

CS 287: Advanced Robotics Fall 2009

Lecture 2: Control 1: Feedforward, feedback, PID, Lyapunov direct method

Pieter Abbeel
UC Berkeley EECS

Announcements

- Office hours: Thursdays 2-3pm + by email arrangement, 746 SDH
 - SDH 7th floor should be unlocked during office hours on Thursdays
- Questions about last lecture?

CS 287 Advanced Robotics

- **Control**
- Estimation
- Manipulation/Grasping
- Reinforcement Learning
- Misc. Topics
- Case Studies

Control in CS287

- Overarching goal:
 - Understand what makes control problems hard
 - What techniques do we have available to tackle the hard (and the easy) problems
- Any applicability of control outside robotics? Yes, many!
 - Process industry, feedback in nature, networks and computing systems, economics, ...
 - [See, e.g., Chapter 1 of Astrom and Murray, http://www.cds.caltech.edu/~murray/amwiki/Main_Page, for more details--- optional reading. Fwiw: Astrom and Murray is a great read on mostly classical feedback control and is freely available at above link.]
 - We will not have time to study these application areas within CS287 [except for perhaps in your final project!]

Today's lecture

- Feedforward vs. feedback
- PID (Proportional Integral Derivative)
- Lyapunov direct method --- a method that can be helpful in proving guarantees about controllers
- Reading materials:
 - Astrom and Murray, 10.3
 - Tedrake, 1.2
 - Optional: Slotine and Li, Example 3.21.

Based on a survey of over eleven thousand controllers in the refining, chemicals and pulp and paper industries, 97% of regulatory controllers utilize PID feedback.
L. Desborough and R. Miller, 2002 [DM02]. [Quote from Astrom and Murray, 2009]

Today's lecture

- Practical result: can build a trajectory controller for a fully actuated robot arm




- Our abstraction: torque control input to motor, read out angle [in practice: voltages and encoder values]

Intermezzo: Unconventional (?) robot arm use




Single link manipulator (aka the simple pendulum)



$$I\ddot{\theta}(t) + b\dot{\theta}(t) + mgl \sin \theta(t) = u(t)$$

$$I = ml^2$$

Single link manipulator



$$I\ddot{\theta}(t) + b\dot{\theta}(t) + mgl \sin \theta(t) = u(t)$$


How to hold arm at $\theta = 45$ degrees?

The Matlab code that generated all discussed simulations will be posted on www.


Single link manipulator

Simulation results:

$$I\ddot{\theta}(t) + c\dot{\theta}(t) + mgl \sin \theta(t) = u(t), \quad u = mgl \sin \frac{\pi}{4}$$




$$\theta(0) = \frac{\pi}{4}, \dot{\theta}(0) = 0$$



Can we do better than this?


$$\theta(0) = 0, \dot{\theta}(0) = 0$$

Feedforward control



$$I\ddot{\theta}(t) + b\dot{\theta}(t) + mgl \sin \theta(t) = u(t)$$

How to make arm follow a trajectory $\theta^*(t)$?



$$u(t) = I\ddot{\theta}^*(t) + c\dot{\theta}^*(t) + mgl \sin \theta^*(t)$$



$$\theta(0) = 0, \dot{\theta}(0) = 0$$

Feedforward control

Simulation results:


$$I\ddot{\theta}(t) + c\dot{\theta}(t) + mgl \sin \theta(t) = u(t) \quad \theta(0) = 0, \dot{\theta}(0) = 0$$

$$u(t) = I\ddot{\theta}^*(t) + c\dot{\theta}^*(t) + mgl \sin \theta^*(t)$$



n DOF (degrees of freedom) manipulator?

- Thus far:



$$I\ddot{\theta}(t) + b\dot{\theta}(t) + mgl \sin \theta(t) = u(t)$$

- n DOF manipulator: standard manipulator equations



$$H(q)\ddot{q} + C(q, \dot{q}) + G(q) = B(q)u$$

- H : “inertial matrix,” full rank
- B : identity matrix if every joint is actuated
- → Given trajectory $q(t)$, can readily solve for feedforward controls $u(t)$ for all times t

Fully-Actuated vs. Underactuated

- A system is fully actuated when in a certain state (q, \dot{q}, t) if, when in that state, it can be controlled to instantaneously accelerate in any direction.
- Many systems of interest are of the form:

$$\ddot{q} = f_1(q, \dot{q}, t) + f_2(q, \dot{q}, t)u \quad (1)$$

- Defn. **Fully actuated**: A control system described by Eqn. (1) is fully-actuated in state (q, \dot{q}, t) if it is able to command an instantaneous acceleration in an arbitrary direction in q :

$$\text{rank} f_2(q, \dot{q}, t) = \dim q$$

- Defn. **Underactuated**: A control system described by Eqn. (1) is underactuated in configuration (q, \dot{q}, t) if it is not able to command an instantaneous acceleration in an arbitrary direction in q :

$$\text{rank} f_2(q, \dot{q}, t) < \dim q$$

- [See also, Tedrake, Section 1.2.]

