

Lecture Notes  
in Control and Information Sciences

316

---

Editors: M. Thoma · M. Morari

R.V. Patel · F. Shadpey

---

# Control of Redundant Robot Manipulators

**Theory and Experiments**

With 94 Figures

 Springer

## Series Advisory Board

F. Allgöwer · P. Fleming · P. Kokotovic · A.B. Kurzhanski ·  
H. Kwakernaak · A. Rantzer · J.N. Tsitsiklis

## Authors

Prof. R.V. Patel  
University of Western Ontario  
Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering  
1151 Richmond Street North  
London, Ontario  
Canada N6A 5B9

Dr. F. Shadpey  
Bombardier Inc.  
Canadair Division  
1800 Marcel Laurin  
St. Laurent, Quebec  
Canada H4R 1K2

ISSN 0170-8643

ISBN-10 3-540-25071-9 **Springer Berlin Heidelberg New York**

ISBN-13 978-3-540-25071-5 **Springer Berlin Heidelberg New York**

Library of Congress Control Number: 2005923294

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilm or in other ways, and storage in data banks. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the German Copyright Law of September 9, 1965, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer-Verlag. Violations are liable to prosecution under German Copyright Law.

**Springer is a part of Springer Science+Business Media**

springeronline.com

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2005

Printed in Germany

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

Typesetting: Data conversion by author.

Final processing by PTP-Berlin Protago-TeX-Production GmbH, Germany

Cover-Design: design & production GmbH, Heidelberg

Printed on acid-free paper 89/3141/Yu - 5 4 3 2 1 0

To Roshni and Krishna (RVP)

To Lida, Rouzbeh and Avesta (FS)

## Preface

This monograph is concerned with the position and force control of redundant robot manipulators from both theoretical and experimental points of view. Although position and force control of robot manipulators has been an area of research interest for over three decades, most of the work done to date has been for non-redundant manipulators. Moreover, while both position control and force control problems have received considerable attention, the techniques for position control are significantly more advanced and more successful than those for force control. There are several reasons for this: First, the effectiveness and reliability of force control depends on good models of the environment stiffness. Second, for stability, servo rates much higher than for position control are needed, especially for contact with stiff environments. Third, techniques that are based on tracking a desired force at the end-effector generally use Cartesian control schemes that are computationally much more intensive and prone to instability in the neighborhood of workspace singularities. The fourth factor is the significantly higher noise that is present in force and torque sensors than in position sensors. While most commercial force sensors are supplied with appropriate filters, the delay introduced by the filters can also affect the accuracy and stability of force control schemes.

A large number of techniques have been developed and used for position control such as Proportion-Derivative (PD) or Proportional-Integral-Derivative (PID) control, model-based control, e.g., inverse dynamics or computed torque control, adaptive control, robust control, etc. Most of these provide closed-loop stability and good tracking performance subject to various constraints. Several of them can also be shown to have varying degrees of robustness depending on the extent of the effect of unmodeled dynamics or dynamic or kinematic uncertainties.

For force or compliant motion control, there are essentially two main approaches: impedance control and hybrid control. Most techniques currently available are based on one or other of these approaches or a combination of the two, e.g., hybrid-impedance control. Impedance control does

not directly control the force of contact but instead attempts to adjust the manipulator's impedance (modeled as a mass-spring-damper system) by appropriate control schemes. For pure position control, the manipulator is required to have high stiffness and for contact with a stiff environment, the manipulator's stiffness needs to be low. Hybrid control is based on the decomposition of the control problem into two: one for the position-controlled subspace and the other for the force-controlled subspace. Hybrid control works well when the two subspaces are orthogonal to each other. This decomposition is possible in many practical applications. However, if the two subspaces are not orthogonal, then contradictory position and force control requirements in a particular direction may make the closed-loop system unstable.

From the point of view of experimental results, there have been numerous papers where various position and, to a lesser extent, force control schemes have been implemented for industrial as well as research manipulators. There have also been a number of attempts made to extend position and force control schemes for non-redundant manipulators to redundant manipulators. These extensions are by no means trivial. The main problem has been to incorporate redundancy resolution within the control scheme to exploit the extra degree(s) of freedom to meet some secondary task requirement(s). With the exception of a couple of papers, these secondary tasks have been position based rather than force based. One of the key issues is to formulate redundancy resolution to address singularity avoidance while satisfying primary as well as secondary tasks. A number of redundancy resolution schemes are available which resolve redundancy at the velocity or acceleration level. In order to formulate a secondary task involving force control, it is necessary to resolve redundancy at the acceleration level. However, this leads to the problem that undesirable or unstable motions can arise due to self motion when the manipulator's joint velocities are not included in redundancy resolution.

