Discrete Event and Hybrid Systems in Robotics and Automation: An Overview

Discrete event and hybrid systems modeling has been used extensively in automation, robotics, and manufacturing applications. Different frameworks for dynamic supervisory controllers are used in flexible manufacturing systems (FMS) and automated processes. This article presents an overview of some existing strategies that are used to control systems in real-time based on sensory data.
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The underlying mathematical representation of complex robotic and manufacturing computer-controlled systems is still insufficient to create a set of models which accurately captures the dynamics of the system over the entire range of system operation. We remain in a situation where we must trade off the accuracy of our models with the manageability of the models. Closed-form solutions of mathematical models are almost exclusively limited to linear system models. Computer simulation of nonlinear, hybrid and discrete-event models provide a means for off-line design of robotic control systems. Guarantees of system performance are limited to those regions where the robustness conditions apply. These conditions may not apply during startup and shutdown or during periods of anomalous operation. Attempts have been made to model low- and high-level system changes in automated and robotic systems as discrete event dynamic systems (DEDS) and hybrid systems, where minor events can lead to a catastrophe. Discrete event and hybrid systems have been used in the manufacturing and automation domains to model system state changes within a process. Timed and untimed Petri nets and state automata, in addition to markovian, stochastic, perturbation and other models, have been used extensively to model and control automated manufacturing systems. High-level DEDS controllers have also been used to guide the behavior of robots based on sensory outputs.

As industries move closer to implementing agile-manufacturing concepts the need for automatic and re-programmable controllers will increase rapidly [1,2]. The productivity of flexible manufacturing systems (FMSs) in such industries will be measured in terms of: (i) device flexibility—use of re-configurable and re-programmable machines for part production; and robotic manipulators for part transfer; and (ii) system flexibility—use of a supervisory controller to re-program the operation of the FMS, in order to accommodate alternate production routes when needed [3].

Agile manufacturing is primarily characterized by "the ability to rapidly respond to continuously changing cus-
customer requirements." Therefore, it is assumed that in an FMS, parts could be re-routed in an on-line manner in response to such changes, as well as in response to unexpected device failures or deadlocks, without intervention from an external agent.

A centralized supervisory controller for an FMS must perform the following three tasks: (1) monitor the behavior of the system using sensory feedback; (2) evaluate phenomena in accordance with the governing supervisory-control strategy; and (3) enforce the common strategy through the execution of the device programs [4]. The design of a supervisory controller entails the formulation of control laws, and the synthesis of supervisors. The laws specify how the supervisor is to react to the behavior of the FMS, the goal being to have some production specifications satisfied within the standing control-enforcement constraints.

From a planning and control perspective, an FMS for discrete production can be seen as a dynamic system whose states evolve according to the occurrence of abrupt physical events, thus exhibiting the characteristics of a discrete-event system (DES). Such systems are event driven, discrete in time and space, usually asynchronous, and typically non-deterministic.

In the past, DESs have usually been sufficiently simple that intuitive or ad-hoc control solutions have been adequate [5]. However, the increasing complexity of these systems has created a need for formal approaches for their analysis and control. The essential distinction between an ad-hoc approach and a formal approach is that the latter provides a mathematical framework (e.g., algebraic set theory, formal language theory, etc.) for the formulation and synthesis of the supervisory-control laws. With the use of mathematical tools developed within the formal approach, the synthesized supervisory-control law is (mathematically) proven to be free of conflict and deadlock. Petri-net theory [6,7], real-time temporal logic [8,9] and controlled automata [10] are formal approaches that have been commonly applied to the analysis and control of DESs.

Because of the non-deterministic nature of behavior of a manufacturing system, its supervisory control must be carried out in a closed loop. The above-mentioned traits complicate and greatly increase the complexity of the supervisory-control implementation. Thus, the control of even a moderately complex system can easily require an immensely large DES strategy. In [11], it has been shown that, when solving basic control-synthesis problems, although they have been noted to be of polynomial complexity in the number of states, the number of states in a practical system can be exponential in the number of constituent processes.

To some extent, this problem of excessive states can be mitigated through modular synthesis, use of aggregation, decentralization, and hierarchies [12]. However, these techniques are of limited use, since they draw on special characteristics of the numerous control objectives. In a complex environment with many interdependencies between objectives, these techniques will not be sufficient for reducing the number of states to manageable numbers.

