

Wave Prediction and Delay Modeling for Teleoperation Via Internet

Dr. Ehsan Kamrani¹

¹ Harvard University

Received: 10 December 2011 Accepted: 3 January 2012 Published: 15 January 2012

Abstract

This paper propose a novel approach for modeling the end-to-end time delay dynamics of the internet using system identification, and use it for controlling real-time internet-based telerobotic operations. When a single model is used, it needs to adapt to the operating conditions before an appropriate control mechanism can be applied. Slow adaptation may result in large transient errors. As an alternative, we propose to use an adaptive multiple model framework, and determine the best model for the current operating conditions to activate the corresponding controller. We employ multivariable wave prediction method to achieve this objective.

Index terms—

1 Introduction

he concept of teleoperation has been around for awhile. It involves remote control of a plant or machine from far distance via a medium environment. The distance can vary from tens of centimeters (micromanipulation) to millions of kilometers (space applications). Teleoperation takes several forms and can be done via any communication medium. Recently, the main focus has been on teleoperation via the Internet. Motivated by the availability, widespread access, and low cost of the Internet, many researchers have focused on the Internet-based teleoperation.

Since the Internet introduces random communication delays, several challenges and difficulties, such as loss of transparency and synchronization in real-time closed-loop telerobotic systems, may arise. In order to meet these challenges, a general and efficient modeling and analysis tool for the Internet delay needs to be developed. Several techniques have been proposed to compensate for this effect, such as a time forward observer developed for a supervisory control over the Internet by Brady and Tarn [1]- [3], a position-based force-feedback scheme implemented by Oboe and Fiorini [4], and a wave variable based technique developed by Niemeyer and Slotine [5].

The methods in [1] and [4] require knowledge of the remote plant, but the method in [5] does not. Due to possible uncertainties on the remote plant, the methods that require the knowledge of remote plant may not be applicable in all cases. The stability of such techniques may depend on the accuracy of knowledge on the remote plant. As such, the wave-based method has an advantage from this point of view, but may suffer from poor performance for delays significantly longer than the time constant(s) of the system. Wave variables were first introduced by Anderson and Spong [6]- [7], and were later presented in a more intuitive, physically motivated, passivity-based formalism by Niemeyer and Slotine [5]- [8]. Later the use of wave variables was extended to variable delay [9]- [10], as is the case for the Internet. Nevertheless, performance degradation for prolonged time delays is still a serious issue. In order to overcome these shortcomings, we propose a multimodel adaptive controller to choose the optimum controller.

Multi-model adaptive control schemes have been used in several applications [17]- [20]. In [21], we have used it in teleoperation control systems to maintain stability in the presence of time-varying or fluctuating delays. In this paper, we study the behavior of multimodel adaptive control systems in conjunction with wave prediction

VII. Nonlinear Adaptive Control

A typical teleoperation system consists of a local master manipulator (master site) and a remote slave manipulator (slave site). The human operator controls the local master manipulator to drive the slave in order to perform a given task remotely. The must be completely "transparent" so that the human operator could feel as if he/she is able to directly manipulate the remote environment. Instead of perfect force tracking, the overall teleoperation system should behave as a free-floating mass plus linear damper specified by the control and scaling parameters.

Hung, Marikiyo and Tuan in [16] used the concept of a virtual manipulator to design a nonlinear control scheme that guarantees the asymptotic motion (velocity/position) tracking and has a reasonable force tracking performance even in when the acceleration, the values of dynamic parameters of manipulators as well as the models for human operator and the environment are not available. In the absence of friction and other disturbances, dynamic models of the master and the slave manipulators are

$$M\ddot{q} + C\dot{q} + F = \tau \quad (7)$$

If the followings are achieved $\ddot{x}_m = \ddot{x}_s$, $\dot{x}_m = \dot{x}_s$, $x_m = x_s$ (8)

Then the system is said to be "transparent" to human-task interface. This requires knowledge of the manipulator acceleration, which in practice, is difficult to obtain. Moreover, there is a trade-off between motion tracking performance, force tracking performance, and system stability for a master-slave teleoperation system. In order to improve the performance, we increase the degree of freedom of the control system by utilizing a "virtual master manipulator." This manipulator is described by the following dynamic model 8 shows the block diagram of the overall teleoperation system using the virtual master manipulator.

$$\ddot{x}_m = \ddot{x}_s \quad (9)$$

VIII. The Proposed Control System

A switched system is utilized when there are abrupt changes in the structures and parameters of the dynamic system, which can be caused by component failures, repairs, environment changes, disturbances or changes in subsystems interconnections [17]- [18], and may result in improving the performance [19]- [20].