Fully-Actuated vs. Underactuated

$\ddot{q} = f_1(q, \dot{q}, t) + f_2(q, \dot{q}, t)u$ fully actuated in (q, \dot{q}, t) iff $\text{rank} f_2(q, \dot{q}, t) = \dim q$.

- Hence, for any fully actuated system, we can follow a trajectory by simply solving for $u(t)$:

$$u(t) = f_2^{-1}(q, \dot{q}, t) (\ddot{q} - f_1(q, \dot{q}, t))$$

- [We can also transform it into a linear system through a change of variables from u to v :

$$\ddot{q}(t) = v(t)$$

$$u(t) = f_2^{-1}(q, \dot{q}, t) (v(t) - f_1(q, \dot{q}, t))$$

The literature on control for linear systems is very extensive and hence this can be useful. This is an example of feedback linearization. More on this in future lectures.]

Fully-Actuated vs. Underactuated

$\ddot{q} = f_1(q, \dot{q}, t) + f_2(q, \dot{q}, t)u$ fully actuated in (q, \dot{q}, t) iff $\text{rank} f_2(q, \dot{q}, t) = \dim q$.

- **n DOF manipulator**

$$H(q)\ddot{q} + C(q, \dot{q}) + G(q) = B(q)u$$

$$f_2 = H^{-1}B, H \text{ full rank}, B = I, \text{ hence } \text{rank}(H^{-1}B) = \text{rank}(B)$$


- All joints actuated $\rightarrow \text{rank}(B) = n \rightarrow$ fully actuated
- Only $p < n$ joints actuated $\rightarrow \text{rank}(B) = p \rightarrow$ underactuated

Example underactuated systems


- Car



- Acrobot




- Cart-pole



- Helicopter



Fully actuated systems: is our feedforward control solution sufficient in practice?




$$I\ddot{\theta}(t) + b\dot{\theta}(t) + mgl \sin \theta(t) = u(t)$$

Task: hold arm at 45 degrees.

- What if parameters off? --- by 5%, 10%, 20%, ...
- What is the effect of perturbations?


Fully actuated systems: is our feedforward control solution sufficient in practice?




$$I\ddot{\theta}(t) + b\dot{\theta}(t) + mgl \sin \theta(t) = u(t)$$

Task: hold arm at 45 degrees.

- Mass off by 10%:
→ steady-state error




Fully actuated systems: is our feedforward control solution sufficient in practice?



$$I\ddot{\theta}(t) + b\dot{\theta}(t) + mgl \sin \theta(t) = u(t)$$


Task: swing arm up to **180** degrees and hold there

- Perturbation after 1 sec:
→ Does ****not**** recover
[$\theta = 180$ is an “unstable” equilibrium point]




Proportional control

Task: hold arm at 45 degrees



$$u(t) = u_{\text{feedforward}}(t)$$




$$u(t) = u_{\text{feedforward}}(t) + K_p(q_{\text{desired}}(t) - q(t))$$


- Feedback can provide
 - Robustness to model errors
- However, still:
 - Overshoot issues --- ignoring momentum/velocity!
 - Steady-state error --- simply crank up the gain?

Proportional control

Task: swing arm up to 180 degrees and hold there



$$u(t) = u_{\text{feedforward}}(t)$$



$$u(t) = u_{\text{feedforward}}(t) + K_p(q_{\text{desired}}(t) - q(t))$$


Current status

- Feedback can provide
 - *Robustness to model errors*
 - *Stabilization around states which are unstable in open-loop*
- Overshoot issues --- ignoring momentum/velocity!
- Steady-state error --- simply crank up the gain?

