

NFL-ROO/SMC 의 안정도 증명 : Part 2

이 상 성^o 박종근

서울대학교 전기공학부

이 주 장

한국과학기술원 전기공학과

Stability Proof of NFL-ROO/SMC : Part 2

Sang-Seung Lee^o and Jong-Keun Park

School of Electrical Engineering
Seoul National University

Ju-Jang Lee

Dept. of Electrical Engineering
KAIST

[Abstract] This paper presents the stability proof of a nonlinear feedback linearization-reduced order observer/sliding mode controller (NFL-ROO/SMC). The closed-loop stability is proved by a Lyapunov function candidate using an addition form of the sliding surface vector and the estimation error.

Keywords : nonlinear feedback linearization-reduced order observer/sliding mode controller, Lyapunov function, separation principle, stability proof

1. Introduction

By the separation principle, a nonlinear feedback linearization-reduced order observer/sliding mode controller (NFL-ROO/SMC) is developed [1-18]. The closed-loop stability is proved by a Lyapunov function candidate using an addition form of the sliding surface vector and the estimation error.

2. NFL-ROO/SMC design

The state equation for full-state feedback and the output equation based on nonlinear feedback linearization (NFL) can be expressed as [19]

$$z(t) = T(x(t)) \quad (1)$$

$$\dot{z}(t) = Az(t) + Bu(t) \quad (2)$$

$$y(t) = Cz(t) \quad (3)$$

The transformation matrix is introduced by

$$q(t) = Tz(t) \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} y(t) \\ q(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ T \end{bmatrix} z(t) \quad (5)$$

$$z(t) = \begin{bmatrix} C^T \\ T \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} y(t) \\ q(t) \end{bmatrix} = [P \quad M] \begin{bmatrix} y(t) \\ q(t) \end{bmatrix} = Py(t) + Mq(t) \quad (6)$$

The estimate \hat{z} of z is generated as

$$\hat{z}(t) = Py(t) + M\hat{q}(t) \quad (7)$$

A new realization for the system is expressed as

$$E\dot{z}(t) = EAz(t) + EBu(t) \quad (8)$$

Substituting for z and E , we get

$$E\dot{z}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} C \\ T \end{bmatrix} \dot{z}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{y}(t) \\ \dot{q}(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} C \\ T \end{bmatrix} Az(t) + \begin{bmatrix} C \\ T \end{bmatrix} Bu(t) \quad (10)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} C \\ T \end{bmatrix} A \begin{bmatrix} P & M \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y(t) \\ q(t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} C \\ T \end{bmatrix} Bu(t) \quad (11)$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{y}(t) \\ \dot{q}(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} CAP & CAM \\ TAP & TAM \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y(t) \\ q(t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} CB \\ TB \end{bmatrix} u(t) \quad (12)$$

$$:= \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y(t) \\ q(t) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix} u(t) \quad (13)$$

$$\dot{y}(t) = A_{11}y(t) + A_{12}q(t) + B_1u(t) \quad (14)$$

$$\dot{q}(t) = A_{22}q(t) + A_{21}y(t) + B_2u(t) \quad (15)$$

The estimator equation for q is

$$\dot{\hat{q}}(t) = A_{22}\hat{q}(t) + A_{21}y(t) + B_2u(t) + L(y(t) - C\hat{z}(t)) \quad (16)$$

Let $CP = I$ and $CM = 0$

$$y(t) - C\hat{z} = y(t) - C(Py(t) + M\hat{q}) \quad (17)$$

$$= y(t) - CPy(t) - CM\hat{q} \quad (18)$$

$$= y(t) - y(t) - 0 = 0 \quad (19)$$

The reduced-order observer is represented by

$$\dot{\hat{q}}(t) = A_{22}\hat{q}(t) + A_{21}y(t) + B_2u(t) + L(\dot{y}(t) - A_{11}y(t) - B_1u(t) - A_{12}\hat{q}(t)) \quad (20)$$

