)}{\gamma(s)} = -\frac{a_i(s)}{\gamma(s)}$. The response in distance is thus strongly related to the response in velocity and acceleration. These responses can be obtained using input $\gamma$ and output $v_i$ or $a_i$ with the formulas $\frac{dv_i(s)}{\gamma(s)} = -s^2 \frac{v_i(s)}{\gamma(s)} = -s^2 \frac{a_i(s)}{\gamma(s)}$. This yields transfer function

$$G_{FBD}(s) = \frac{d_i(s)}{\gamma(s)} = \frac{1}{1 + hs}.$$  

The transfer functions can be seen as a low-pass filter. Since $h > 0$ the maximum gain of the functions is 1. In other words, the high frequency excitations of $d_i$ are dampened versions of excitations in $\gamma$. This behavior can be explained using (4). If a gap is opened by increasing $\gamma$ the vehicle slows down, this decreases the distance $hv_i$. Thus, at a time $t_1$ during a gap opening maneuver starting at time $t_0$, $\gamma(t_1) - \gamma(t_0) \geq d_{\gamma}(t_1) - d_{\gamma}(t_0)$. Therefore, $d_i$ may still be changing at the end of the $\gamma$-trajectory as the vehicle is still adjusting its velocity. However, a suitable gap is available for the new vehicle when the $\gamma$-trajectory ends.

**Feedback controller assuming a differentiable $\gamma$ (FBD)**

The feedback controller reacts to changes in the error and does not directly use the planned trajectory of $\gamma$. In essence, the control law (11) is replaced by

$$\dot{u}_i = \frac{1}{h} \left( [k_p \ k_d] \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{1.1} \\ \epsilon_{2.1} \end{bmatrix} + u_{i-1} - u_i \right).$$  

However, $\epsilon_{2.1}$ as described by (6) does contain the term $\dot{\gamma}$. It can be obtained by using knowledge of the designed $\gamma$-trajectory or through an observer. Using the states of (13) the state dynamics can then be written as

$$\dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & -h & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\tau} & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{k_p}{h} & -\frac{k_d}{h} & -k_d & 1 & -k_d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \gamma.$$

Using these equations and (16), the transfer function between $\gamma$ and $\epsilon_i$ is found to be

$$\frac{\epsilon_i(s)}{\gamma(s)} = s^3 \frac{\epsilon_i(s)}{\gamma(s)} = \frac{s^2 + \tau s^3}{k_p + k_d s + s^2 + \tau s^3}.$$  

At low frequencies this transfer function has a small gain, the gain will go to 1 at high frequencies. In essence, at low frequencies the $\gamma$-trajectory can be followed closely and thus the error remains close to 0. At high frequencies the $\gamma$-trajectory cannot be followed and thus the error has the same amplitude as the $\gamma$. The exact behavior is dependent on the system parameters. This behavior is confirmed by investigating the transfer function

**Feedback controller assuming a constant $\gamma$ (FBC)**

Without knowledge of $\dot{\gamma}$, the feedback control law of (19) can be combined with the error definition

$$e_{2.1} = v_{i-1} - v_i - h\dot{a}_i.$$  

The system with this controller can be written in the form

$$\dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & -h & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\tau} & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{k_p}{h} & -\frac{k_d}{h} & -k_d & 1 & -k_d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \gamma.$$  

Using this system, the transfer function between $\epsilon_i$ and $\gamma$ is found to be

$$\frac{\epsilon_i(s)}{\gamma(s)} = s^3 \frac{\epsilon_i(s)}{\gamma(s)} = \frac{s^2 + \tau s^3}{k_p + k_d s + s^2 + \tau s^3}.$$  

This equation is similar to (21) with an additional $k_d$s term in the numerator. The general behavior is thus similar, this is confirmed by the transfer function

$$G_{FBC}(s) = \frac{d_i(s)}{\gamma(s)} = \frac{k_p}{k_p + k_d s + s^2 + \tau s^3 1 + hs}.$$  

which is comparable to (22). The difference becomes apparent when analyzing the maximum gain. The analysis for this system is shown in Figure 3. A maximum gain of 1 is obtainable with a larger parameter set using this controller. Since $\dot{\gamma}$ is ignored the $\gamma$-trajectory is followed less aggressively. Thus, an overshoot in distance less probable.
At low frequencies this transfer function has a small gain, and the feedback controller reacts to changes in the error and the state dynamics can then be written as

\[ \dot{x} = \left[ \begin{array}{c} -1 \frac{1}{h} \end{array} \right] x + [1] u, \quad y = \left[ \begin{array}{c} 1 \frac{1}{h} \end{array} \right] x. \]  \hspace{1cm} (27)

Using the standard A, B, and C matrix notation in this model, the impulse response \( g(t) \) can be computed as

\[ g(t) = Ce^{At}B = e\frac{-t}{h}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (28)

The impulse response shows how the vehicle will return to a constant velocity \( v_{i-1} \) after the maneuver. Furthermore, it is apparent that this return is dependent on headway time \( h \). Since \( g(t) > 0 \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \) no overshoot of the desired gap is expected.

