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Abstract

This paper presents a new kinematic model based on the Darboux-frame for motion control and planning. In this work, we show that an underactuated system as a spin-rolling sphere on a plane with three inputs and five states can be transformed into a fully-actuated model by the given Darboux-frame transformation. This nonlinear state transformation is a geometric model that is different from conventional state-space models. First, a kinematic model of the Darboux frame at the contact point of a rotating object i.e., the sphere, is established. Next, we propose a virtual surface that is trapped between sphere and plane surfaces. This virtual surface generates arc-length-based inputs for controlling the trajectories on the sphere and plane. Finally, we discuss the controllability of this new system after our introduced transformation. In the future, we will design a proper geometric path planning method for the obtained kinematic model.
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1. Introduction

Sphere is a unique geometrical object that can be visualized as a fingertip \cite{1, 2, 3, 4, 5}, a convex object \cite{6, 7, 8} or a rolling robot \cite{9, 10, 11, 12, 13}. Path planning and control of this underactuated model is a well-known problem. However, a proper kinematic parametrization can fundamentally make the control problem easier with realizable trajectories.

In the kinematics of the rolling contact, the pure-rolling motion has 2 degrees of freedom whose instantaneous rotation axis is located at the contact point. This axis is always parallel to the common tangent plane of two surfaces e.g., sphere and plane. However, spin-rolling motion, also known as twist-rolling, has 3 degrees of freedom with a similar instantaneous rotation axis that passes contact point. Also, its axis can be in any arbitrary direction because the spinning motion is normal to the rolling axis.

From a physical point of view, it is known that spin-rolling motions are possible to be realized in the mechanical systems which the Gimbal mechanic is the classic example. For example, if we imagine the fingertip of the hand like a hemisphere, angular spinning can be achieved by wrist rotation \cite{4}. Another example is rotating the spherical object in multiple directions with control of the fingertips sometimes called as dexterous manipulation \cite{11, 12, 5}. Also, there are mechanical actuators with 3 or more degrees of freedom in realizing spin-rolling motions which are developed for spherical mobile robots \cite{9, 10, 11} and Ballbots \cite{12, 13}. In particular, spherical robots can rotate multiple masses or use different cart-based actuators inside their shell to create spin-rolling locomotion. Additionally, rotating spherical particles have broad applications in the field of nano and micro manipulations \cite{6, 7, 8}.
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In the conventional pure rolling, the sphere rotates with two degrees of freedom considered a ball-plate problem [14, 15]. Because the ball is sandwiched between a moving plane and the ground, the system binds with spinning constraint. Basically, the ball-plate definition does not fit the spin-rolling case when there is spinning around the perpendicular axis of the surface plane. Thus, our model excludes mechanisms that manipulate convex objects e.g., sphere, by planes [15, 16] since rotating the plane around its normal axis cannot spin the sphere physically. To deal with this issue, Kiss et al. [2] proposed a kinematic model with three independent planes to manipulate the sphere, and controlled the relative angles by ignoring the plane configuration. Also, Date et al. used the advantage of spinning in an indirect way [17]. Their designed algorithm was shifting the coordinate of the actuating plane in iterations with respect to different base frames which was, in a sense, utilizing a third rotational virtual center. However, time scaling with the included coordinate transformation of the kinematic model can result in uncontrollable states [18]. Also, the practicality of the approach was not discussed for realizing the proposed virtual center by different propulsion mechanisms.

On the other hand, the Montana kinematic model [19] illustrated that spinning can be included in the rolling sphere on the surface. It is also clear that having one more input (spinning or twist) makes the kinematic model $5 \times 3$ which increases the level of accessibility in the given system. However, the spinning of the rolling object creates a certain complexity because the spin angle changes all the rotational states. This new system leaves the conventional planning in geometric phase shifting [14, 20, 21, 22] hard to be applied. In order to find a model that is easier to develop motion planning and control strategies, a different parametrization of the kinematics model can help to reduce the complexity of the problem. Recently, the Darboux-frame-based kinematics has seen serious attention because it is time- and coordinate-invariant [5, 23, 24]. L. Cui and J. Dai at their preliminary studies presented the Darboux-frame-based kinematics on the spin-rolling sphere with point contact under the rolling constraint [23]. Then, they investigated the formulation based on the Darboux-Frame in form of polynomials for rolling loci of the instantaneous kinematics on different surfaces [24]. However, these studies mostly did not consider a generalized and suitable model for the control and planning problem purposes.

In this paper, we have designed our novel kinematic model considering two main motivations: developing a geometric kinematic model with inputs at the arc-length domain, and transforming the underactuated model into a fully-actuated and controllable one. At first, we propose a new geometric model where the control inputs are time- and coordinate-invariant with arc length properties. In order to derive the kinematic model with arc-length-based inputs, the Darboux frame model was defined on the contact frame between the rotating object and fixed surface. Also, a novel virtual surface is introduced and proved to manipulate the inputs of the kinematic model to the desired states. Our model is different from works in Refs. [5, 23, 24] since we have defined a novel virtual surface that can control the new system in the arc-length domain. Also, the induced curvatures of surfaces (sphere and plane) have been designed dependent on spinning angles through the Darboux frame. We will design these angular inputs to constrain the developed virtual surface inputs. These extra angular constraints let the spin-rolling sphere be manipulated directly for arriving at the desired states of the fixed surface (plane). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first arc-length-based model that transfers the kinematic model to a more accessible one. Note that this geometric model separates the time scale from the kinematics, which gives the system freedom to converge with different convergence rates in the given time. Finally, we check the controllability of this new kinematic model. It is important to note that our designed formulation through the Darboux frame increases the number of input parameters ($5 \times 5$ model) that make the control problem much easier.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the Darboux-frame-based kinematic model of moving frame is derived and explained by considering curvature properties of surfaces. Then, we find a fully-actuated kinematic model from our nonlinear transformation. Next, the controllability of the new kinematic model is studied in Section 3. Finally, we conclude our findings in Section 4.

2. Kinematic Model of Moving Darboux Frame

The new model of the Darboux frame at the contact point of the spin-rolling sphere and plane with an introduced virtual surface is developed. Next, the induced curvatures with relative angles between the
sphere, plane, and the established Darboux frame are found. Finally, this Darboux kinematics is substituted into the Montana Kinematics [19] and a fully-actuated model for the sphere-plane system is obtained. As we derive the new geometric model, the kinematics readily suits both contact trajectories and arbitrary parameters of the surfaces [23 25]. Also, this transformation provides three significant benefits. First, the spin-rolling angular rotations explicitly appear on the relative curvature and torsion that makes it easier for manipulation. Second, the Darboux frame separates the time variable from the planning due to its time- and coordinate-invariance (arc-length-based control inputs). Third, the underactuated sphere-plane system can be transformed into a fully-actuated one to simplify the control and planning problems.

