



Joint Modeling and Control Design

Bob Bitmead
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
University of California, San Diego

Advanced Process Control Applications for Industry 2004

The Big Picture

Model-based - Advanced - Control

Model development

Deductive Physics, Inductive System Identification

For control/prediction/simulation

Model quality measures - approximation

Effect of experimental conditions/controller

Model-based controller design

Performance - nominal model

Robustness - model quality

Connections

Modeling involves approximation

A general-relativistic, quantum-mechanical model for an ore crusher

Mostly linear tools for fitting - matlab toolbox

There is a need for parsimony

Trade-offs need to be made in modeling

Let's make them where they hurt control least

What does that mean?

How do experiments help us to do this?

Frequency-domain formulae really assist here

Modeling Approximation Formula

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \{L(z)[y_k - \hat{y}_{k|k-1}]\}^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left\{ |P(e^{j\omega} - \hat{P}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)|^2 \Phi_u(\omega) + |H(e^{j\omega})|^2 \right\} \frac{|L(e^{j\omega})|^2}{|\hat{H}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)|^2} d\omega$$

It exists

It is a discrete frequency domain formula

Connected to time domain prediction errors

It is useful

Model approximation is the subject

Plant, noise, plant model, noise model involved

There are some free variables - design handles

Input spectrum $\Phi_u(\omega)$

Data filter $L(e^{j\omega})$

Closed-loop Modeling Formula

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \{L(z)[y_k - \hat{y}_{k|k-1}]\}^2 =$$
$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left\{ \frac{|P(e^{j\omega}) - \hat{P}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)|^2}{|1 + P(e^{j\omega})C(e^{j\omega})|^2} |C(e^{j\omega})|^2 \Phi_r(\omega) \right.$$
$$\left. + \frac{|1 + \hat{P}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)C(e^{j\omega})|^2}{|1 + P(e^{j\omega})C(e^{j\omega})|^2} |H(e^{j\omega})|^2 \right\} \frac{|L(e^{j\omega})|^2}{|\hat{H}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)|^2} d\omega$$

The same story

A bit more complicated

But not much more

The controller appears in the picture explicitly

Robust Control Formulae

$$\left| \frac{P(e^{j\omega}) - \hat{P}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)}{\hat{P}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)} \times \frac{C(e^{j\omega})\hat{P}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)}{1 + C(e^{j\omega})\hat{P}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)} \right| < 1$$

$$\left| H(e^{j\omega}) \times \frac{P(e^{j\omega}) - \hat{P}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)}{\hat{P}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)} \times \frac{C(e^{j\omega})\hat{P}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)}{1 + C(e^{j\omega})\hat{P}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)} \times \frac{1}{1 + C(e^{j\omega})P(e^{j\omega})} \right| < \epsilon$$

Formulae for robust stability and performance exist

They are in the discrete frequency domain

They involve designed properties

They involve model errors $P(e^{j\omega}) - \hat{P}(e^{j\omega}, \theta)$

The controller is the design variable

Outline

1. Big Pictures and introduction
2. Modeling from data and System Identification
3. Example and some Philosophy
Combustion instability modeling
4. Modeling for control example
Helicopter vibration control model
5. Experiment design and data preparation
Sugar mill control problem
6. Iterative modeling and control
Sugar mill