A similar analysis is performed for the FBD and FBC controllers using (22) and (26) respectively. Their impulse response is dependent on parameters \( k_p, k_d, \tau, \) and \( h \). Therefore, a numerical example is used for this investigation, where \( k_p = 0.2, k_d = 0.7, \tau = 0.1 \text{ s} \) and \( h = 0.5 \text{ s} \).

The corresponding A-matrix is equal for the FBD and FBC, in this numeric example its eigenvalues have strictly negative real parts. Therefore, the impulse response of (28) can be bounded as

\[ \|g(t)\| \leq ce^{-\lambda t}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (29)

All eigenvalues of \( A \) have multiplicity equal to 1. Thus \( \lambda \) can be chosen as the absolute value of the largest real part of the eigenvalues of \( A \) (Hespanha (2009)). The chosen value of \( \lambda = 0.3660 \), the value of \( c \) is estimated numerically to be 0.9842 and 0.9464 for the FBD and FBC respectively. The resulting impulse responses of all controllers using the previously mentioned parameters can be found in Figure 4.

The impulse response of the FF is largest at \( t = 0 \), since the system reacts directly to changes in \( \gamma \). Furthermore, there is no overshoot in \( d_e \), since \( g(t) > 0 \) is satisfied. The impulse response of FBD has a larger overshoot than that of FBC. The bound on the impulse response for FBC is slightly stricter than that of FBD. A comparison using a time simulation is provided at the end of this section to highlight the difference in behavior.

### 2.3 Transient Behavior

For a timely execution of the gap opening maneuver, the transient behavior of the controllers is investigated. First, the impulse response of the FF algorithm is analyzed using (18). This transfer function can be written as

\[ s \gamma(t) = k_d \gamma(t) + k_p u(t), \]

which is comparable to (22). The difference becomes noticeable when the state dynamics can be constrained by other factors and this solution is not possible. Therefore, an overshoot in distance less probable. Thus, an overshoot in distance less probable.

The gain of this transfer function is close to 1 at low frequencies; \( \gamma \) will go to 1 at high frequencies. In essence, at low frequencies the return is dependent on headway time \( h \). Since \( g(t) > 0 \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \) no overshoot of the desired gap is expected.

A similar analysis is performed for the FBD and FBC controllers using (22) and (26) respectively. Their impulse response is dependent on parameters \( k_p, k_d, \tau, \) and \( h \). Therefore, a numerical example is used for this investigation, where \( k_p = 0.2, k_d = 0.7, \tau = 0.1 \text{ s} \) and \( h = 0.5 \text{ s} \).

The corresponding A-matrix is equal for the FBD and FBC, in this numeric example its eigenvalues have strictly negative real parts. Therefore, the impulse response of (28) can be bounded as

\[ \|g(t)\| \leq ce^{-\lambda t}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (29)

All eigenvalues of \( A \) have multiplicity equal to 1. Thus \( \lambda \) can be chosen as the absolute value of the largest real part of the eigenvalues of \( A \) (Hespanha (2009)). The chosen value of \( \lambda = 0.3660 \), the value of \( c \) is estimated numerically to be 0.9842 and 0.9464 for the FBD and FBC respectively. The resulting impulse responses of all controllers using the previously mentioned parameters can be found in Figure 4.

The impulse response of the FF is largest at \( t = 0 \), since the system reacts directly to changes in \( \gamma \). Furthermore, there is no overshoot in \( d_e \), since \( g(t) > 0 \) is satisfied. The impulse response of FBD has a larger overshoot than that of FBC. The bound on the impulse response for FBC is slightly stricter than that of FBD. A comparison using a time simulation is provided at the end of this section to highlight the difference in behavior.

### 2.4 Trajectory Design

One way to obtain a smooth trajectory that satisfies constraints on the derivatives is the usage of a polynomial. A fifth order polynomial can be used to describe a \( C^2 \) continuous \( \gamma \)-trajectory, such that

\[ \gamma(T) = c_1 + c_2T + c_3T^2 + c_4T^3 + c_5T^4 + c_6T^5. \]  \hspace{1cm} (30)

Where \( T \) is the time starting from the initiation of \( \gamma \). Constants \( c_1 \) till \( c_6 \) are parameters used to give \( \gamma \) the desired behavior. Primarily, \( \gamma(T) \) is designed to reach the gap size \( \gamma_{end} \) at time \( T_{end} \), where \( T_{end} \) is the desired timespan of the gap opening maneuver. The trajectory of \( \gamma(T) \) is designed such that \( \dot{\gamma}(T_{end}) = 0 \) and \( \ddot{\gamma}(T_{end}) = 0 \). Initial values \( \dot{\gamma}_{ini} \) and \( \ddot{\gamma}_{ini} \) are considered such that the trajectory can be redesigned at any time. These conditions are fulfilled by selecting the constants

\[ c_1 = \gamma_{ini}, \quad c_2 = \dot{\gamma}_{ini}, \quad c_3 = 0.5\ddot{\gamma}_{ini}, \]

\[ c_4 = \frac{20}{T_{end}^5} (5\dot{\gamma}_{ini} + T_{end}\ddot{\gamma}_{ini}) \]

\[ c_5 = -30\dot{\gamma}_{ini} + T_{end}(6\ddot{\gamma}_{ini} + T_{end}\dddot{\gamma}_{ini}) \]

\[ c_6 = \frac{12}{T_{end}^5} (\dddot{\gamma}_{ini} + T_{end}\ddddot{\gamma}_{ini}). \]

An example \( \gamma \)-trajectory for gap opening is shown in Figure 5. The parameters for the \( \gamma \)-trajectory, such as \( \gamma_{end} \), in this graph are chosen purely for illustrative reasons and do not bear any significance. Every derivative of \( \gamma \) is a polynomial one order lower than previous derivative.