Fig. 1 is depicted for a rotating object and fixed surface coordinate frames in the ball and plane system. Σ₀ and Σₛ are the fixed frames on the rolling object (red sphere) and the plane. There are contact frames for a sphere Σₖo and fixed traveled surface Σₖs. Also, Σₛ frame is fixed relative to other frames. It is assumed that the sphere with radius $R_o$ is rotating with no sliding constraint. The local coordinate systems for the sphere at Σₖo and plane at Σₛ are defined [19 20 22] as follows

$$f_o : U_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 : c(u_o, v_o) \mapsto (-R_o \sin u_o \cos v_o, R_o \sin v_o, -R_o \cos u_o \cos v_o),$$
$$f_s : U_S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 : c(u_s, v_s) \mapsto (u_s, v_s, 0),$$

where $c(u_o, v_o) \in [-\pi, \pi]$ and $c(u_s, v_s)$ are contact parameters of the sphere and plane. Coordinates $(u_o, v_o)$ are known to be the latitude and longitude of spherical surface $U_C$, respectively. Note that there is a spin angle $\psi$ between x-axis of Σₖo sphere and Σₖs plane contact frames as Fig. 1. Next, the sphere is the rotating object $U_C$ with curvature properties [20] as follows

$$k_{nu}^o = k_{nv}^o = \frac{1}{R_o}, \quad \tau_{gu}^o = \tau_{gv}^o = 0, \quad k_{gu}^o = \tan(v_o)/R_o, \quad k_{gv}^o = 0,$$

where $\{k_{nu}^o, \tau_{gu}^o, k_{gu}^o\}$ and $\{k_{nv}^o, \tau_{gv}^o, k_{gv}^o\}$ are the normal curvature, geodesic torsion and geodesic curvature of the rotating body with respect to $u_o$ and $v_o$ principles. Also, the curvature terms of the plane surface $U_S$ are

$$k_{nu}^s = k_{nv}^s = \tau_{gu}^s = \tau_{gv}^s = k_{gu}^s = k_{gv}^s = 0,$$

where $\{k_{nu}^s, \tau_{gu}^s, k_{gu}^s\}$ and $\{k_{nv}^s, \tau_{gv}^s, k_{gv}^s\}$ are the normal curvature, geodesic torsion and the geodesic curvature of the fixed surface (plane) with respect to $u_s$ and $v_s$ principles.
At first, we introduce a Darboux frame $\Sigma_f$, for deriving the kinematics in arc-length domain, that is on the contact coordinate of the plane $\Sigma_s$. Let a traced curve $L_s$ in Euclidean space be on the surface plane $U_S$ [see Fig. 2]. Every contacted point $P \in U_S$ has a unit-based Darboux frame $(e_1^s, e_2^s, e_3^s)$ where $e_1^s$ is a tangent vector to the path $L_s$, $e_3^s$ is a normal vector to the surface $U_S$ and $e_2^s$ is perpendicular to the plane $e_3^s \times e_1^s$ [see Appendix A for the preliminary equations of the Darboux frame]. Apart from the Darboux frame attached to the plane trajectory $L_s$, the angular velocity of the Darboux frame $\omega^s$ is determined with including two more Darboux frames attached to the sphere trajectory $L_v$ as $(e_1^v, e_2^v, e_3^v)$ and trajectory of our defined virtual surface $L_v$ as $(e_1^v, e_2^v, e_3^v)$ on the contact point $P$ [see Fig. 2]. Note that all these Darboux frames coincide with each other $[23]$ due to no-sliding constraint. Then, the angular velocity $\omega^s$ at point $P$ is derived by the defined virtual surface:

**Definition 1.** The virtual surface $U_v$ [see Fig. 2 as an example] is introduced with geodesic curvature $\alpha_s$, geodesic torsion $\beta_s$ and normal curvature $\gamma_s$. These curvature variables $\{\alpha_s, \beta_s, \gamma_s\}$ will be replaced with angular velocity inputs of the Montana Kinematic model $[19]$ after transformation as the arc-length-based inputs. This virtual surface can be imagined as a sandwiched surface that its curvatures variations (geometric control inputs) are projected onto both sphere and plane trajectories with resultant angular velocity $\omega^s$.\footnote{Example 2.1 shows this kinematic relation in a simple rolling disc case.} As explained earlier, the unit-based Darboux frames of all three surfaces are always aligned with each other $[23]$ [see Fig. 2]. This means the sphere always rolls on the plane $\{\text{see Fig. 2}\}$. Every contacted point $P$ can be imagined as a flexible sandwiched sheet between the ball and plate whose relative arc length variation $ds$ results in the angular change in the spin-rolling sphere. Thus, the angular velocity of the Darboux frame along $L_s$ [the derivation is in Appendix B on P is shown by

$$\omega^s = \delta(-\tau_3^se_1^v + k_3^s e_2^v - k_2^s e_3^v).$$

(4)

where

$$\delta = ds/dt, \quad k_3^s = k_g^s - k_g - \alpha_s, \quad k_3^s = k_n^s - \beta_s - \gamma_s, \quad \tau_3^s = \tau_g^s - \tau_g - \beta_s.$$

(5)

where $\delta$ is the derivation of the arc length relative to time called the rolling rate, and $k_g^s, k_n^s$ and $\tau_g^s$ are the induced geodesic curvature, normal curvature and geodesic torsion between two surfaces (sphere and plane) including a sandwiched virtual surface’s curvatures $\{\alpha_s, \beta_s, \gamma_s\}$. Also, $\{k_g^s, k_n^s, \tau_g^s\}$ and $\{k_n^s, k_n^s, \tau_g^s\}$ are the induced curvatures of the sphere and plane with respect to the Darboux frame $e_1^s$ of the plane.
Remark 1. Because we want to parametrize the kinematic model by using Darboux frame and have its mentioned advantages [5, 23, 24, 25], the defined virtual surface should exist in the formulation \([1]\) for the ability to control the sphere-plane system in the arc-length domain (angle/arc length) by \(\{\alpha_s, \beta_s, \gamma_s\}\) rather than the angular velocity in the time domain, presented in Montana kinematics \([19]\). Without our defined virtual surface, the sphere-plane kinematics \([4]\) will only correspond to certain constrained trajectories from the induced curvature of the geometric surfaces with invariant variables which were already presented in Ref. \([23]\) work.

Remark 2. In Ref. \([24]\), the angular velocity of the Darboux frame \([4]-[5]\) had only similar \(\delta \alpha_s\) term that it was defined as the compensatory spin rate. However, we have derived a general formulation with the defined arbitrary virtual surface to control the pure-rolling velocities of the sphere by \(\{\delta \gamma_s, \delta \beta_s\}\) and its spin velocity by \(\delta \alpha_s\). Note that our introduced virtual surface does not fit the proposed analytical solution in Ref. \([24]\) since the problem becomes unsolvable with unknown variables more than the polynomial formulations (5 unknown variable and 3 equations).