Define w and \dot{w} , we get

$$w(t) := \hat{q}(t) - Ly(t) \quad (21)$$

$$\dot{w}(t) := \dot{\hat{q}}(t) - L\dot{y}(t) \quad (22)$$

The final form of the reduced-order observer is

$$\dot{w}(t) = (A_{22} - LA_{12})w(t) + [(A_{22} - LA_{12})L$$

$$+A_{21} - LA_{11}]y(t) + (B_2 - LB_1)u(t) \quad (23)$$

$$\dot{z}(t) = Mw(t) + (P + ML)y(t) \quad (24)$$

The differential form of the equation (24) is

$$\dot{z}(t) = M\dot{w}(t) + (P + ML)y(t) \quad (25)$$

The equations (23) and (24) are simplified as [1]

$$\dot{w}(t) = Fw(t) + Gy(t) + Hu(t) \quad (26)$$

$$\dot{z}(t) = Mw(t) + Ny(t) \quad (27)$$

$$\text{where, } F := (A_{22} - LA_{12}) \quad (28)$$

$$G := [(A_{22} - LA_{12})L + A_{21} - LA_{11}] \quad (29)$$

$$H := (B_2 - LB_1) \quad (30)$$

$$N := (P + ML) \quad (31)$$

Theorem 1: Consider the state equations based on NFL for the regulation problem

$$\dot{z} = Az + B\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign} \quad \text{and} \quad y = Cz$$

Consider the reduced order observer state equation based on NFL

$$q = Tz \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{q} = T\hat{z}$$

$$\dot{q} = A_{22}q + A_{21}y + B_2\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign}$$

$$\dot{\hat{q}} = A_{22}\hat{q} + A_{21}y + B_2\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign} + Ly - LC\hat{z}$$

The equal controller gain K_{RSMC}^{equal} and observer gain L may be selected separately for desired closed-loop behavior.

Proof. Let us consider the estimation error and differential estimation error

$$e = q - \hat{q}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e} &= \dot{q} - \dot{\hat{q}} = A_{22}q + A_{21}y + B_2\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign} - (A_{22}\hat{q} + A_{21}y + B_2\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign} \\ &\quad + L(\dot{y} - A_{11}y - B_1\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign} - A_{12}\hat{q})) \\ &= A_{22}q - A_{22}\hat{q} - LA_{12}q + LA_{12}\hat{q} = (A_{22} - LA_{12})(q - \hat{q}) \\ &= (A_{22} - LA_{12})e \end{aligned}$$

$$\dot{z} = Az + B\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign} = Az + B(-K_{RSMC}^{equal}\hat{z})$$

Let $\hat{z} = z - Me$

$$\dot{z} = Az - BK_{RSMC}^{equal}(z - Me) = (A - BK_{RSMC}^{equal})z - BK_{RSMC}^{equal}Me$$

The complete closed loop dynamics is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{z} \\ \dot{e} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A - BK_{RSMC}^{equal} & -BK_{RSMC}^{equal}M \\ 0 & A_{22} - LA_{12} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} z \\ e \end{bmatrix}$$

The characteristic values of the system is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(s) &= \det \begin{pmatrix} sI - A + BK_{RSMC}^{equal} & -BK_{RSMC}^{equal}M \\ 0 & sI - (A_{22} - LA_{12}) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= |sI - (A - BK_{RSMC}^{equal})| \cdot |sI - (A_{22} - LA_{12})| \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the *separation principle* is satisfied.

This completes the proof of this theorem. \square

The Lyapunov's function candidate is chosen by

$$q(t) = Tz(t)$$

$$V(q(t)) = \sigma^2(q(t)) / 2 \quad (32)$$

The time derivative of $V(q(t))$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(q(t)) &= \sigma(q(t))\dot{\sigma}(q(t)) = G_{ss}^T q(t)G_{ss}^T \dot{q}(t) \\ &= G_{ss}^T q(t)G_{ss}^T [A_{22}q(t) + A_{21}y(t) + B_2u_{RSMC}(t)] \leq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

The control inputs with switching function are

$$\begin{aligned} u_{RSMC}^+(t) &\geq -(G_{ss}^T B_2)^{-1} G_{ss}^T (A_{22}q(t) + A_{21}y(t)) \\ &\quad \text{for } G_{ss}^T q(t) > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} u_{RSMC}^-(t) &\leq -(G_{ss}^T B_2)^{-1} G_{ss}^T (A_{22}q(t) + A_{21}y(t)) \\ &\quad \text{for } G_{ss}^T q(t) < 0 \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The control input with sign function is formed as

$$u_{RSMC}^{ign}(t) = -(G_{ss}^T B_2)^{-1} G_{ss}^T (A_{22}q(t) + A_{21}y(t)) \text{sign}(\sigma(q(t))) \quad (36)$$

