Robustness Margins Separating Process Dynamics Uncertainties

Per-Ola Larsson, Tore Hägglund

Dept. of Automatic Control Lund University, Sweden



Background

Considered controllers for performance comparison

- PI(D)
- Smith Predictor, PI(D)_τ
 - "Bad" reputation, sensitive to modelling errors.
- Tuning Control requirements
 - Remove load disturbance errors quickly, IAE.
 - Robust

Considerations

• Process properties change simultaneously, e.g., gain, time constant, and time delay.



Specifying robustness in easy ways

Classic measures

• Gain, phase, and dead time margins do not guarantee stability for simultaneous process changes.

Present solution: Robust control

- Lumps all uncertainties together
- Conservative, especially for time delays
- Design should be as simple as possible
- Common design for PI(D) min IAE with

 $\|S(s)\|_{\infty} \le M_S, \qquad \|T(s)\|_{\infty} \le M_T$

Works very well for PI(D) design



Specifying robustness in easy ways

Classic measures

• Gain, phase, and dead time margins do not guarantee stability for simultaneous process changes.

Present solution: Robust control

- Lumps all uncertainties together
- Conservative, especially for time delays
- Design should be as simple as possible
- Common design for $PI(D) \min IAE$ with

 $\|S(s)\|_{\infty} \leq M_S, \qquad \|T(s)\|_{\infty} \leq M_T$

Works very well for PI(D) design



• Minimizing IAE with PI_{τ} controller and constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{PI}_{\tau}(s) = & K \frac{sT_i + 1}{sT_i} \frac{sT_i}{sT_i + 1 - e^{-sL_r}} \\ \|S(s)\|_{\infty} \leq & M_S, \qquad \|T(s)\|_{\infty} \leq M_T \end{aligned}$$



PI_{τ} design

Minimizing IAE with PI_τ controller and constraints





Example:

- Process $P(s) = \frac{1}{s+1}e^{-s} + 20\%$ uncertainty in dead time. Minimize IAE using PI control, appropriate weight on T(s).
- Result: 15% higher IAE than if only dead time margin is used.

Conclusion: Must have frequency dependent weights, but ordinary robust control is (most often) too conservative.



Example:

- Process $P(s) = \frac{1}{s+1}e^{-s} + 20\%$ uncertainty in dead time. Minimize IAE using PI control, appropriate weight on T(s).
- Result: 15% higher IAE than if only dead time margin is used.

Conclusion: Must have frequency dependent weights, but ordinary robust control is (most often) too conservative.



Focusing on dead times – I

- Idea: Separate dead time and other uncertainties
- Why?
 - Dead time uncertainty give rotation of Nyquist curve.
 - Badly approximated by disk.
- Modelling: Multiplicative uncertainty

$$P_{\Delta} = P_o(1 + W_T \Delta) e^{-s(L + \Delta L)}$$

 P_o – nominal process, dead time free. $W_T\Delta$ – gain, time constants,... ordinary weight, $\|\Delta\|_{\infty} = 1$. ΔL – in dead time uncertainty interval $[\Delta L_{\min}, \Delta L_{\max}]$



Focusing on dead times – II



Robust stability cond.: $|CP_oW_T| < |1 + CP_oe^{-i\omega(L+\Delta L)}|, \forall \Delta L, \omega$



Condition can be rewritten as

$$\sup_{\omega} |T(i\omega, \Delta L)W_T(\omega)| < 1, \forall \Delta L$$

with extended complementary sensitivity function

$$T(s,\Delta L) = rac{CPe^{-s\Delta L}}{1+CPe^{-s\Delta L}}$$

 Graphical interpretation in Nyquist plot: Circles with centers and radii

$$rac{1}{W_T^2(\omega)-1}(\cos\omega\Delta L,\sin\omega\Delta L), \quad rac{W_T(\omega)}{|1-W_T^2(\omega)|}$$



Control of

$$P(s) = \frac{1}{s+1} e^{-s}$$

with the PI_{τ} -controller

$$\mathsf{PI}_{\tau}(s) = 2.6 \, \frac{0.75s + 1}{0.75s} \frac{0.75s}{0.75s + 1 - e^{-1.25s}}$$

- 10% uncertainty in gain and time constant 20% (symmetric) uncertainty in dead time.
- Robustly stable?



Weights on (extended) complementary sensitivity function





Example — Graphical interpretation





Example — Graphical interpretation



No guarantees from ordinary robust control



Example — Graphical interpretation







• Conclusion: Robustly stable by separating uncertainties.

• Actually, IAE is minimized with active constraints.



Relations to other margins

• If no dead time uncertainty, we have ordinary robust control

$$|T(i\omega,\Delta L)W_T(\omega)| = |T(i\omega)W_T(\omega)| < 1$$

- If only dead time uncertainty
 - radii are 0
 - recover ordinary delay margin





Focusing on dead times – VI

• Inverse multip. uncertainty $P_{\Delta} = P_o(1 + W_S \Delta)^{-1} e^{-s(L + \Delta L)}$ gives the condition

$$\sup_{\omega} |S(i\omega, \Delta L) W_S(\omega)| < 1$$

 Graphical interpretation in Nyquist plot: Circles with centers and radii

 $-(\cos\omega\Delta L,\sin\omega\Delta L), \quad W_S(\omega)$

• Robust performance, i.e., $\sup_{\omega} |S_{\Delta}(i\omega)W_p(\omega)| < 1$, gives $\sup_{\omega} (|S(i\omega, \Delta L)W_p(\omega)| + |T(i\omega, \Delta L)W_T(\omega)|) < 1$

or equivalently

$$\sup_{\omega} \left| S(i\omega, \Delta L) ilde{W}_p(\omega)
ight| < 1 \ ilde{W}_p(\omega) = W_p(\omega) + \left| C P_o W_T(\omega)
ight|$$



Computational effort

- Algorithms developed to compute margins, e.g.,
 - decide if robustly stable (shown in example)
 - given weight $W_X(\omega)$, compute $[\Delta L_{\min}, \Delta L_{\max}]$
 - given uncertainty interval [$\Delta L_{\min}, \Delta L_{\max}$], compute $W_X(\omega)$
- Based on graphical interpretation
- Fast



Always better?

- Depends on process and controller
- Phase of $e^{-s\Delta L}$ not taken into account
- Solution: Combine allowed areas. Better or equal performance.





- Explores dead time characteristics
- $T(s) \rightarrow T(s, \Delta L), S(s) \rightarrow S(s, \Delta L)$ + robust control
- In between robust control and classic measures
- Gives good insight on inherent problems of time delays
- Algorithms available
- Combine allowed areas for better or equal performance