Example 2.1. In order to show the relation of the virtual surface inputs with angular velocity in a simple example, we consider a rolling disc case with radius \(R\). Let the disc rolls with angle of \(\gamma_s\) without spinning angle which has the curvature of \(k_\gamma^s = \tau_\gamma^s = 0\) and \(k_n^s = 1/R\). The fixed surface \(U_S\) is considered as a plane with \(k_\gamma^s = \tau_\gamma^s = k_n^s = 0\). Then, by substituting these curvatures into Eq. \([4]\), we have the angular \(\omega^s\) and linear \(v^s\) velocities on \(P\) as follows

\[
\omega^s = \delta ((1/R) + \gamma_s) e_2^s, \quad v^s = \omega^s \times r_s = \delta [(1/R) + \gamma_s] e_2^s \times R e_3^s = \delta [1 + R \gamma_s] e_1^s.
\]

We can see that the curvature variation of \(\gamma_s\) is projected onto unit frames which changes the linear and angular velocities. The disc travels on the plane along \(e_1^s\) with corresponding kinematics \([6]\). Also, the kinematics \([9]\) can be represented in the classic velocity formulation on the Cartesian coordinate \(\{s-ijk\}\) system by given definitions

\[
e_1^s = i, \quad e_2^s = j, \quad \delta = \frac{ds}{dt} = R \frac{dv_o}{dt}.
\]

Note that \([6]-[7]\) can be extended for the spin-rolling system with three arc-length-based inputs.

Now, we want to design the induced curvatures of the sphere \(\{k_\nu^s, k_\psi^s, \tau_\psi^s\}\) and plane \(\{k_n^s, k_\nu^s, \tau_\nu^s\}\) for \([4]-[5]\) in a way that they become constrained by angles between two surfaces and the Darboux frame. There are the unit-based orthonormal frames of \((e_\nu^s, e_\psi^s, e_3^s)\) and \((e_\nu^s, e_\psi^s, e_3^s)\) [see in Fig. \([3]\)] induced by the contact coordinates of the rotating object (sphere) \(\Sigma_{co}\) and fixed surface (plane) \(\Sigma_{sa}\), respectively. These vectors presenting the contact point’s tangential velocity of each surface that can be found by taking a derivative of local coordinates in \([1]\). Note that both frames of the contact point’s velocities of the sphere \((e_\nu^s, e_\psi^s)\) and
the plane \((e_u^a, e_u^b)\) reside on the plane of the Darboux frame \((e^1_u, e^2_u)\) of the curve \(L_s\). Additionally, the unit normals of the surfaces \((e_3^a, e_3^b)\) and the Darboux frame of the plane are always aligned with each other. Then, let the rotating sphere tangent vector of \(u_s\)-curve \(e_u^a\) makes an anlge \(\varphi\) (about \(e_3\) vector) with the Darboux frame \(e^1_u\) vector [see Fig. 3] that is tangent to path \(L_s\). Also, \(\theta\) is the angle (about \(e_3\)) between the vectors of the sphere \(e_u^a\) and plane \(e_u^b\) contact frames. The general equations of the Darboux frame (trihedrons) with angle respect to induced coordinates of a surface is summarized as the preliminaries in Appendix A, which were also shown in Refs. [5, 23, 26]. Then, the induced curvature between the Darboux frame \(\Sigma_f\) and each of the contact coordinates of the sphere \(\Sigma_{co}\) and the plane \(\Sigma_{cs}\) can be developed [see Appendix C for the details of calculation]. By using the derived general Darboux relation (C.7), the normal curvature \(k_n\), the geodesic curvature \(k^g\) and geodesic torsion \(\tau^g\) of the sphere in the direction of \(e^1_u\) can be found in terms of the angle \(\varphi\) as follow

\[
k_n^o = k_{nu}^o \cos^2 \varphi + 2\tau_{gu}^o \cos \varphi \sin \varphi + k_{nv}^o \sin^2 \varphi = 1/R_o,\]

\[
\tau_g^o = \tau_{gu}^o \cos 2\varphi + \frac{1}{2}(k_{nu}^o - k_{nv}^o) \sin 2\varphi = 0,\]

\[
k_g^o = k_{gv}^o \cos \varphi + k_{gu}^o \sin \varphi = \tan v_o \cos \varphi/R_o.\]

The normal curvature \(k_n^s\), the geodesic curvature \(k_g^s\) and the geodesic torsion \(\tau_g^s\) of the plane in the direction of \(e^1_u\) vectror \((e_u^a - e^1_u\) make the angle of \(\varphi + \theta\) as Fig. 2 is

\[
k_n^s = k_{nu}^s \cos^2(\theta + \varphi) + 2\tau_{gu}^s \cos(\theta + \varphi) \sin(\theta + \varphi) + k_{nv}^s \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) = 0,\]

\[
\tau_g^s = \tau_{gu}^s \cos 2(\theta + \varphi) + \frac{1}{2}(k_{nu}^s - k_{nv}^s) \sin 2(\theta + \varphi) = 0,\]

\[
k_g^s = k_{gv}^s \cos(\theta + \varphi) + k_{gu}^s \sin(\theta + \varphi) = 0.\]  

Note that the derived induced curvatures of the sphere \(8\) and plane \(9\) will be substituted into Eq. 5 for finding the angular velocity of the Darboux frame \(\omega^s\).

Eq. (4) is the angular velocity of the Darboux frame. Transformation that expresses the Darboux frame \((e^1_u, e^2_u, e_3^u)\) on the frame \((e_u^a, e_u^b, e_3^a)\) of the sphere is

\[
e^1_u = \cos(\varphi + \theta)e_u^a + \sin(\varphi + \theta)e_u^b,\]

\[
e^2_u = -\sin(\varphi + \theta)e_u^a + \cos(\varphi + \theta)e_u^b,\]

\[
e^3_u = e^3_u.\]  

The angular velocity of the Darboux frame \(\omega^s\) is equal to the angular velocity of the sphere. Thus, one gets the angular velocity of the sphere \(\omega^o\) by substituting (10) into (4) [see Fig. 2] as follows

\[
\omega^o = \omega^o_u e_u^a + \omega^o_v e_u^b + \omega^o_3 e^3_u,\]  

where

\[
\omega^o_u = \delta(-\cos(\varphi + \theta)\tau^s - \sin(\varphi + \theta)k_n^s),\]

\[
\omega^o_v = \delta(-\sin(\varphi + \theta)\tau^s + \sin(\varphi + \theta)k_n^s),\]

\[
\omega^o_3 = \delta(-k_g^s).\]  

The following angular velocities (12) are in terms of \(\delta\), \(\theta\) and \(\varphi\) including the virtual surface where \(\delta\) is the rolling rate of the sphere and \(\theta\) and \(\varphi\) angles are for assigning the direction of the sphere on the plane. Because we use kinematics that gives the angular velocities \((\omega^o_u, \omega^o_v, \omega^o_3)\), all these input variables directly change the motion of the sphere on the plane.