For parameterization of the \( \gamma \)-trajectory, consider an ego vehicle opening the gap behind a preceding (pre) vehicle. The \( \gamma \)-trajectory should be such that it can accommodate a new vehicle when the pre vehicle is at a location \( q_{end,pre} \). The time constraint of the \( \gamma \)-trajectory should thus correspond with a spatial constraint using

![Fig. 3. sup_{ω∈R} |G_FBC(jω)| with τ = 0.1 for different values of \( k_p, k_d \) and \( h \).](image-url)

![Fig. 4. The \( \frac{d\gamma}{dt} \) impulse response of the FF (—), FBD (—), and FBC (—), and the corresponding bounds for the FBD (—) and FBC (—).](image-url)

![Fig. 5. Example \( \gamma \)-trajectories from 0 to 10 meters in 4 seconds and their derivatives. With \( \gamma \) [m] (—), \( \dot{\gamma} \) [m/s] (—), \( \ddot{\gamma} \) [m/s²] (—), and \( \dddot{\gamma} \) [m/s³] (—).](image-url)
The benefit of the \textit{FBC} algorithm reaches $e_i = 0$ at $T_{\text{end}}$ because it reaches $e_i = 0$ later. The new vehicle may thus not be accommodated close to $T_{\text{end}}$. It is therefore concluded that the usage of the \textit{FF} controller is beneficial because it reaches $e_i = 0$ at $T_{\text{end}}$ without an overshoot. The benefit of the \textit{FF} controller is especially apparent when threshold $\epsilon_d$ is considered in the merging strategy.

Further information can be found at http://www.e-puck.org.
platoon where each vehicle computes its own control inputs. The available knowledge of the vehicles is considered in the software on the PC. Moreover, communication delays are simulated by holding the control input $u_{pre}$ for one computation step. The system operates at approximately 25 Hz, thus the communication delay is around 0.04 seconds. All experiments were conducted using $\tau = 0.1$ s, $k_p = 0.2$, $k_d = 0.7$ h = 0.5 s and $\tau = 0.1$ m.

3.2 Experimental Results

For spatial or time-restricted merging scenarios, such as highway on-ramps, the timely execution of the gap opening maneuver is the primary objective. Error $e_{1, ego}$ is used as an indicator of the maneuver completion because $e_{1, ego} = 0$ implies $d_{ego} = d_{s, ego}$.

Experiments were conducted for a gap opening maneuver starting at $t = 50$ and ending at $t = 60$. The $pre$ vehicle is driving at 0.05 meters per second. Furthermore, $\gamma$ grows from 0 to 0.1 meters during the maneuver. The algorithms are denoted with Poly or Lin when a polynomial or linear $\gamma$-trajectory is used respectively.

Figure 8 shows the error during the gap opening maneuver. The error when using the FF Poly algorithm remained close to 0. The FF Lin strategy introduces errors at $t = 50$ and $t = 60$, because $\hat{\gamma}$ and $\hat{\dot{\gamma}}$ are not determined. However, the error goes to 0 when $\hat{\gamma} = 0$ and $\hat{\dot{\gamma}} = 0$. It is shown that at $t = 60$ the position error is zero but the velocity differs from the preceding vehicle. The FB control algorithms caused larger errors.

When error $e_{1, ego} \neq 0$ it is implied that the inter-vehicle gap is not the correct size. Therefore, only the FF Poly strategy has a timely maneuver execution. The other strategies do not satisfy the objective as the maneuver ends at approximately 67 seconds. Thus there is no significant difference in timeliness of these algorithms. In the context of a merge maneuver this means that only the FF Poly strategy would result in a gap with the correct size at the predefined time. This is important to satisfy the spatial constraints of a highway on-ramp environment.

4. CONCLUSION

Research on merging of CAVs does not often consider CACC platoons. In prior research the merging strategies for CACC platoons generally used heuristic methods for the vehicle alignment. However, there is no focus on the fulfillment of time and spatial restrictions. In the current work we aimed to start the development of a cooperative platoon-based merging strategy by tackling the problem of gap opening. The main objective was to execute the maneuver in a predefined time. Experimental validation is performed with small mobile robots.

A gap opening strategy was developed to merge maneuvers with spatial constraints, such as highway on-ramp scenarios. A corresponding controller was designed to ensure the gap is opened in a predefined time. In future work, the desired trajectory of the gap may be optimized. Furthermore, these results can be used in the design of a merging algorithm specifically for CACC platoons.
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