Objective

- Use Machine learning for predictive maintenance of drones for Zipline Inc.
- Predict the probability of a successful flight based on historical telemetry data.
- Categorize the failure into mission failure or flight failure.
- Based on prediction identify the parts which can cause the flight to fail.
- Use the model as a prototype to analysis flights in production.

Telemetry Data

- During the flight, telemetry data like energy analysis (current drawn from battery, etc.), flight tracking information and weather information is collected.
- After each flight, this data along with true labels is analyzed and stored in AWS S3.
- We have ~3000 real flight data captured, and around ~20 flights are added every day.
- Each flight captures 1000~1200 features varying on mission status.

Feature Reduction

- After cleansing the data (strings, nan, constant columns) we were left with ~700 features.
- We used the correlation matrix to remove highly correlated features and uncorrelated features with output label.
- Correlation matrix and final features reduced to 18 features.

Train and Test data

- **Labels:** Label highest_failure_level is categorized as 1-Success, 2-Mission Failure (flight returned without delivery) and 4- Flight Failure (flight deploys parachute)
- **Data size:** ~3000 flights as train set. ~250 flights as test set.

Models

- **Locally weighted linear regression:**
  \[
  \sum_{i=1}^{N} w(i)(y(i) - \theta^T x(i))^2.
  \]
- **Logistic regression:**
  \[
  J(\theta) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} [y(i) \log(h_\theta(x(i))) + (1 - y(i)) \log(1 - h_\theta(x(i)))]
  \]
- **Support Vector Machine:**
  \[
  f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i y_i \Phi(s_i) \cdot \Phi(x) + b = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i y_i K(s_i, x) + b
  \]
  - With Linear kernel \( k(x, x_i) = x \cdot x_i \)
  - With RBF kernel \( k(x, x_i) = \exp(-\gamma ||x - x_i||^2) \)
- **Decision Trees & Random Forests**
- **Principal Component Analysis (PCA):**
  - To visualize the data and select appropriate model we performed PCA on the features.
  - First 2 principal components were found using the top 2 eigenvectors.
  - SVM RBF with 2 principal components plotted the contour with labels.

Results and Discussion

We achieved following results accuracy for the models that we used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Train result(%)</th>
<th>Test result (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LWR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Eq.</td>
<td>81.89</td>
<td>89.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Descent(L1)</td>
<td>79.42</td>
<td>87.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Descent (L2)</td>
<td>79.42</td>
<td>87.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Trees</td>
<td>91.68</td>
<td>90.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Forests</td>
<td>86.09</td>
<td>86.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM Linear Kernel</td>
<td>86.09</td>
<td>86.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM RBF Kernel</td>
<td>93.04</td>
<td>92.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:
Based on the above results and the PCA plot, for our non-linear data, SVM-RBF Kernel & Decision Trees gave good results SVM-RBF achieved best result.

Review & Future Work

Result Analysis

- Model predicts flight failures with 100% accuracy, and 92.18% overall accuracy.
- Flights classified as mission failure/flight failure but reported as success, might require maintenance.

If we had more time

- We could go with regression approach to predict how much time is left before the next failure. (RUL – Remaining useful time)
- We can also run unsupervised anomaly detection on the telemetry signals reported.

Deliverables

- **Serialized Model:** Our final model will be serialized and added to the codebase of Zipline.
- For a new flight, our model will be run to get the probabilities of success, mission failure and flight failure.
- Based on our predictions and thresholds set by Zipline, they can anticipate maintenance work on the parts used in the flight.
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