

### Lecture 12

#### **FRTN10 Multivariable Control**

#### **Automatic Control LTH, 2019**





- L1–L5 Specifications, models and loop-shaping by hand
- L6–L8 Limitations on achievable performance
- L9–L11 Controller optimization: analytic approach
- L12–L14 Controller optimization: numerical approach

Youla parametrization, internal model control

- Synthesis by convex optimization
- Controller simplification, course review
- L15 Course review





Internal model control (IMC)



# **Basic idea of Youla and IMC**

Assume stable SISO plant *P*. Model for design:



$$Q = \frac{C}{1 + PC}$$

Design Q to get desired closed-loop properties. Then  $C = \frac{Q}{1-QP}$ 



### **General idea for Lectures 12–14**



The choice of controller corresponds to designing a transfer matrix Q(s), to get desirable properties of the following map from w to z:

Once Q(s) has been designed, the corresponding controller can be found.



# The Youla (Q) parameterization

General feedback control system (assuming positive feedback!):



$$Z(s) = P_{zw}(s)W(s) + P_{zu}(s)U(s)$$
$$Y(s) = P_{yw}(s)W(s) + P_{yu}(s)U(s)$$
$$U(s) = C(s)Y(s)$$



# The Youla (Q) parameterization



Closed-loop transfer function from w to z:

$$G_{zw}(s) = P_{zw}(s) + P_{zu}(s) \underbrace{C(s) [I - P_{yu}(s)C(s)]^{-1}}_{=O(s)} P_{yw}(s)$$

Given Q(s), the controller is  $C(s) = [I + Q(s)P_{yu}(s)]^{-1}Q(s)$ 



Suppose the plant 
$$P = \begin{bmatrix} P_{zw} & P_{zu} \\ P_{yw} & P_{yu} \end{bmatrix}$$
 is stable. Then

• Stabilty of Q implies stability of  $P_{zw} + P_{zu}QP_{yw}$ • If  $Q = C[I - P_{yu}C]^{-1}$  is unstable, then the closed loop is unstable.

Hence, if P is stable then **all stabilizing controllers** are given by

$$C(s) = \left[I + Q(s)P_{yu}(s)\right]^{-1}Q(s)$$

where Q(s) is an arbitrary stable transfer function.



# **Dealing with unstable plants**



If  $P_0(s)$  is unstable, let  $C_0(s)$  be some stabilizing controller. Then the previous argument can be applied with  $P_{zw}$ ,  $P_{z\tilde{u}}$ ,  $P_{yw}$ , and  $P_{y\tilde{u}}$  representing the stabilized system.



#### **Example – DC-motor**



Assume we want to optimize the closed-loop transfer matrix from  $(w_1, w_2)^T$  to  $(z_1, z_2)^T$ ,

$$G_{zw}(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{P}{1-PC} & \frac{PC}{1-PC} \\ \frac{1}{1-PC} & \frac{C}{1-PC} \end{bmatrix}$$

when  $P(s) = \frac{20}{s(s+1)}$ .

Find the Youla parameterization of all stable closed-loop systems  $G_{wz}(s)$  and the corresponding stabilizing controllers C(s).



# Stabilizing controller for DC-motor

Generalized plant model:



where  $C_0(s) = -1$  stabilizes the plant;  $P_c(s) = \frac{P(s)}{1+P(s)} = \frac{20}{s^2+s+20}$ 



## **Redrawn diagram for DC-motor example**



## **Redrawn** diagram for DC-motor example



All stable closed-loop systems are parameterized by

$$G_{zw} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} P_c & -P_c \\ 1 - P_c & P_c - 1 \end{bmatrix}}_{P_{zw}} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} P_c \\ 1 - P_c \end{bmatrix}}_{P_{z\tilde{u}}} Q\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} P_c & 1 - P_c \end{bmatrix}}_{P_{yw}}$$

where Q(s) is any stable transfer function.

The controllers are given by  $C(s) = C_0(s) + C_1(s) = -1 + \frac{Q(s)}{1 + Q(s)P_c(s)}$ 





Internal model control (IMC)



# Internal model control (IMC)



(Negative) Feedback is used only if the real plant P(s) deviates from the model  $P_m(s)$ . Q(s), P(s),  $P_m(s)$  must be stable.

If  $P_m(s) = P(s)$ , the transfer function from r to y is P(s)Q(s).



# **Two equivalent diagrams**







# **IMC design rules**

With  $P(s) = P_m(s)$ , the transfer function from r to y is P(s)Q(s).