The angular velocities of the Darboux frame in Eq. (12) have to be transferred to the states of the sphere and plane for obtaining the transformation of the fully-actuated model. We utilize the Montana equation
with the inclusion of no-sliding constraints. By knowing the curvatures of the surfaces (2)-(3), we can have the Montana kinematics as follows \[11, 15\] with the inclusion of no-sliding constraints. By knowing the curvatures of the surfaces (2)-(3), we can have the Montana

\begin{align}
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{u}_s(t) \\
\dot{v}_s(t) \\
\dot{u}_o(t) \\
\dot{v}_o(t) \\
\dot{\psi}(t)
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
0 & R_o & 0 \\
-R_o & 0 & 0 \\
-\sin \psi/\cos v_o & -\cos \psi/\cos v_o & 0 \\
-\cos \psi & \sin \psi & 0 \\
-\sin \psi \tan v_o & -\cos \psi \tan v_o & -1
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\omega^s_x \\
\omega^s_y \\
\omega^s_z
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align}

(13)

where \(\psi\) is the spin angle between the sphere and plane as Fig. 1. We use Eq. (13) as the Montana kinematics of a spin-rolling sphere on the plane \(\theta, \varphi\). The angular velocity of the spin-rolling sphere \(\omega^s\) with our new Darboux frame definition in Eq. (13) is constructed including the sphere and plane induced curvatures in (8)-(9) and the virtual surface. Finally, we substitute the new angular velocity \(\omega^s\) into \((\omega^s_x, \omega^s_y, \omega^s_z)\) inputs of (13), which results

\begin{align}
\begin{bmatrix}
\alpha_s \\
\beta_s \\
\gamma_s
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{R_o \sin(\theta + \varphi)}{-R_o \cos(\theta + \varphi)} \\
\frac{\sin(\psi + \theta + \varphi)}{\cos v_o} \\
-\tan v_o [\sin(\psi + \theta + \varphi) + \cos \psi]
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\sin(\theta + \varphi)}{\sin(\theta + \varphi) \sin \psi - \cos \psi} \\
\frac{\sin(\theta + \varphi)}{\sin(\theta + \varphi) \cos \psi + \sin \psi} \\
\tan v_o [\sin(\psi + \theta + \varphi) + \cos \psi]
\end{bmatrix}
\end{align}

(14)

\[\theta(\beta_s, \gamma_s, G_f) = \cot^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{\beta_s} \left( \frac{1}{R_o} (1 - \tan G_f) + \gamma_s (-1 + \tan G_f) - \beta_s \tan G_f \right) \right],\]

\[\varphi(G_f) = \begin{cases}
\pi, & -\frac{3\pi}{4} < G_f < 0 \quad \& \quad 0 \leq G_f < \frac{\pi}{4} \\
0, & -\pi < G_f < -\frac{3\pi}{4} \quad \& \quad -\pi \leq G_f < -\frac{\pi}{4}
\end{cases}\]

(15)

By using Darboux-frame-based kinematics \[14\] with \[15\], the system has an independent angular input \(G_f\) to converge desired plane states \((u_{s,f}, v_{s,f})\) and three arc-length-based inputs \((\alpha_s, \beta_s, \gamma_s)\) for controlling the spin-rolling states toward the desired angular states \((u_{o,f}, v_{o,f}, \psi_f)\).

Proof. To move in the direction of desired arbitrary angle \(G_f\) with the assigned trajectory of \(L_s\), we derive \(\theta\) from Eq. (14). Derivation happens by the definition of the goal angle \(G_f\) on plane in a small size arc length step \(ds\) from using the plane’s differential equations \((u'_s, v'_s)\) in (14)

\[G_f \triangleq \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{v'_s}{u'_s} \right) = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{dv_s}{du_s} \right) = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\sin(\theta + \varphi) - R_o \sin(\theta + \varphi) \beta_s}{\cos(\theta + \varphi) - R_o \sin(\theta + \varphi) \gamma_s + R_o \cos(\theta + \varphi) \beta_s} \right),\]

(16)

after factoring the numerator and denominator by \(\sin(\theta + \varphi)\) and finding equation (16) for \(\theta + \varphi\), we have

\[\theta + \varphi = \cot^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{\beta_s} \left( \frac{1}{R_o} (1 - \tan G_f) + \gamma_s (-1 + \tan G_f) - \beta_s \tan G_f \right) \right].\]

(17)
We already know $\theta$ is the angle between two surfaces’ contact curves $e_u^o - e_u^s$; hence, Eq. (17) is assigned to angle $\theta$. Next, angle $\phi$ only corresponds to angular input $G_f$ shift on the plane. Because we have a cotangent function in (17), there is $\pi$ shift (the shifting line is located on $u_s = v_s$ of the plane as $G_f = \pm \pi/4$) in $\phi$ depending on the desired angular input $G_f$ value to converge in all directions on the plane as (15). Based on the defined functions for $\theta$ and $\phi$ angles, Eq. (15) is developed.

Remark 3. The nonlinear transformation has changed the underactuated $5 \times 3$ model (13) to $5 \times 4$ kinematic model in $s$-domain as (14) because $\{\theta(\beta_s, \gamma_s, G_f), \phi(G_f)\}$ with angular input $G_f$ will always converge the system toward the desired plane states $\{u_{s,f}, v_{s,f}\}$ and we have three arc-length-based inputs $\{\alpha_s, \beta_s, \gamma_s\}$ to converge the remaining desired angular states of the sphere $\{u_{o,f}, v_{o,f}, \psi_f\}$. However, we have one more input in the time-domain as the rolling rate $\delta$ providing the rest-to-rest motion of the sphere (similar to a time-scaling variable in Ref. [17, 27]). Thus, the transformed kinematic model in time domain becomes $5 \times 5$ system with $\{\alpha_s, \beta_s, \gamma_s, G_f, \delta\}$ inputs. If we look carefully, we can see that this nonlinear transformation lets us have $\{G_f, \delta\}$ new extra inputs. These two inputs are similar to a steering angular input and vehicle’s input velocity in the kinematics of the 2-DoF wheeled mobile systems. This transformation can solve certain control challenges for the model (13) that is not differentially flat. We have also proved that one cannot obtain extra angular control input $G_f$ by directly using the Montana kinematics in Appendix D.

Remark 4. Fig. 4 illustrates an example simulation for a constant $G_f = \tan^{-1}[(v_{s,f} - v_{s,0})/(u_{s,f} - u_{s,0})]$ by a desired straight path on plane. The arc-length-inputs $\{\alpha_s, \beta_s, \gamma_s\}$ are changed with different values while $\{\theta, \phi\}$ angles constrain these inputs. This results in different trajectories on the sphere $U_C$ but the path on the plane $L_s$ kept the same. The new kinematics becomes a model with a drift term in which the sphere can be manipulated toward its desired rotations on the plane. Geometrically, if we have our virtual surface inputs $(\alpha_s, \beta_s, \gamma_s)$ zero, the drift term varies (change in $\{\theta, \phi\}$ angles) the sphere velocity with constant angular direction on the plane (45°) as Fig. 5. This drift term appears in angular displacement as a sine wave with a constant periodic cycle. Note that the drift term appears due to the substituted sphere’s normal and geodesic curvatures (2) which are dependent on $\{\theta, \phi\}$ by our the Darboux frame (12). Also, this drift term vanishes in the time-domain because the rolling rate $\delta$ that provides rest-to-rest locomotion converges to zero. We plan to design a geometric controller (surface with varying curvatures) for $(\alpha_s, \beta_s, \gamma_s)$ inputs.
3. Controllability of the Darboux-Frame-Based Kinematic Model

We check the controllability of the derived kinematic model in Eq. (14). This model can be represented as

\[ \dot{x} = f(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} g_i(x) u_i, \]  

(18)

where \( f(x) \) and \( g_i(x) \) are our drift term and the control input coefficients. Also, we consider \( x = \{u_s, v_s, u_o, v_o, \psi\} \) and \( u_i = \{\alpha_s, \beta_s, \gamma_s\} \).

