Control 2

Keypoints:

- Given desired behaviour, determine control signals
- Inverse models:
 - Inverting the forward model for simple linear dynamic system
 - Problems for more complex systems
- Open loop control: advantages and disadvantages
- Feed forward control to deal with disturbances

The control problem

• Forward: Given the control signals, can we predict the motion of the robot?



- Inverse: Given the desired motion of the robot can we determine the right control signals?
- Often no

unique or easy exact solution (non-linearities, noise).



Examples:

- To execute memorised trajectory, produce appropriate sequence of motor torques
- To obtain a goal, make a plan and execute it

 (means-ends reasoning could be seen as inverting a forward model of cause-effect)
- 'Ballistic' movements such as saccades

Open loop control

- Potentially cheap and simple to implement e.g. if solution is already known.
- Fast, e.g. useful if feedback would come too late.
- Benefits from calibration e.g. tune parameters of approximate model.
- If model unknown, may be able to use statistical learning methods to find a good fit e.g. neural network.

Open loop control

• Neglects possibility of disturbances, which might affect the outcome.



- For example:
 - change in temperature may change the friction in all the robot joints.
 - Or unexpected obstacle may interrupt trajectory

Feed-forward control



- One solution is to measure the (potential) disturbance and use this to adjust the control signals.
- For example
 - thermometer signal alters friction parameter.
 - obstacle detection produces alternative trajectory.

Feed-forward control

- Can sometimes be effective and efficient.
- Requires anticipation, not just of the robot process characteristics, but of possible changes in the world.
- Does not provide or use knowledge of actual output for this need to use **feedback** control



Feedback control

- Example: Greek water clock
- Require constant flow to signal time
- Obtain by controlling water height
- Float controls inlet valve



Feedback control

• Example: Watt governor





Compare: room heating

- Open loop: for desired temperature, switch heater on, and after pre-set time, switch off.
- Feed forward: use thermometer outside room to compensate timer for external temperature.
- Feedback: use thermometer inside room to switch off when desired temperature reached. NO PREDICTION REQUIRED!



Control Laws



- On-off: switch system if desired \neq actual
- Servo: control signal proportional to difference between desired and actual, e.g.

spring:



Servo control

Simple dynamic example:

$$V_B = k_1 s + \frac{MR}{k_2} \frac{ds}{dt}$$

Control law:

$$V_B = K(s_{\text{goal}} - s)$$

So now have new process:

$$K(s_{\text{goal}} - s) = k_1 s + \frac{MR}{k_2} \frac{ds}{dt}$$
$$Ks_{\text{goal}} = (K + k_1)s + \frac{MR}{k_2} \frac{ds}{dt}$$



With steady state:

$$s_{\infty} = \frac{Ks_{\text{goal}}}{K + k_1}$$

And half-life: $\tau_{\frac{1}{2}} = 0.7 \frac{MR}{(K+k_1)k_2}$ • Say we have s_{goal} =10. What does K need to be for s_{∞} = 10?

 If K=5, and s_∞ = 8, and the system takes 14 seconds to reach s=6, what is the process equation?

$$Ks_{\text{goal}} = ? S + ? \frac{ds}{dt}$$





- May involve multiple inputs and outputs
- E.g. 'homeostatic' control of human body temperature
 - Multiple temperature sensors linked to hypothalamus in brain
 - Depending on difference from desired temperature, regulates sweating, vasodilation, piloerection, shivering, metabolic rate, behaviour...
 - Result is reliable core temperature control

Negative vs. Positive Feedback

- Examples so far have been *negative* feedback: control law involves subtracting the measured output, acting to decrease difference.
- *Positive* feedback results in amplification: – e.g. microphone picking up its own output.
 - e.g. 'runaway' selection in evolution.
- Generally taken to be undesirable in robot control, but sometimes can be effective
 - e.g. in model of stick insect walking (Cruse et al 1995)



- 6-legged robot has 18 degrees of mobility.
- Difficult to derive co-ordinated control laws
- But have linked system: movement of one joint causes appropriate change to all other joints.
- Can use signal in a feedforward loop to control 12 joints (remaining 6 use feedback to resist gravity).



Advantages

- Major advantage is that (at least in theory) feedback control does not require a model of the process.
 - E.g. thermostats work without any knowledge of the dynamics of room heating.
- Thus controller can be very simple and direct
 - E.g. hardware governor does not even need to do explicit measurement, representation and comparison
- Can (potentially) produce robust output in the face of unknown and unpredictable disturbances
 - E.g. homeostatic body temperature control keeps working in unnatural environments

Issues

- Requires sensors capable of measuring output – Not required by open-loop or feed-forward
- Low gain is slow, high gain is unstable
- Delays in feedback loop will produce oscillations (or worse)
- In practice, need to understand process to obtain good control:
 - E.g. James Clerk Maxwell's analysis of dynamics of the Watt governor
- ...more next lecture

Cybernetics

- Feedback control advanced in post WW2 years (particularly by Wiener) as general explanatory tool for all 'systems': mechanical, biological, social...
- E.g. Powers –

"Behaviour: the control of perception"

• Forrester –

"World dynamics" – modelling the global economic-ecological network

Combining control methods

- In practice most robot systems require a combination of control methods
 - Robot arm using servos on each joint to obtain angles required by geometric inverse model
 - Forward model predicts feedback, so can use in fast control loop to avoid problems of delay
 - Feed-forward measurements of disturbances can be used to adjust feedback control parameters
 - Training of an open-loop system is essentially a feedback process

Further reading:

Most standard robotics textbooks (e.g. McKerrow) discuss forward and inverse models in great detail.

For the research on saccades see:

Harris, C.M. & Wolpert, D.M. (1998) Signal dependent noise determines motor planning. *Nature*, 394:780-184.

For an interesting discussion of forward and inverse models in relation to motor control in humans, see: Wolpert, DM & Ghahramani, Z. (2000) "Computational principles of movement neuroscience" Nature Neuroscience 3:1212-1217

Further reading:

Most standard robotics textbooks (e.g. McKerrow) discuss feedback control in great depth.

For the research on stick insect walking see:

Cruse, H., Bartling, Ch., Kindermann, T. (1995) High-pass filtered positive feedback for decentralized control of cooperation. In: F. Moran, A. Moreno, J. J. Merelo, P. Chacon (eds.), Advances in Artificial Life, pp. 668-678. Springer 1995

Classic works on cybernetics:

Wiener, Norbert: (1948) *Cybernetics. or Control and Communication in the Animal and Machine*, MIT Press, Cambridge

Powers, WT: (1973) Behavior, the Control of Perception, Aldine, Chicago

Forrester, JW (1971) World Dynamics, Wright and Allen, Cambridge