Implementation of Experience-driven Predictive Control on **Computationally Constrained Platform Mosam Dabhi and Nathan Michael**



Research Objective and Challenges

Objective: Leverage past experiences to reduce computation needed to generate new control commands a Nonlinear Model Predictive Control (NMPC) formulat implementing this controller on and sever computationally constrained platform.

Challenges:

Evaluation on a computationally constrained platform Pixhawk autopilot microcontroller, having 32bit STM32F4 Cortex M4 core with FPU/ 168 Mhz/256 KB RAM/2 Flash and 32 bit STM32F103 failsafe co-processor.

Approach

Experience-driven Predictive Control (EPC) approach that constructs online an experience database consisting of parametrized feedback controllers and dynamic models. [1,2]



- operates away from constraint boundaries MAV (a) enabling it to apply a controller in database while the dynamics model continues to be updated.
- A new controller is added to the experience database (b) as the MAV transitions to a more aggressive flight and the updated dynamics model predicts that the system state is approaching a constraint boundary.
- The MAV reuses controllers in the database based on **(C)** state evolution predicted by current estimate of its dynamics model.
- and (f): Controller database transferred to (e) (d), computationally constrained platform and on-board control runs.

| | | Experience-driven Predictive Control Algo |
|-------------|-------------|--|
| the | 1: | $\mathcal{M} \leftarrow \emptyset \text{ or } \mathcal{M}_{prior}$ |
| IS IN | 2: | while control is enabled do |
| roly | 3: | $x \leftarrow$ current system state |
| iciy | 4: | $r \leftarrow$ current reference sequence |
| | 5: | $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \tilde{\mathbf{c}} \leftarrow \text{current dynamics model from } \mathbf{A}$ |
| n of 427 | 6: | for each element $m_i \in \mathcal{M}$ do |
| | 7: | Compute $\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ |
| | 8: | if x, r satisfy parameterized KKT c |
| INIR | 9: | $importance_i \leftarrow current time,$ |
| | 10: | $solution_found \leftarrow true$ |
| | 11: | Apply affine control law \rightarrow from |
| it | 12: | end if |
| | 13: | end for |
| | 14: | if solution_found is false then |
| | 15: | Use Existing PD Controller |
| | u: | Control Input |
| | λ : | Set of active constraints |

 \mathcal{M} : Controller Database



- Send the trajectory references and robot state from simulation environment to Pixhawk controller.
- Calculate final rpm commands using on-board control (PD or EPC) on computationally constrained platform (Pixhawk) and receive the rpm commands back on ground-station.
- Visualise the trajectory in simulated environment.

Carnegie Mellon University The Robotics Institute

orithm

Preliminary Controller Performance Evaluation

• Preliminary results of EPC Controller Implementation at the embedded level for a basic desired state in a specific direction is displayed below: (Horizon Length = 10)



- criteria **then** sort \mathcal{M}
- $m m_i$







- EPC Controller formulated on Pixhawk comprises a controller database with gains similar to PD Control. After the controller database is populated, efficient control results are leveraged via on-board control.
- Leverage Controller database generated by an external computer and extend the present formulation to Robust Experience Predictive Control using tightened constraints [2] and Markov Chain based Controller Selection [3].

References

- 1. V. R. Desaraju and N. Michael, "Leveraging Experience for Computationally Efficient Adaptive Nonlinear Model Predictive Control", IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA), May 2017 2. V. R. Desaraju, "Safe, Efficient, and Robust Predictive Control of Constrained Nonlinear Systems", Ph.D. Thesis, Robotics Institute, Carnegie
 - Mellon University, 2017 V. R. Desaraju, A. E. Spitzer, and N. Michael, "Experience-driven Predictive Control with Robust Constraint Satisfaction under Time-Varying State Uncertainty", Robotics: Science and Systems Conference (RSS), July 2017



| Co | ntrol inp | out | | | | |
|------|------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 8(| 0.1 | 0.12 | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.18 | |
| Time | e (in seco | nds) | | | | |