The above control input can be simplified as

$$u_{RSMC}^{ign}(t) = -(K_{RSMC1} q(t) + K_{RSMC2} y(t)) \text{sign}(\sigma(q(t))) \quad (37)$$

$$\text{where, } K_{RSMC1} := (G_{ss}^T B_2)^{-1} G_{ss}^T A_{22} \quad (38)$$

$$K_{RSMC2} := (G_{ss}^T B_2)^{-1} G_{ss}^T A_{21} \quad (39)$$

Finally, the *estimated control input vector* is

$$\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign}(t) = -(K_{RSMC1} \hat{q}(t) + K_{RSMC2} y(t)) \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q}(t))) \quad (40)$$

$$\text{subject to } \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q}(t))) = 1 \quad \text{for } \sigma(\hat{q}(t)) > 0$$

$$\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q}(t))) = 0 \quad \text{for } \sigma(\hat{q}(t)) = 0$$

$$\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q}(t))) = -1 \quad \text{for } \sigma(\hat{q}(t)) < 0$$

Theorem 2: Consider the reduced order system

$$q = Tz \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{q} = T\hat{z}$$

$$\dot{q} = A_{22}q + A_{21}y + B_2\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign}$$

$$\dot{\hat{q}} = A_{22}\hat{q} + A_{21}y + B_2\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign} + Ly - LC\hat{z}$$

The estimated sliding mode reduced order control law with sign function based on NFL is guaranteed an *asymptotically stable* for system (2)

$$\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign} = -(K_{RSMC1} \hat{q} + K_{RSMC2} y) \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q}))$$

$$\text{subject to } \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) = 1 \quad \text{for } \sigma(\hat{q}) > 0$$

$$\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) = 0 \quad \text{for } \sigma(\hat{q}) = 0$$

$$\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) = -1 \quad \text{for } \sigma(\hat{q}) < 0$$

Proof. Let us define the estimation error and the differential estimation error

$$e = q - \hat{q}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e} &= \dot{q} - \dot{\hat{q}} = A_{22}q + A_{21}y + B_2\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign} \\ &\quad - (A_{22}\hat{q} + A_{21}y + B_2\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign} \\ &\quad + L(\dot{y} - A_{11}y - B_1\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{ign} - A_{12}\hat{q})) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= A_{22}q - A_{22}\hat{q} - LA_{12}q + LA_{12}\hat{q} = (A_{22} - LA_{12})(q - \hat{q}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= (A_{22} - LA_{12})e$$

Lyapunov's function candidate is chosen by

$$V = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^T\sigma + \frac{1}{2}e^T e$$

The derivative is formed as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= \sigma^T\dot{\sigma} + e^T\dot{e} = \sigma^T\left(G_{ss}^T\dot{\hat{q}}\right) + e^T(A_{22} - LA_{12})e \\ &= \sigma^T G_{ss}^T\left(A_{22}\hat{q} + A_{21}y + B_2\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{*n} + L(y - Cz)\right) \\ &\quad + e^T(A_{22} - LA_{12})e \\ &= \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q} + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T B_2\hat{u}_{ROO/SMC}^{*n} \\ &\quad + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T Ly - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T LC\hat{z} + e^T(A_{22} - LA_{12})e \\ &= \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q} + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y \\ &\quad - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T B_2(K_{RSMC1}\hat{q} + K_{RSMC2}y)\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) \\ &\quad + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T Ly - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T LC\hat{z} + e^T(A_{22} - LA_{12})e\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Let } K_{RSMC1} := (G_{ss}^T B_2)^{-1} G_{ss}^T A_{22} \text{ and } K_{RSMC2} := (G_{ss}^T B_2)^{-1} G_{ss}^T A_{21}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q} + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y \\ &\quad - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T B_2\left((G_{ss}^T B_2)^{-1} G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q} + (G_{ss}^T B_2)^{-1} G_{ss}^T A_{21}y\right)\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) \\ &\quad + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T Ly - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T LC\hat{z} + e^T(A_{22} - LA_{12})e\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Let } G_{ss}^T B_2 (G_{ss}^T B_2)^{-1} = I,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q} + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q}\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) \\ &\quad - G_{ss}^T A_{21}y\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T Ly - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T LC\hat{z} \\ &\quad + e^T(A_{22} - LA_{12})e \\ &= \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q} + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T Ly \\ &\quad - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q}\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) \\ &\quad - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T LC\hat{z} + e^T(A_{22} - LA_{12})e\end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{z} = Mw + Ny$, $N = P + ML$, $CP = I$, and $CM = 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q} + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T Ly \\ &\quad - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q}\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) \\ &\quad - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T LCMw - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T LCNy + e^T(A_{22} - LA_{12})e \\ &= \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q} + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T Ly \\ &\quad - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q}\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) \\ &\quad - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T LC(P + ML)y + e^T(A_{22} - LA_{12})e \\ &= \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q} + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T Ly \\ &\quad - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q}\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) \\ &\quad - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T Ly + e^T(A_{22} - LA_{12})e \\ &= \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q} - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q}\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y \\ &\quad - \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y\text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q})) + e^T(A_{22} - LA_{12})e\end{aligned}$$