While considerable work has been done on force and position control of non-redundant manipulators, the situation for redundant manipulators is very different. This is probably because of the fact that there are very few redundant manipulators available commercially and hardly any are used in industry. The complexity of redundancy resolution and manipulator dynamics for a manipulator with seven or more degrees of freedom (DOF) also makes the control problem much more difficult, especially from the point of view of experimental implementation. Most of the experimental work done to illustrate algorithms for force and position control of redundant manipulators has been based on planar 3-DOF manipulators. The

notable exceptions to this have been the work done at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory using the 7-DOF Robotics Research Arm and the work presented in this monograph which uses an experimental 7-DOF isotropic manipulator called REDIESTRO.

### **Acknowledgements**

Much of the work described in the monograph was carried out as part of a Strategic Technologies in Automation and Robotics (STEAR) project on Trajectory Planning and Obstacle Avoidance (TPOA) funded by the Canadian Space Agency through a contract with Bombardier Inc. The work was performed in three phases. The phases involved a feasibility study, development of methodologies for TPOA and their verification through extensive simulations, and full-scale experimental implementations on REDIESTRO. Several prespecified experimental strawman tasks were also carried out as part of the verification process. Additional funding, in particular for the design, construction and real-time control of REDIESTRO, was provided by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of Canada through research grants awarded to Professor J. Angeles (McGill University) and Professor R.V. Patel.

The authors would like to acknowledge the help and contributions of several colleagues with whom they have interacted or collaborated on various aspects of the research described in this monograph. In particular, thanks are due to Professor Jorge Angeles, Dr. Farzam Ranjbaran, Dr. Alan Robins, Dr. Claude Tessier, Professor Mehrdad Moallem, Dr. Costas Balafoutis, Dr. Zheng Lin, Dr. Haipeng Xie, and Mr. Iain Bryson. The authors would also like to acknowledge the contributions of Professor Angeles and Dr. Ranjbaran with regard to the REDIESTRO manipulator and the collision avoidance work described in Chapter 3.

*R.V. Patel  
F. Shadpey*

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>VII</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Objectives of the Monograph . . . . .	2
1.2 Monograph Outline . . . . .	3
<b>2. Redundant Manipulators: Kinematic Analysis and Redundancy Resolution</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Introduction . . . . .	7
2.2 Kinematic Analysis of Redundant Manipulators . . . . .	8
2.3 Redundancy Resolution . . . . .	9
2.3.1 Redundancy Resolution at the Velocity Level . . . . .	9
2.3.1.1 Exact Solution . . . . .	10
2.3.1.2 Approximate Solution . . . . .	13
2.3.1.3 Configuration Control . . . . .	15
2.3.1.4 Configuration Control (Alternatives for Additional Tasks) . . . . .	16
2.3.2 Redundancy Resolution at the Acceleration Level . . . . .	18
2.4 Analytic Expression for Additional Tasks . . . . .	20
2.4.1 Joint Limit Avoidance (JLA) . . . . .	20
2.4.1.1 Definition of Terms and Feasibility Analysis . . . . .	21
2.4.1.2 Description of the Algorithms . . . . .	23
2.4.1.3 Approach I: Using Inequality Constraints . . . . .	23
2.4.1.4 Approach II: Optimization Constraint . . . . .	24
2.4.1.5 Performance Evaluation and Comparison . . . . .	25
2.4.2 Static and Moving Obstacle Collision Avoidance . . . . .	28
2.4.2.1 Algorithm Description . . . . .	28
2.4.3 Posture Optimization (Task Compatibility) . . . . .	31
2.5 Conclusions . . . . .	32