**Theorem 1.** System (18) is controllable if \( f(x) \) is weakly positively Poisson stable (WPPS) and Lie algebra rank condition (LARC) is satisfied for local accessibility [28, 29].

In order to prove the weakly positively Poisson stable (WPPS) condition in given Theorem 1, we find whether the volume of phase space inside the given vector field for the drift term \( f(x) \) is preserved by Liouville’s theorem [30].

\[ \nabla \cdot f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x^i} = \delta \sin(\theta + \varphi)(\sin \psi + \cos \psi) \frac{\tan v_o}{Ro} = 0. \]  

(19)
Not only it is possible to change $\theta + \varphi$ from angular input $G_f$ but also we can assign $\delta \geq 0$ to converge the desired plane states $P_f = (u, v, \omega, \nu)$ in time-domain as

$$\lim_{P \to P_f} \delta(u, v, \omega, \nu) = 0,$$

and makes property (19) always true. Also, this is proved under assumption that following condition

$$\sum_{i=1}^{5} \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x^i} = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x^i} = 0,$$

is satisfied. The condition (20) can be derived by using Eq. (15) as follows

$$\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial x^i} = \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x^i} - 1 + \rho^2 = -\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x^i} \beta_s^2 + \left[ \frac{1}{\rho_o}(1 - \tan G_f) + \gamma_s(-1 + \tan G_f) - \beta_s \tan G_f \right]^2$$

where

$$\theta = \frac{1}{\beta_s} \left( \frac{1}{\rho_o}(1 - \tan G_f) + \gamma_s(-1 + \tan G_f) - \beta_s \tan G_f \right).$$

If we choose our control inputs $\{\beta_s, \gamma_s\}$ in a way that the sufficient condition as $1 \ll \rho^2$ is satisfied, then, Eq. (20) is true. Also, because $\varphi$ is a constant value in (15), the relation (20) is satisfied. Thus, our considered drift system based on (19) and (20) becomes WPPS. Note that the term $\delta$ is similar to the time-scaling control method that was used for the ball-plate system in Ref. [17].

**Remark 5.** The Liouville’s theorem is a sufficient condition to grant the WPPS property of our drift term. Moreover, Lory proved that compact orientable manifold i.e., sphere, is Poisson stable [51] since every point on $\mathbb{R}^2$ of topological space is reachable. Then, Ref. [28] already proved that Poisson stable dense manifold is equivalent to WPPS.

In order to find the Lie brackets of (18), we have four vector fields in total. In our new kinematic model, the spin orientation of the sphere is an important control input that roughly corresponds to $g_3$ matrix. Then, we find the Lie brackets as follows

$$\begin{align*}
\mathbf{f} &= \begin{bmatrix}
\sin(\theta + \varphi) \\
\sin(\theta + \varphi) \\
\sin(\theta + \varphi) \sin(\psi - \cos \psi) \\
\sin(\theta + \varphi) \cos(\psi - \sin \psi) \\
\tan v_o \sin(\theta + \varphi) \sin(\psi - \cos \psi)
\end{bmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{g}_1 &= \begin{bmatrix}
-R_o \sin(\theta + \varphi) \\
-R_o \sin(\theta + \varphi) \\
-R_o \sin(\theta + \varphi) \cos(\psi - \sin \psi) \\
-R_o \sin(\theta + \varphi) \cos(\psi - \sin \psi) \\
-R_o \sin(\theta + \varphi)
\end{bmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{g}_2 &= \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{g}_3 &= \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}_3 &= \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}_3 &= \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}.
\end{align*}$$

\[ (22) \]
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It is clear that the necessary condition for controllability in Theorem 1 is satisfied since \( \text{dim}(L_3) = \dim \{ g_1, g_2, g_3, [f, g_3], [f, f, g_3] \} = 5 \), and its determinant is

\[
\det(L_3) = -2 \frac{\sin v_0}{\cos^2 v_0} \cos \varphi \sin^3(\theta + \varphi)[\sin(\theta + \varphi) + \cos(\theta + \varphi)].
\]  

(23)

Note that the determinant \(\det(L_3)\) has singular points at \(\theta + \varphi = k\pi, \pi(2k+1)/2\) and \(\varphi = \pi(2k+1)/2\) which have to be avoided when we are choosing our desired configuration on the plane. Also, the third singularity is at the local coordinate of the sphere manifold at \(v_o = \pi(2k+1)/2\) angles that cause the determinant to converge infinity and controllability is lost. This can be solved by avoiding the physical desired angles \(v_o, f\) near to \(\pm \pi/2\) (two points located at two sides of the sphere’s equator when \(u_o\) is an arbitrary angle in our coordinate system \([1]\)).

In this kinematic model all three inputs always exists. In particular, if one of the inputs is removed e.g., \(\beta = 0\), the the kinematic model becomes uncontrollable

\[
\text{dim}(L) = \dim \{ g_1, g_3, [g_1, g_3], [f, g_3], [f, f, g_3], [f, g_1, g_3], [f, f, g_3], \}
\]

\[
[f, [g_1, g_3]], [f, g_1, g_3], [f, f, g_3], [f, g_1, g_3], [f, [g_3, f, g_3]], [f, g_3, g_1, g_3], [f, g_3, f, g_3]
\]

(24)

Thus, we define a proposition based on our findings.

**Proposition 2.** All three arc-length-based control inputs, in particular \(\gamma\) and \(\beta\), should always exist in [14]. Otherwise, the rank of Lie bracket \(n\) for drift system becomes \(n < 5\). This makes the kinematic model uncontrollable.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we presented a new parametrization based on Darboux-frame for path planning and control purposes. At first, the kinematic model of the Darboux frame was derived from the contact point of the sphere and plane. This new formula has an introduced virtual surface sandwiched between surfaces (sphere and plane) to produce arc-length-based control inputs. Next, the induced curvatures of the sphere and plane were developed with relative angular input relations. Then, the Montana kinematics with 3 inputs and 5 states, an underactuated model, was transformed into a fully-actuated one. This ease the control and planning problem for this system. Additionally, the controllability of the Darboux-frame-based kinematic model was checked. The proposed kinematics preserves the advantages of time- and coordinate-invariance while we have more control inputs to converge the spin-rolling sphere to desired states.

In the future, we will apply a proper path planning strategy with derived Darboux-frame-based kinematics. Also, we will extend the problem for general 2D manifold surfaces.
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Appendix A. Moving Darboux Frame Preliminaries

The structural equations of a Darboux frame, which is known for the trihedron, are explained on an arbitrary surface $U$ as Fig. A.6. Let every contacted point $P \in U$ is defined by a unit-based Darboux frame.