When a single identification model is used, it will have to adapt itself to the operating condition before appropriate controls can be taken. If the environment changes suddenly, the original model (and hence the controller) is no longer valid. If the adaptation is slow, it may result in a large transient error. However, if different models are available for different operating conditions, then suitable controllers corresponding to each condition can be devised in advance.

The control structure in Fig. ?? determines the best model for the existing operating condition at every instant, and activates the corresponding controller. This structure is based on N models which have been developed at various points across the operating range of the process. A controller is designed for each model, using the Diophantine pole-placement algorithm. A supervisor as shown in Fig. 10 compares the output errors for each one of the N models. A discrete equivalent of the performance index is given in (10), for the i th model:

$$J_i = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |e(k)|^2 \quad (10)$$

Fig. ?? : Multi-model adaptive control system Fig. 10: Supervisor operation Expansion of this controller for the teleoperation was proposed in [21], where the best model for the current operating condition is identified and the corresponding controller either in the master or in the slave is activated. The block diagram of this proposed control system is shown in Fig. 11.

Here we have used the ARX model for the communication delay, and obtained its parameters using a system identification approach; and studied its performance under abrupt changes in the time delay using simulation and analysis.

10 Results and Conclusions

We presented a new method for designing a robust stable Internet-based teleoperation system. Our focus is on the robustness against delay and its random nature. We have applied our proposed method to control a simple teleoperation system and studied its behavior for a time varying delay on the communication link between the plant and the controller.

This control scheme was initially proposed and analyzed in [21]. Here we focus on the behavior of the proposed control system under abrupt changes in the time delay. Furthermore, we have replaced the delay block in [21] with a delay model obtained using the ARX model, the parameters of which are obtained using system identification as discussed above.

Fig. 12 shows the system output using ordinary wave prediction method. In the output of our proposed method (Fig. 13) we note that the proposed control system is more robust with minim overshoot. Fig. 14 shows the step responses for ordinary and proposed control methods, when time delay changed abruptly from 700 msec to 2100 msec at t=50. We note that the proposed multi-model control strategy has a satisfactory response with small fluctuations. Fig. 15 shows the tracking response without wave prediction. In Figs. 16 and 17, the tracking responses of wave prediction and the proposed control methods are shown. The results indicate the usefulness of our proposed approach particularly for abrupt variations of the environment's parameters.

We can also use this structure together with the wave variable method, the Smith predictor method, and a combination of the two in linear and/or nonlinear controllers, time-based and/or non-time based controllers

160 and other suitable types of controllers, so that the most fitting controller can be utilized depending on the
circumstances.



Figure 1: TFig. 1 :




Figure 2:

¹© 2012 Global Journals Inc. (US) Global Journal of Computer Science and Technology

²© 2012 Global Journals Inc. (US)

345




Figure 3: Fig. 3 :Fig. 4 :Fig. 5 :

6




Figure 4: Fig. 6 .

6




Figure 5: Fig. 6 :





Figure 6:



8

Figure 7: Fig. 8 :




Figure 8: Fig. 11 :



Figure 9: Fig. 12 :Fig. 13 :




Figure 10: Fig. 14 :Fig. 15 :Fig. 16 :Fig. 17 :

1

		Internet nodes		Place
Minimum delay(ms)	Maximum delay(ms)	Std. deviation(ms)	Average delay(ms)	
639	1381	38.6454	846.01035	Sistan Univ.
723	1931	94.2156	930.7525	Tabriz Univ.
691	2831	83.0866	1911.55	T.M.U Univ.
86	337	61.0934	189.2639	www.yahoo.com

Figure 11: Table 1 :

