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#### Abstract

The optimum design for Micro Air Vehicle (MAV) fixed wing is Zimmerman based on the optimal efficiency, however, the effect of camber to aerodynamics performance on the Zimmerman design are not fully discovered by previous researchers due to wide range of airfoil profile. Thus, the objectives of this research are to compare the aerodynamics performance of Zimmerman wing design with different percentage of camber.Three types of Zimmerman wing design known as Profile 1, Profile 2 and Profile 3 with $3 \%, 6 \%$ and $12 \%$ of camber, respectively which has different polynomial equation are used for ANSYS-CFX simulations. The three types of wing are initially developed by using ANSYS-Design Modeler before the aerodynamic simulation executed based on ANSYS-CFX simulation. The results shows that the stall angle of attack (AOA) for Profile 2 is $35^{\circ}$ which is $3^{\circ}$ and $5^{\circ}$ higher than Profile 1 and Profile 3, respectively. The maximum lift coefficient $\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{L}_{\text {max }}}\right)$ results shows that Profile 3 has better $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{L}_{\text {max }}}$ at $179.19 \%$ and $22.89 \%$ higher than Profile 1 and Profile 2, respectively. Based on the minimum drag coefficient $\left(C_{D \min }\right)$ analysis, all three profile produce $C_{D \min }$ at $A O A \approx 0^{\circ}$. However, at this stage, Profile 1 produce the lowest $C_{D \min }$ at $99.6 \%$ and $99.9 \%$ lower than Profile 2 and Profile 3, respectively. The moment coefficient analysis shows that Profile 3 shows the steepest curve slope at $\Delta \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{L}} / \Delta \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{M}}$ which is $22 \%$ and $35.32 \%$ higher than Profile 2 and Profile 1, respectively. Based on aerodynamic efficiency $\left(C_{L} / C_{D}\right)$ study, Profile 2 shows the highest $C_{L} / C_{D}$ value at 10.1175 which is higher about $23.38 \%$
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## CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

Micro air vehicle (MAV) is defined as small, portable flying vehicle which is designed for performing useful work. MAV maximum length is 6 inch with the gross takeoff weight at 200 gram or less[1]. Reynolds Number divided into three regimes which are the first one is dominated by viscous forces; this is the regime where the entire small organism fit in. The second regime is the most difficult regime where the insects and small birds fit in. lastly, the third regime where the body moving through the fluid[1]. MAV fly in the low Reynolds Number regime which is $10^{5}$ or less[1]. Due to the low Reynolds number, the suitable airfoil should be thin and well-cambered[2]. Recent study shows that thinner thickness of airfoil lead to