![Figure A.6: Two coordinate frames related by $\varphi$ rotational angle about $e_3$.](image-url)
$e_1, e_2, e_3$ \cite{26} where $e_1$ is a tangent vector to the path $L$, $e_4$ is a normal vector to the $U$ surface and $e_2$ is perpendicular to the plane $e_3 \times e_1$. The Darboux frame motion along the curve $L$ on the surface $U$ becomes \cite{26}

$$dP = \omega^f_{ij} e_i,$$

$$d \begin{bmatrix} e_1 \\ e_2 \\ e_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \omega^f_{12} & \omega^f_{13} \\ -\omega^f_{12} & 0 & \omega^f_{23} \\ -\omega^f_{13} & -\omega^f_{23} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} e_1 \\ e_2 \\ e_3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (A.1)$$

where $\omega^f_{ij}$ are the one-forms of the Darboux frame. Based on Cartan \cite{26}, if the curve $L$ is parametrized by arc length $s$, $\omega^f_{ij}$ is the component of translation of the Darboux frame (trihedron) in arc-length domain. Also, $\omega^f_{12}, \omega^f_{23}$ and $\omega^f_{13}$ are the components of rotation of the Darboux frame (trihedron) in arc-length domain. The curvature dependencies along the curve $L$ are defined for the Darboux frame by (A.1) by using these one-form differential relations as \cite{24}

$$k_g = \omega^f_{12} / \omega^f_{13}, \quad k_n = \omega^f_{13} / \omega^f_{13}, \quad \tau_g = \omega^f_{23} / \omega^f_{13}, \quad (A.2)$$

where $k_g, k_n$ and $\tau_g$ are the geodesic curvature, normal curvature and geodesic torsion of the Darboux frame, respectively.

Now, consider an angle $\varphi$ between the Darboux frame $e_1$ and the induced contact coordinate of the arbitrary surface ($e_u,e_v,e_3$) about aligned $e_3$, then the structural equations are parameterized by

$$e_1 = \cos \varphi \ e_u + \sin \varphi \ e_v,$$

$$e_2 = -\sin \varphi \ e_u + \cos \varphi \ e_v,$$

$$e_3 = e_3, \quad (A.3)$$

which differentiating both sides of given transformation results

$$\begin{bmatrix} \omega^f_{12} \\ \omega^f_{13} \\ \omega^f_{23} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \varphi & \sin \varphi \\ 0 & -\sin \varphi & \cos \varphi \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{12} \\ \omega_{13} \\ \omega_{23} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (A.4)$$

where $\omega_{ij}$ are the one-forms for an induced coordinates of an arbitrary surface. Note that we apply this to the arbitrary rotating object with the angle $\varphi$ with respect to the Darboux frame. These properties are also applied to derive the fixed surface (plane) and rotating sphere equation with the inclusion of angle $\theta$. We will use these kinematic relations to develop curvature equations between the Darboux frame and the induced contact coordinates of an arbitrary surface in Appendix C.

**Appendix B. Darboux-Frame-Based Kinematics Between Two Surfaces with Sandwiched Virtual Surface**

The induced curvatures between the rotating object (sphere) and fixed surface (plane) including a sandwiched virtual surface \cite{5} is derived here. We show the derivation by using the preliminary study on the induced curvature for two surfaces \cite{23}. Here, we develop a new virtual surface that is sandwiched between two surfaces (sphere and plane in our case). This virtual surface will relate our arc-length-based inputs with derived curvatures in \cite{C.7} to manipulate the spin-rolling sphere angular coordinates.

We propose a spin-rolling object $U_C$ on the surface $U_S$ where a virtual moving surface $U_V$ is sandwiched as Fig. B.7. As explained earlier, the unit-based Darboux frames ($e^1_n,e^2_n,e^3_n$) of all three surfaces are always aligned with each other [see Fig. B.7]. The spin-rolling object (sphere), the fixed surface (plane) and virtual
surface keep having the same contact point $P$. The moving Darboux frame at the contact point $P$ contains a general motion equation as:

$$
\frac{dP}{ds} = e_1,
$$

$$
d \begin{bmatrix}
e_1 \\
e_2 \\
e_3
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & k_y & k_n \\
-k_y & 0 & \tau_g \\
-k_n & -\tau_g & 0
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
e_1 \\
e_2 \\
e_3
\end{bmatrix},
$$

where, regardless of coordinate dependency, $s$ is the arc length of path $L$, and also $k_y$, $k_n$ and $\tau_g$ are geodesic curvature, the normal curvature and geodesic torsion of the Darboux frame. Also, the right-handed orthonormal unit vectors are aligned in same direction for all objects with respective subscripts, for example, the object $U_C$ has $(e_1^o, e_2^o, e_3^o)$ [see Fig. B.7]. Initially, the position of an arbitrary fixed point $M_o$ on body $U_C$ is

$$
M_o = P + \sigma^o_1 e_1^o + \sigma^o_2 e_2^o + \sigma^o_3 e_3^o,
$$

where $\sigma$ is a scaler coordinate for the considered object, here $\{\sigma^o_1, \sigma^o_2, \sigma^o_3\}$ is for the rotating sphere. Differentiating this position matrix (B.2) with respect to arc length $s$ besides using Eq. (B.1) gives

$$
\frac{dM_o}{ds} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 + \sigma^o_1 \frac{d\sigma^o_1}{ds} - \sigma^o_2 k_y^o - \sigma^o_3 k_n^o \\
\sigma^o_2 \frac{d\sigma^o_2}{ds} + \sigma^o_1 k_y^o - \sigma^o_3 \tau_g^o \\
\sigma^o_3 \frac{d\sigma^o_3}{ds} + \sigma^o_1 k_n^o + \sigma^o_2 \tau_g^o
\end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix}
e_1^o \\
e_2^o \\
e_3^o
\end{bmatrix},
$$

Because $M_o$ vector is a fixed point, the derivative with respect to the arc length is $dM_o/ds = 0$. This fact is true for all three surfaces. Then, we can conclude followings for the rotating surface $U_C$:

$$
\frac{d\sigma^o_1}{ds} = \sigma^o_2 k_y^o + \sigma^o_3 k_n^o - 1, \quad \frac{d\sigma^o_2}{ds} = -\sigma^o_1 k_y^o + \sigma^o_3 \tau_g^o,
$$

$$
\frac{d\sigma^o_3}{ds} = -\sigma^o_1 k_n^o - \sigma^o_2 \tau_g^o.
$$

By using the same steps of derivation, a differentiated model at (B.3) can be found for a fixed point $M_o$ at surface $U_V$ with arc length of $s'$:

$$
\frac{dM_o}{ds'} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 + \sigma^v_1 \frac{d\sigma^v_1}{ds'} - \sigma^v_2 k_y^v - \sigma^v_3 k_n^v \\
\sigma^v_2 \frac{d\sigma^v_2}{ds'} + \sigma^v_1 k_y^v - \sigma^v_3 \tau_g^v \\
\sigma^v_3 \frac{d\sigma^v_3}{ds'} + \sigma^v_1 k_n^v + \sigma^v_2 \tau_g^v
\end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix}
e_1^v \\
e_2^v \\
e_3^v
\end{bmatrix},
$$

which helps us to have same conclusion for $M_o$ point as

$$
\frac{d\sigma^v_1}{ds'} = \sigma^v_2 k_y^v + \sigma^v_3 k_n^v - 1, \quad \frac{d\sigma^v_2}{ds'} = -\sigma^v_1 k_y^v + \sigma^v_3 \tau_g^v, \quad \frac{d\sigma^v_3}{ds'} = -\sigma^v_1 k_n^v - \sigma^v_2 \tau_g^v.
$$