-
- [Anderson ()] , R J Anderson . 1994. Livermore, CA. SMART Class Notes, Intelligent Systems & Robotics Center, Sandia National Laboratories
- [West Cummings ()] , Park West Cummings . 2001. Woburn, MA 01801; New Haven, Connecticut 06520, USA. 3000. USA and Center for Systems Science, Yale University
- [IEEE/ASME Trans. Mechatronics (2002)] , *IEEE/ASME Trans. Mechatronics* June 2002. 7 (2) .
- [Oboe and Fiorini (1998)] ‘A design and control environment for internet based telerobotics’. R Oboe , P Fiorini . *Int. J. Robot. Res* Apr. 1998. 17 (4) p. .
- [Tarn and Brady ()] ‘A framework for the control of time-delayed telerobotic systems’. T J Tarn , K Brady . *Proc. IFAC Robot Control*, (IFAC Robot ControlNantes, France) 1997. p. .
- [Kamrani et al. ()] ‘A Multi-model adaptive control system for teleoperation via Internet’. E Kamrani , H R Momeni , A R Sharafat . *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Control Applications*, (the IEEE International Conference on Control ApplicationsTaipei, Taiwan) September 2-4, 2004. p. .
- [Narendra et al. (1995)] ‘Adaptation and learning using multiple models, switching, and tuning’. K S Narendra , J Balakrishnan , M K Ciliz . *IEEE Control Systems Magazine* Jun. 1995. 15 (3) p. .
- [Narendra and Balakrishnan (1997)] ‘Adaptive control using multiple models’. K S Narendra , J Balakrishnan . *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* Feb. 1997. 42 (2) p. .
- [Anderson and Spong (1989)] ‘Bilateral control of teleoperators with time delay’. R J Anderson , M W Spong . *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr* May 1989. 34 p. .
- [Yokokohji et al. (1999)] ‘Bilateral teleoperation under time-varying communication delay’. Y Yokokohji , T Imaida , T Yoshikawa . *Proc. IEEE/RSJ Int. Conf. Intelligent Robots and Systems*, (IEEE/RSJ Int. Conf. Intelligent Robots and Systems) Oct. 1999. 3 p. .
- [Brady ()] K Brady . *Time-Delayed Control of Telerobotic Manipulators*, (Seattle) 1997.
- [Smith (1957)] ‘Closer control of loops with dead Time’. J M Smith . *Chemical Engineering Progress* May 1957. 53 (5) p. .
- [Kamrani] *Control of Teleoperation Systems via Internet: Robustness against Delay*, E Kamrani . (A Thesis)
- [Brady and Tarn (1998)] ‘Internet-based remote teleoperation’. K Brady , T J Tarn . *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, (IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and AutomationLeuven, Belgium) May 1998. p. .
- [Munir and Book] *Internet-based teleoperation using wave variables with prediction*, S Munir , W J Book .
- [Hung et al. ()] ‘Nonlinear adaptive control of master-slave system in teleoperation’. N Hung , T Marikiyo , H Tuan . *Control Engineering Practice* 2003. (11) p. .
- [Chen and Narendra] *Nonlinear Adaptive Control Using Neural Networks and Multiple Models*, L Chen , K S Narendra . Scientific Systems Company Inc. p. 500.
- [Palmor ()] ‘Stability properties of Smith dead-time compensator controllers’. Z Palmor . *International Journal of Control* 1980. 32 (6) p. .
- [Niemeyer and Slotine (1991)] ‘Stable adaptive teleoperation’. G Niemeyer , J E Slotine . *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr* Jan. 1991. 36 p. .
- [Mosca and Agnoloni ()] *Switching Supervisory Control Based on Controller Falsification and Closed-Loop Performance Inference*, *Dipartimento di Sistemi Informatica*, E Mosca , T Agnoloni . 2002. Firenze, Italy. Universita di Firenze
- [Book and Kontz ()] ‘Teleoperation of a Hydraulic Forklift from a Haptic Manipulator over the Internet’. W J Book , M Kontz . *George W. Woodruff School of Mechanical Engineering* 2003. Georgia Institute of Technology
- [Ganjefar et al. (2002)] ‘Teleoperation systems design using augmented wave-variables and Smith predictor method for reducing time-delay Effects’. S Ganjefar , H R Momeni , F Janabi-Sharifi . *Proc. International Symposium on Intelligent Control*, (International Symposium on Intelligent ControlVancouver, Canada) October 2002. p. .
- [Niemeyer and Slotine (1998)] ‘Toward forcereflecting teleoperation over the Internet’. G Niemeyer , J E Slotine . *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, (IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and AutomationLeuven, Belgium) May 1998. p. .
- [Niemeyer and Slotine] ‘Using wave variables for system analysis and robot control’. G Niemeyer , J E Slotine . *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, (IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and AutomationAlbuquerque, New Mexico) p. .