PD control

$$u(t) = K_p(q_{\text{desired}}(t) - q(t)) + K_d(\dot{q}_{\text{desired}} - \dot{q}(t))$$

zero feedforward + $K_p = 100$, $K_d = 0, 10, 50$ with zero initial conditions and model error




Eliminate steady state error by cranking up Kp ?

$$I\ddot{\theta}(t) + b\dot{\theta}(t) + mgl \sin \theta(t) = u(t)$$

$$u(t) = u_{\text{feedforward}}(t) + K_p(q_{\text{desired}}(t) - q(t))$$

Task: hold arm at 45 degrees



In steady-state, $\ddot{q} = \dot{q} = 0$ and we get:



$$mgl \sin \theta = u_{\text{feedforward}} + K_p(\theta^* - \theta)$$

Using some trigonometry and assuming θ is close to θ^* we get:

$$\theta - \theta^* = \frac{u_{\text{feedforward}} - mgl \sin \theta^*}{K_p + mgl \cos \theta^*}$$


Eliminate steady state error by cranking up Kp ?

$$u(t + \delta t) = K_p(q_{\text{desired}}(t) - q(t))$$



PID

$$u(t) = K_p(q_{\text{desired}}(t) - q(t)) + K_d(\dot{q}_{\text{desired}} - \dot{q}(t)) + K_i \int_0^t (q_{\text{desired}}(\tau) - q(\tau)) d\tau$$



- Zero error in steady-state: [assumes steady-state is achieved!]

$\ddot{q} = \dot{q} = 0, \dot{u} = 0$, hence, taking derivatives of above:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u} &= K_p(\dot{q}_{\text{desired}} - \dot{q}(t)) + K_d(\ddot{q}_{\text{desired}} - \ddot{q}(t)) + K_i(q_{\text{desired}}(t) - q(t)) \\ 0 &= K_i(q_{\text{desired}}(t) - q(t)) \end{aligned}$$

Recap so far



- Given a **fully actuated system** and a (smooth) target trajectory
 - Can solve dynamics equations for required control inputs = “feedforward controls”
 - Feedforward control is insufficient in presence of
 - Model inaccuracy
 - Perturbations + instability
 - Proportional feedback control can alleviate some of the above issues.
 - Steady state error reduced by (roughly) factor K_p , but large K_p can be problematic in presence of delay → Add integral term
 - Ignores momentum → Add derivative term
- **Remaining questions:**
 - How to choose PID constants? Aka “tuning”
 - Any guarantees?

PID tuning

- Typically done by hand (3 numbers to play with) [policy search should be able to automate this in many settings]
- Ziegler-Nichols method (1940s) provides recipe for starting point
 - Frequency response method
 - Step response method
- Recipe results from
 - (a) Extensively hand-tuning controllers for many settings
 - (b) Fitting a function that maps from easy to measure parameters to the three gains

[See also Astrom and Murray Section 10.3]


PID tuning: Ziegler-Nichols frequency domain method

- Set derivative and integral gain to zero
- Drive up the proportional gain until steady oscillation occurs, record the corresponding gain k_c and period T_c
- Use the following table to set the three gains:

Type	k_p	T_i	T_d
P	$0.5k_c$		
PI	$0.4k_c$	$0.8T_c$	
PID	$0.6k_c$	$0.5T_c$	$0.125T_c$

Notation: $K_I = \frac{k_p}{T_i}$, $K_D = k_p T_d$

PID tuning: Ziegler-Nichols step response method







Type	k_p	T_i	T_d
P	$1/a$		
PI	$0.9/a$	3τ	
PID	$1.2/a$	2τ	0.5τ

1. Record open-loop step-response characteristics



2. Read gains out from above table

Frequency domain Ziegler-Nichols for single link



- $K_c = 100$;
- $T_c = 0.63s$;

ZN and TLC results



Type	k_p	T_i	T_d
P	$0.5k_c$		
PI	$0.4k_c$	$0.8T_c$	
PID	$0.6k_c$	$0.5T_c$	$0.125T_c$

Tyres-Luyben tuning chart:
 $K_p = k_c/2.2, T_i = 2.2T_c, T_d = T_c/6.3$
 Tends to:
 increase robustness,
 decrease oscillation.


Aside: Integrator wind-up

- Recipe: Stop integrating error when the controls saturate
- Reason: Otherwise it will take a long time to react in the opposite direction in the future.
- Matters in practice!


[See also Astrom and Murray, Section 10.4]

Recap of main points

- To control a fully actuated system:
 - Compute feedforward by solving for $u(t)$
 - However, feedforward is insufficient when:
 - Model is imperfect (i.e., always when dealing with real systems)
 - System is unstable
 - Feedback can address these issues
 - Standard feedback: PID
 - In practice, often even only feedback (i.e., without feedforward) can already provide ok results → in these settings, no model needed, which can be very convenient



- In this lecture no solution provided for underactuated systems



- Note: many underactuated systems do use PID type controllers in their core (e.g., helicopter governor, gyro)