Figure B.7: Rotating object $U_C$ on the fixed surface $U_S$ with sandwiched virtual surface $U_V$. Note that $n \in \{e_1^n, e_2^n, e_3^n\}$ frame stands for fixed surface (plane) $s$, virtual surface $v$ and rotating object (sphere) $o$ at each of these compact surfaces.
\( \mathbf{L}_u \) and \( \mathbf{L}_v \) trajectories are traversed with the same velocity and always the Darboux frame units coincide because of the rolling constraint with no-slippage. Then, the following conditions should exist \( \sigma_q^v = \sigma_q^w \) and \( \sigma_q^u/ds = \sigma_q^w/ds' \) for \( q \in [1, 3] \) that are length of two curves with the same time period is the same. With given assumptions and substitution of Eq. (B.4) into Eq. (B.5), the differentiated point \( \mathbf{M}_v \) becomes

\[
\frac{d\mathbf{M}_v}{ds} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\sigma_1^w k_{11}^{ov}}{d_s} + \frac{\sigma_3^w k_{13}^{ov}}{d_s} \\
-\frac{\sigma_1^v k_{11}^{ov}}{d_s} + \frac{\sigma_3^v k_{13}^{ov}}{d_s} \\
-\frac{\sigma_1^w k_{11}^{ov}}{d_s} - \frac{\sigma_3^w k_{13}^{ov}}{d_s}
\end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix}
e_1^v \\
e_2^v \\
e_3^v
\end{bmatrix},
\] (B.7)

where \( k_{11}^{ov} = k_1^v - k_1^w, k_{13}^{ov} = k_3^v - k_3^w \) and \( \tau_g^{ov} = \tau_g^v - \tau_g^w \). Next, the same derivation is repeated to virtual surface \( \mathbf{U}_v \) with respect to fixed surface \( \mathbf{U}_S \) with \( \mathbf{L}_v \) and \( \mathbf{L}_v \) trajectories that ultimately results in

\[
\frac{d\mathbf{M}_w}{ds} = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\sigma_2^w k_{22}^{us}}{d_s} + \frac{\sigma_3^w k_{23}^{us}}{d_s} \\
-\frac{\sigma_2^v k_{22}^{us}}{d_s} + \frac{\sigma_3^v k_{23}^{us}}{d_s} \\
-\frac{\sigma_2^w k_{22}^{us}}{d_s} - \frac{\sigma_3^w k_{23}^{us}}{d_s}
\end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix}
e_1^v \\
e_2^w \\
e_3^v
\end{bmatrix},
\] (B.8)

where \( k_{22}^{us} = k_2^v - k_2^w, k_{23}^{us} = k_3^v + k_3^w \) and \( \tau_g^{us} = \tau_g^v - \tau_g^w \). From (B.8), we can rearrange the curvature properties as:

\[
k_2^v = k_2^{us} + k_2^w, k_3^v = k_3^{us} + k_3^w, \quad \tau_g^v = \tau_g^{us} + \tau_g^w.
\] (B.9)

Substituting back (B.9) to Eq. (B.7), we assume \( k_2^w = \alpha_s, k_3^{us} = \gamma_s \) and \( \tau_g^{us} = \beta_s \), results in the Darboux frame angular velocity in point \( \mathbf{P} \) as

\[
\omega' = \delta(-\tau_g^w e_1 + k_3^w e_2 - k_2^w e_3),
\] (B.10)

where

\[
k_2^w = k_2^v - k_2^w - \alpha_s, k_3^w = k_3^v - k_3^w - \gamma_s, \tau_g^w = \tau_g^v - \tau_g^w - \beta_s.
\] (B.11)

Eq. (B.11) shows the parametrized kinematics with a virtual surface that is related to induced curvatures of the moving object and fixed surface. For our case, the sphere curvature properties are subtracted from the virtual surface to create the corresponding angular velocity \( \{ \gamma_s, \alpha_s, \beta_s \} \) in each point \( \mathbf{P} \subset S \). Also, this formula describes the physical meaning of arc-length-based inputs \( \{ \gamma_s, \alpha_s, \beta_s \} \) in Eq. (9).

Appendix C. The Induced Curvatures Variation in a Given Direction

We derive a relation between angular rotation of the Darboux frame about \( e_3 \) [see Fig. A.6] and the normal curvature, geodesic torsion and geodesic curvature on an arbitrary surface. Let a differentiable manifold \( f_j(u, v) \) in \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \) exists where \( e_u \) and \( e_v \) present the unit vector along \( v \) and \( u \) curves on a moving point \( \mathbf{P} \subset S \). The differentiated map of the point \( \mathbf{P} \) is \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \)

\[
d\mathbf{P} = r_u du + r_v dv = \omega_1 e_u + \omega_2 e_v,
\]

hence, by defining \( \omega_1 = \sqrt{E}du, \omega_2 = \sqrt{G}du \), we have

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
r_u \\
r_v \\
A
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
\sqrt{E} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \sqrt{G} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
e_u \\
e_v \\
e_3
\end{bmatrix} = A \begin{bmatrix}
e_u \\
e_v \\
e_3
\end{bmatrix},
\] (C.1)
where \( E = \mathbf{r}_u \cdot \mathbf{r}_u, G = \mathbf{r}_v \cdot \mathbf{r}_v \) and \( A \) are the coefficients for the first fundamental form and normal vector of the surface \( S \), respectively. Differentiating the left side of Eq. (C.1) results in

\[
d \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{r}_u \\ \mathbf{r}_v \\ A \end{bmatrix} = du \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{r}_{uu} \\ \mathbf{r}_{uv} \\ A_u \end{bmatrix} + dv \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{r}_{uv} \\ \mathbf{r}_{vv} \\ A_v \end{bmatrix}
\]