For perfect reference following, one would like to have  $Q(s) = P^{-1}(s)$ , but that is is not possible

Design rules:

If P(s) is strictly proper, the inverse would have more zeros than poles. Instead, one can choose

$$Q(s) = \frac{1}{(\lambda s + 1)^n} P^{-1}(s)$$

where n is large enough to make Q proper. The parameter  $\lambda$  determines the speed of the closed-loop system.

(cf. feedforward design in Lecture 4)



- If P(s) has an unstable zero, the inverse would be unstable. Two different options:
  - Remove the unstable factor  $(-\beta s + 1)$  from the plant numerator before inverting.
  - Replace the unstable factor  $(-\beta s + 1)$  with  $(\beta s + 1)$ . With this option, only the phase is modified, not the amplitude function.
- If P(s) includes a time delay, its inverse would be non-causal. Instead, the time delay is removed before inverting.



$$P(s) = \frac{1}{Ts+1}$$

$$Q(s) = \frac{1}{\lambda s+1} P(s)^{-1} = \frac{Ts+1}{\lambda s+1}$$

$$C(s) = \frac{Q(s)}{1-Q(s)P(s)} = \frac{\frac{Ts+1}{\lambda s+1}}{1-\frac{1}{\lambda s+1}} = \frac{T}{\lambda} \left(1 + \frac{1}{sT}\right)$$
PI controller

Note that  $T_i = T$ 

This way of tuning a PI controller is known as lambda tuning



#### IMC design example 2 — non-minimum phase plant

0.1

$$P(s) = \frac{-\rho s + 1}{Ts + 1}, \quad \beta > 0$$

$$Q(s) = \frac{(-\beta s + 1)}{(\beta s + 1)} P(s)^{-1} = \frac{Ts + 1}{\beta s + 1}$$

$$C(s) = \frac{Q(s)}{1 - Q(s)P(s)} = \frac{\frac{Ts + 1}{\beta s + 1}}{1 - \frac{(-\beta s + 1)}{(\beta s + 1)}} = \frac{T}{2\beta} \left(1 + \frac{1}{sT}\right)$$
Pl controller

Note that, again,  $T_i = T$ 

The gain is adjusted in accordance with the fundamental limitation imposed by the RHP zero in  $1/\beta$ .



# IMC design for deadtime processes

Consider the deadtime process

$$P = P_0 e^{-sL}$$

where the delay L is assumed known and constant.

Let  $C_0 = Q/(1 - QP_0)$  be a controller designed for the delay-free plant model  $P_0$ . Solving for Q gives

$$Q = \frac{C_0}{1 + C_0 P_0}$$

The controller then becomes

$$C = \frac{Q}{1 - QP_0 e^{-sL}} = \frac{C_0}{1 + (1 - e^{-sL})C_0 P_0}$$

This modification of  $C_0$  to account for a time delay is known as a Smith predictor.



### **Smith predictor**



Ideally y and  $y_m$  cancel each other and only feedback from  $y_0$  "without delay" is used. If  $P = P_m$  then

$$Y = \frac{C_0 P_0}{1 + C_0 P_0} e^{-sL} R$$



Plant: 
$$P(s) = \frac{1}{s+1}e^{-s}$$
, nominal controller:  $C_0(s) = K\left(1 + \frac{1}{s}\right)$ 

Simulation with K = 0.4, no Smith predictor ( $M_s = 1.4$ ):





Simulation with K = 1, no Smith predictor ( $M_s = 3.1$ ):





Simulation with K = 1 with Smith predictor ( $P_m(s) = P(s)$ ,  $M_s = 1.5$ ):



Looks perfect. But do not the forget the fundamental limitation imposed by the time delay! Respect the rule of thumb  $\omega_c < \frac{1.6}{L}$  when designing  $C_0$ .



Simulation with K = 1 with Smith predictor as before and true process  $P(s) = \frac{1}{s+0.8}e^{-1.2s}$ 1.5 Output 1 0.5 0 15 0 5 10 20 Time 3 2 Input 0 0 5 10 15 20 Time

Some performance degradation due to model and plant mismatch.



#### • Idea: Parameterize the closed loop as

$$G_{yr} = PQ$$
SISO case, for IMC design  
or  
$$G_{zw} = P_{zw} + P_{zu}QP_{yw}$$
General MIMO case, suitable  
for optimization  
for some stable Q.

• After designing Q, the controller is given by

$$C = \frac{Q}{1 - QP}$$
SISO case (assuming negative feedback)  
or  
$$C = \left[I + QP_{yu}\right]^{-1}Q$$
General MIMO case (positive feedback)