If it is not possible to construct, for a given set of control objectives, a DES supervisory controller which has a manageable number of states, it might be possible to create a split approach that uses some alternative mechanism in addition to a DES supervisory controller. This second mechanism would relieve the DES supervisory controller of the need for so many states by either (i) taking on the responsibility for some of the control objectives, or (ii) asserting control whenever events diverge from the (reduced number of) states of the DES supervisory controller [4].

A second problem to be addressed is the selection of hardware that can be easily re-programmed on-line. The utilization of personal computers (PC), augmented with data-acquisition and interface devices, as well as programmable logic controller (PLC) technology, have been proposed in the literature for the execution of control strategies generated on-line. A primary reason for the selection of PLCs over PCs is that they are standard, rugged manufacturing hardware widely used in factory automation.

APPLICATIONS OF AD-HOC APPROACHES TO FMS CONTROL

In [5], a workcell-management concept is introduced for the integration of workcell-programming, workcell-coordination and error-recovery issues. A manufacturing-workcell programming language is also proposed. Its basic features permit the evaluation of mathematical, relational and logical expressions, the assignment of variables, the conditional and unconditional branching of program flow, and looping. The management system was tested using multiple PCs in a token-ring environment to simulate a manufacturing workcell.

In [13], the conceptual design and partial implementation of an on-line supervisor for a robotic assembly workcell is described. The proposed supervisor is defined as an on-line system responsible for the real-time monitoring of the assembly process. The proposed system was implemented on a computer workstation connected directly to an assembly workcell. In [14], a knowledge-based on-line system is proposed for scheduling, execution monitoring, and failure diagnosis and recovery for a flexible-assembly-cell environment. It is a hierarchical system with three levels: a task level, a functional level and an action level. For the implementation, a PC was used to host the supervisory controller, which was in turn connected to dedicated microprocessors utilized to control the workcell devices.

A common shortcoming of the above supervisory controllers is their lack of formalism to verify and ensure correctness of the control strategies (i.e., free of conflict and deadlock).

APPLICATION OF FORMAL APPROACHES TO FMS CONTROL

Both Petri-net and controlled-automata DES-modeling techniques have been utilized for PC-based implementations of supervisory control [15-18]. In [7], an extended Petri-net notation is introduced for the modeling and control of a manufacturing system. In [15, 16], a scheduling and control system for manufacturing workcells utilizes Petri nets for the local control of the workcell devices at the machine level in a hierarchical system. The modeling and performance evalua-
tion of Petri-net models applied to manufacturing workcells are discussed in [17]. In [18], an augmented timed Petri-net system is introduced for handling failures within a robotic flexible-assembly workcell.

A Petri-net operating system has also been developed as the basis for a controller. [19, 20]. A Petri-net description language is proposed to convert a graphical (Petri-net) model of a manufacturing system into a textual representation. The output of the conversion process is a set of (English) statements, where for each state and transition the corresponding preceding and following states and transitions are listed as a single statement. To supervise the workcell, the Petri-net operating system resided in a PC, that was in turn interfaced to other PCs which acted as local controllers of the machines in the workcell.

In a rare PLC-based controller example, Petri-net modeling is used as an intermediate step in moving from a high-level description of a control-strategy to the Boolean format of the corresponding ladder-logic description [21]. The conversion from Petri-net to ladder-logic code is performed by a set of transformation rules defined in the work.

One of the two controlled-automata-based implementations reported so far has been for the supervisory control of an integrated-circuit wafer-fabrication system [22]. The supervisory controller consists of two parts: a supervisor and a controller. The role of the supervisor is to ensure that safety constraints are enforced. The role of the controller is to direct the system toward the desired goal, that is, to accomplish a specific set of tasks. In the implementation of the controller, a dedicated computer workstation was utilized and directly connected to the device.

As another real implementation example, controlled automata is utilized in [3] for the supervisory control of a robotic manufacturing workcell. The control strategy is developed based on the framework presented in [10], automatically translated into a ladder-logic code, and subsequently downloaded into the PLC. The PLC program was then executed to control the workcell devices.

Some DES-type controllers have also been targeted for the control of power plants using learning automata [23], satellite stabilization through inductive learning [24], and flexible-wing aircraft control using fuzzy logic [25].
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