(C.2)

where \( \Gamma^k_{ij} \), \( W^j_i \), \( L \), \( M \) and \( N \) are coefficients of Gauss and Weingarten equations, and rest of the three coefficients are the second fundamental form of surface, in which are [23]

\[
\Gamma_{11}^1 = \frac{GE_u - 2FF_u + FE_v}{2(EG - F^2)}, \quad \Gamma_{11}^2 = \frac{2EF_u - EE_u + FE_v}{2(EG - F^2)}, \\
\Gamma_{12}^1 = \frac{GE_v - FG_u}{2(EG - F^2)}, \quad \Gamma_{12}^2 = \frac{EG_u - FE_v}{2(EG - F^2)}, \\
\Gamma_{22}^1 = \frac{2GF_u - 2GG_u - FG_v}{2(EG - F^2)}, \quad \Gamma_{22}^2 = \frac{EG_v - 2FF_v + FG_u}{2(EG - F^2)}, \\
W_1^1 = \frac{MF - LG}{EG - F^2}, \quad W_1^2 = \frac{LF - ME}{EG - F^2}, \quad W_2^1 = \frac{MF - MG}{EG - F^2}, \quad W_2^2 = \frac{MF - NE}{EG - F^2}.
\]

Next, differentiating Eq. (C.1)’s right side gives

\[
d \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}_u \\ \mathbf{e}_v \\ \mathbf{e}_3 \end{bmatrix} = (d \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}_u \\ \mathbf{e}_v \\ \mathbf{e}_3 \end{bmatrix}) + Bd \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}_u \\ \mathbf{e}_v \\ \mathbf{e}_3 \end{bmatrix}
\]

(C.3)

where \( \omega_{12}, \omega_{13} \) and \( \omega_{23} \) are the one-forms for \( (\mathbf{e}_u, \mathbf{e}_v, \mathbf{e}_3) \) here. Also, Eqs. (C.2)-(C.3) yield the angular velocities of rotating body \( (\mathbf{e}_u, \mathbf{e}_v, \mathbf{e}_3) \) for isometric surfaces \( (F = 0) \) assumption

\[
\omega_{12} = \frac{-E_v du + G_u dv}{2\sqrt{EG}}, \quad \omega_{13} = \frac{L du + M dv}{\sqrt{E}}, \quad \omega_{23} = \frac{M du + N dv}{\sqrt{G}},
\]

(C.4)

where obtained ones are used besides the defined \( \omega_1 \) and \( \omega_2 \). By the derived formulation, for each \( u \) and \( v \) principle curves the curvature properties in Eq. (A.2) are calculated. For each principle, the derivative of perpendicular curve becomes zero, therefore, \( u \)-curve has

\[
k_{gu} = \frac{\omega_{12}}{\omega_1} = \frac{-E_v du}{2\sqrt{EG}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{E du}} = -\frac{E_v}{2E\sqrt{G}},
\]

\[
k_{nu} = \frac{\omega_{13}}{\omega_1} = \frac{L du}{\sqrt{E}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{E du}} = \frac{L}{\sqrt{E}},
\]

\[
k_{uv} = \frac{\omega_{23}}{\omega_1} = \frac{M du}{\sqrt{G}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{E du}} = \frac{M}{\sqrt{EG}}.
\]

Also, the same operation for the \( v \)-curve gives

\[
k_{gv} = \frac{G_u}{2G\sqrt{E}}, \quad n_{uv} = \frac{N}{G}, \quad \tau_{uv} = -\frac{M}{\sqrt{EG}}.
\]

(C.5)
while the v-curve vector is \((e_v, -e_u, e_3)\) and \(\varphi\) in Eq. (A.4) equals \(\pi/2\). Finally, the curvature in a given direction of trajectory \(L_s\) on a surface of object, is obtained using Eq. (A.1), Eq. (A.4) and (C.5)-(C.6) where curvature properties are derived dependent on the arc length \(s\) as follows

\[
\begin{align*}
    k_n &= \frac{\omega_{13}^f}{ds} = \frac{\omega_{13} \cos \varphi + \omega_{23} \sin \varphi}{ds} = k_{nu} \cos^2 \varphi + 2\tau_{gu} \cos \varphi \sin \varphi + k_{nv} \sin^2 \varphi, \\
    \tau_g &= \frac{\omega_{12}^f}{ds} = -\frac{\omega_{13} \sin \varphi + \omega_{23} \cos \varphi}{ds} = \tau_{gu} \cos 2\varphi + \frac{1}{2}(k_{nv} - k_{nu}) \sin 2\varphi, \\
    k_g &= \frac{\omega_{12}^f}{ds} = \frac{\omega_{12}}{ds} = k_{gy} \cos \varphi + k_{gy} \sin \varphi,
\end{align*}
\]  

(C.7)

As a keynote, these formulas (C.7) are designed for the induced curvature of a general surface where its curvature coefficients are changing depending on the rotating arbitrary angle \(\varphi\) with respect to \(e_1\) vector of the Darboux frame as Fig A.6.

Appendix D. Parametrization Limitation of the Montana Kinematics

The Montana kinematics has a simple presentation of contact kinematics between surfaces [19]. However, it has certain limitations in assigning extra angular inputs. Let us assume that we want to constrain spin-rolling sphere motion on the plane trajectory \(L_s\) by an arbitrary angle. This angle helps to always assign the considered curve on the plane \(L_s\) while the sphere curve \(L_o\) is controlled through angular velocity based on our desired motion planning strategy. This is similar to the 2-DoF mobile robots e.g., cars, where their kinematic models have angular velocity and steering angle inputs. In order to have inputs in components of the plane states \(\{u_s, v_s\}\) directly, we can find it from the differential equations of the plane \(\{\ddot{u}_s, \ddot{v}_s\}\) in (13) with following definition

\[
G_f \triangleq \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\dot{v}_s}{\dot{u}_s}\right) = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{dv_s}{du_s}\right) = \tan^{-1}\left(-\frac{R_\omega \omega_\psi^o}{R_\omega \omega_\psi^o}\right),
\]  

(D.1)

where \(G_f\) is the arbitrary independent angle on the plane. If we re-order the Eq. (D.1), we have

\[
\omega_\psi^s = -\omega_\psi^0 \tan G_f.
\]  

(D.2)

By substituting Eq. (D.2) into Montana kinematics (13), we have

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    \dot{u}_s(t) \\
    \dot{v}_s(t) \\
    \dot{u}_o(t) \\
    \dot{v}_o(t) \\
    \psi(t)
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
    0 & R_\psi & 0 \\
    -R_\psi & 0 & 0 \\
    -\sin \psi/ \cos v_o & -\cos \psi/ \cos v_o & 0 \\
    -\cos \psi & \sin \psi & 0 \\
    -\sin \psi \tan v_o & -\cos \psi \tan v_o & -1
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
    \omega_\psi^0 \tan G_f \\
    \omega_\psi^y \\
    \omega_\psi^o \\
    \omega_\psi^o \\
    -1
\end{bmatrix}.
\]  

(D.3)

Although \(G_f\) changes the angular direction on the plane for achieving the desired plane states on the curve \(L_s\) with imposed constraint \((G_f)\), we lose an input \(\omega_\psi^0\) and the rest of the remaining states in the system \(\{u_o, v_o, \psi\}\) should be controlled with only 2 inputs \(\{\omega_\psi^y, \omega_\psi^o\}\). This makes it harder to develop proper control strategies for full-configuration through Montana kinematics (5 states and 3 inputs) only. We can see that the proposed Darboux-frame-based kinematics (14) does not have this limitation because it has three arc-length-based inputs including a constraining angular input \(G_f\).