If $(A_{22} - LA_{12})$ is stable, the error is $e \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

$$\dot{V} = \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q}(1 - \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q}))) + \sigma^T G_{ss}^T A_{21}y(1 - \text{sign}(\sigma(\hat{q}))) \leq 0$$

subject to if $\sigma > 0$, $\dot{V} = 0$
if $\sigma = 0$, $\dot{V} = 0$

if $\sigma < 0$, $\dot{V} \leq -2kG_{ss}^T A_{22}\hat{q} - 2kG_{ss}^T A_{21}y < 0$,
 k is positive constant.

The above condition is satisfied on negative definite, and is *asymptotically stable*. This completes the proof of this theorem. \square

3. Conclusion

A separation theorem and a stability proof for a nonlinear feedback linearization-reduced order observer/sliding mode controller (NFL-ROO/SMC) have been done.

References

- [1] D. G. Luenberger, "Observing the state of a linear system", IEEE Trans. Mil. Electron, Vol. MIL-8, pp. 74-80, Apr. 1964.
- [2] V. I. Utkin, "Variable structure systems with sliding modes", IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control, AC-22, No. 2, pp. 212-222, April, 1977.
- [3] W. C. Chan and Y. Y. Hsu, "An optimal variable structure stabilizer for power system stabilization", IEEE Trans. on Power Apparatus and Systems, Vol. PAS-102, pp. 1738-1746, Jun., 1983.
- [4] J. J. Lee, "Optimal multidimensional variable structure controller for multi-interconnected power system", KIEE Trans., Vol. 38, No. 9, pp. 671-683, Sep., 1989.
- [5] M. L. Kothari, J. Nanda and K. Bhattacharya, 'Design of variable structure power system stabilizers with desired eigenvalues in the sliding mode', IEE Proc. C, Vol. 140, No. 4, pp. 263-268, 1993.
- [6] S. S. Lee, J. K. Park and J. J. Lee, "Sliding mode-MFAC power system stabilizer", Jour. of KIEE, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-7, Mar., 1992
- [7] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Sliding mode-model following power system stabilizer including closed-loop feedback", Jour. of KIEE, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 132-138, Sep., 1996
- [8] S. S. Lee, J. K. Park et al., "Multimachine stabilizer using sliding mode-model following including closed-loop feedback", Jour. of KIEE, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 191-197, Dec., 1996.
- [9] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Sliding mode power system stabilizer based on LQR: Part I", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 32-38, 1996.
- [10] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Sliding mode observer power system stabilizer based on linear full-order observer: Part II", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 39-45, 1996.
- [11] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Full-order observer-based sliding mode power system stabilizer with desired eigenvalue-assignment for unmeasurable state variables", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 36-42, 1997.
- [12] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "New sliding mode observer-model following power system stabilizer including CLF for unmeasurable state variables", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 88-94, 1997.
- [13] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Multimachine stabilizer using sliding mode observer-model following including CLF for unmeasurable state variables", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 53-58, 1997.
- [14] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "H_∞ observer-based sliding mode power system stabilizer for unmeasurable state variables", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 70-76, 1997.
- [15] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Nonlinear feedback linearization-full order observer/sliding mode controller design for improving transient stability in a power system", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 184-192, 1998.
- [16] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Nonlinear feedback linearization-H_∞/sliding mode controller design for improving transient stability in a power system", Jour. of EEIS, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 193-201, 1998.
- [17] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Design of power system stabilizer using observer/sliding mode, observer/sliding mode-model following and H_∞/sliding mode controllers for small-signal stability study", Inter. Jour. of Electrical Power & Energy Systems, accepted, 1998.
- [18] S. S. Lee and J. K. Park, "Design of reduced-order observer-based variable structure power system stabilizer for unmeasurable state variables, IEE PROC.-GEN., TRANS. AND DISTRIB., accepted, 1998.
- [19] R. Marino and P. Tomei, "Nonlinear control design", Prentice-Hall Press, 1995.