

# The bang-bang funnel controller: An experimental verification

**Christoph Hackl\*** and **Stephan Trenn\*\***

\* Institute for Electrical Drive Systems and Power Electronics, TU München, Germany

\*\* Technomathematics group, University of Kaiserslautern, Germany




# Content



- 1 Introduction
- 2 Experimental setup and adjusted switching rule
- 3 Experimental results

# The Bang-Bang funnel controller: Basic idea



Here: System has **relative-degree two** with bounded zero dynamics




# The funnel

## Control objective

Error  $e := y - y_{\text{ref}}$  evolves within *funnel*



$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\varphi_-, \varphi_+) := \{ (t, e) \mid \varphi_-(t) \leq e \leq \varphi_+(t) \}$$

where  $\varphi_{\pm} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$



- time-varying strict error bound
- transient behaviour
- practical tracking ( $|e(t)| < \lambda$  for  $t \gg 0$ )

# The switching logic (Liberzon & T. 2010)





# Theoretical result relative degree two

## Feasibility

- feasibility of funnels
- input values large enough

## Theorem (Bang-bang funnel controller)

*Relative degree two & Funnels & simple switching logic & Feasibility*

⇒

*Bang-bang funnel controller works:*

- *existence and uniqueness of global solution*
- *error and its derivative remain within funnels for all time*
- *no zero behaviour*


# Content



- 1 Introduction
- 2 Experimental setup and adjusted switching rule
- 3 Experimental results



# Experimental setup



$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \gamma \end{bmatrix} (u(t) + u_L(t) - (T_{x_2})(t)), \\ y(t) &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x(t),\end{aligned}$$

$x_1$ : angle of the rotary machine

$x_2 = \dot{x}_1$ : angular velocity

$u_L$ : unknown load torque

$T : \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{loc}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{R})$  friction operator





# Control input limitations



## Control inputs

$$U_+ = 22 \text{ Nm} \quad U_0 = 0 \text{ Nm} \quad U_- = -22 \text{ Nm}$$

## Problem and solution


Direct switch from  $U_+$  to  $U_-$  and vice versa not “healthy” for machine

⇒ Definition of **new switching logic** necessary!






# New switching logic




increase  
error

$\Rightarrow$  make and keep  $\dot{e}(t)$  positive






# New switching logic




retain  
error

⇒ make and keep  $\dot{e}(t)$  close to zero






# New switching logic



decrease  
error

$\Rightarrow$  make and keep  $\dot{e}(t)$  **negative**





# Content



- 1 Introduction
- 2 Experimental setup and adjusted switching rule
- 3 Experimental results

# Reference tracking in the presence of unknown load





# Transient response without load disturbance




$$t \in [0, 2s]$$

$$u_L \equiv 0$$

$$y_{\text{ref}} \equiv \pi$$

$$y(0) = 0$$

$$\dot{y}(0) = 0$$






# Response in the presence of load disturbance



$$t \in [5s, 7s]$$

$$u_L \equiv -4 \text{ Nm}$$

$$y_{\text{ref}} \equiv \pi$$





# Summary