<b>3.</b>	<b>Collision Avoidance for a 7-DOF Redundant Manipulator</b>	<b>35</b>
3.1	Introduction	35
3.2	Primitive-Based Collision Avoidance	37
3.2.1	Cylinder-Cylinder Collision Detection	38
3.2.1.1	Review of Line Geometry and Dual Vectors	39
3.2.2	Cylinder-Sphere Collision Detection	49
3.2.3	Sphere-Sphere Collision Detection	50
3.3	Kinematic Simulation for a 7-DOF Redundant Manipulator	51
3.3.1	Kinematics of REDIESTRO	52
3.3.2	Main Task Tracking	53
3.3.2.1	Position Tracking	53
3.3.2.2	Orientation Tracking	54
3.3.2.3	Simulation Results	54
3.3.3	Additional Tasks	61
3.3.3.1	Joint Limit Avoidance	62
3.3.3.2	Stationary and Moving Obstacle Collision Avoidance	62
3.4	Experimental Evaluation using a 7-DOF Redundant Manipulator	69
3.4.1	Hardware Demonstration	70
3.4.2	Case 1: Collision Avoidance with Stationary Spherical Objects	71
3.4.3	Case 2: Collision Avoidance with a Moving Spherical Object	71
3.4.4	Case 3: Passing Through a Triangular Opening	73
3.5	Conclusions	73
<b>4.</b>	<b>Contact Force and Compliant Motion Control</b>	<b>79</b>
4.1	Introduction	79
4.2	Literature Review	81
4.2.1	Constrained Motion Approach	81
4.2.2	Compliant Motion Control	85
4.3	Schemes for Compliant and Force Control of Redundant Manipulators	89
4.3.1	Configuration Control at the Acceleration Level	91
4.3.2	Augmented Hybrid Impedance Control using the Computed-Torque Algorithm	92
4.3.2.1	Outer-loop design	92
4.3.2.2	Inner-loop	94
4.3.2.3	Simulation Results for a 3-DOF Planar Arm	94

4.3.3	Augmented Hybrid Impedance Control with Self-Motion Stabilization. . . . .	102
4.3.3.1	Outer-Loop Design. . . . .	102
4.3.3.2	Inner-Loop Design . . . . .	104
4.3.3.3	Simulation Results on a 3-DOF Planar Arm . .	107
4.3.4	Adaptive Augmented Hybrid Impedance Control. . . . .	108
4.3.4.1	Outer-Loop Design. . . . .	108
4.3.4.2	Inner-Loop Design . . . . .	109
4.3.4.3	Simulation Results for a 3-DOF Planar Arm . .	113
4.4	Conclusions . . . . .	116
<b>5.</b>	<b>Augmented Hybrid Impedance Control for a 7-DOF Redundant Manipulator</b>	<b>119</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	119
5.2	Algorithm Extension. . . . .	119
5.2.1	Task Planner and Trajectory Generator (TG). . . . .	120
5.2.2	AHIC module . . . . .	120
5.2.3	Redundancy Resolution (RR) module. . . . .	122
5.2.4	Forward Kinematics. . . . .	124
5.2.5	Linear Decoupling (Inverse Dynamics) Controller. . . . .	126
5.3	Testing and Verification. . . . .	126
5.4	Simulation Study. . . . .	130
5.4.1	Description of the simulation environment . . . . .	130
5.4.2	Description of the sources of performance degradation . . . . .	131
5.4.2.1	Kinematic instability due to resolving redundancy at the acceleration level. . . . .	132
5.4.2.2	Performance degradation due to the model-based part of the controller . . . . .	135
5.4.3	Modified AHIC Scheme . . . . .	139
5.5	Conclusions . . . . .	144
<b>6.</b>	<b>Experimental Results for Contact Force and Complaint Motion Control</b>	<b>147</b>
6.1	Introduction . . . . .	147
6.2	Preparation and Conduct of the Experiments. . . . .	148
6.2.1	Selection of Desired Impedances. . . . .	148
6.2.1.1	Stability Analysis . . . . .	149
6.2.1.2	Impedance-controlled Axis. . . . .	150
6.2.1.3	Force-controlled Axis: . . . . .	152

6.2.2	Selection of PD Gains . . . . .	158
6.2.3	Selection of the Force Filter. . . . .	159
6.2.4	Effect of Kinematic Errors (Robustness Issue) . . . . .	159
6.3	Numerical Results for Strawman Tasks . . . . .	162
6.3.1	Strawman Task I (Surface Cleaning). . . . .	163
6.3.2	Strawman Task II (Peg In The Hole). . . . .	166
6.4	Conclusions . . . . .	175
<b>7.</b>	<b>Concluding Remarks</b>	<b>179</b>
<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>Kinematic and Dynamic Parameters of REDIESTRO</b>	<b>185</b>
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>Trajectory Generation (Special Consideration For Orientation</b>	<b>189</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>193</b>
	<b>Index</b>	<b>203</b>