

Switching and PI Control of Walking Motions of Planar Biped Walkers

E.R. Westervelt*, J.W. Grizzle⁺, and
C. Canudas de Wit[×]

Abstract—A companion paper has addressed the problem of designing controllers that induce exponentially stable, periodic walking motions at a given fixed walking rate for a planar, biped robot with one degree of underactuation in single support. This note provides two additional control features: (i) the ability to compose such controllers in order to obtain walking at several discrete walking rates with guaranteed stability during the transitions; (ii) the ability to regulate the robot’s average walking rate to a continuum of values. Taken together, these two features afford the construction of a feedback controller that takes the robot from a standing position, through a range of walking rates, and back to a standing position, while providing local stabilization and disturbance rejection. The key technical tool is the hybrid zero dynamics of the robot model.

Keywords. Hybrid systems, zero dynamics, Poincaré sections, Bézier curves, walking

I. INTRODUCTION

This note builds on the results in [8, 9], which developed the notion of the hybrid zero dynamics for the walking motion of an N -link, planar, biped robot with one less degree of actuation than degree of motion freedom (DOF) during the single support phase. This two-dimensional, invariant sub-dynamics of the complete hybrid model of the biped robot was shown to be key to designing exponentially stabilizing controllers for walking motions. In particular, exponentially stable orbits of the hybrid zero dynamics can be rendered exponentially stable in the complete hybrid model. The Poincaré map of the hybrid zero dynamics was proven to be diffeomorphic to a scalar, LTI system, rendering transparent the existence and stability properties of periodic orbits of the hybrid zero dynamics. A special class of output functions based on Bézier polynomials was used to simplify the computation of the hybrid zero dynamics, while at the same time inducing a convenient, finite parameterization of these dynamics. Parameter optimization was then applied to the hybrid zero dynamics to directly design a provably stable, closed-loop system which satisfied design constraints, such as walking at a given average walking rate and the forces on the support leg lying in the allowed friction cone. All of the results were illustrated on a five-link walker.

This note provides two additional features: (i) the ability to compose the above controllers to obtain walking at several discrete walking rates with guaranteed stability during

the transitions; (ii) the ability to regulate the robot’s average walking rate to a continuum of values.

Section III presents a method for serially composing two controllers so as to transition the robot from walking at a given fixed walking rate to another, without loss of stability. The controller design is motivated by a switching idea presented in [3]: controllers were first designed to accomplish the individual tasks of juggling, catching, and palming a ping-pong ball by a robot arm; these controllers were then sequentially composed via switching to accomplish the complex task of maneuvering the ping-pong ball in a three-dimensional workspace with an obstacle. The regions of attraction of each controller were first empirically estimated within the full state space of the robot. Switching from one controller to another without loss of stability was then accomplished by comparing the current state of the robot to the region of attraction of the controller for the next desired task. The problem faced in this note is more challenging in that the domains of attraction of any two of the individual controllers may have empty intersection, and hence a transition controller will be required to steer the robot from the region of attraction of one controller into the region of attraction of a second, “nearby”, controller.

Section IV develops an event-based PI controller to regulate walking rate to a continuum of values. The controller uses integral action to adjust the parameters in a controller that, for fixed parameter values, induces an exponentially stable, periodic orbit. Parameter adjustment takes place just after impact (swing leg touching the ground). The analysis of the controller is based on the restricted Poincaré map of the hybrid zero dynamics.

Section V illustrates how the results of Sections III and IV, when taken together, afford the construction of a feedback controller that steers the robot from a standing position, through a range of walking rates, and back to a standing position, while providing stabilization and a modest amount of robustness to disturbances and parameter mismatch between the design model and the actual robot. The results are illustrated via simulation on the five-link model studied in [4, 6–8]; an animation of the robot’s walking motion is available on [1].

II. NOTATION AND BASIC FACTS

This section summarizes some notation and results from¹ [8]. The reader is encouraged to read [8] for further interpretation, context and supporting diagrams. The configuration coordinates of the robot in single support (also commonly called the swing phase) are denoted by $q = (q_1, \dots, q_N)'$, the state space is denoted by $T\mathcal{Q}$, and a control is applied at each connection of two links, but not at the contact point with the ground (i.e., no ankle torque), for a total of $(N - 1)$ controls. The detailed assumptions on the robot (bipedal, planar and one less degree of actuation than degrees of freedom, point feet, rigid contact model) and the walking gait (instantaneous double support phase, no slipping nor rebound at impact, motion from left to right, symmetric gait) are given in Section II of [8].

The hybrid model of the robot (single support phase La-

*Corresponding author. Control Systems Laboratory, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2122, USA, ewesterv@umich.edu

⁺Control Systems Laboratory, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2122, USA, grizzle@umich.edu

[×]Laboratoire d’Automatique de Grenoble, INPG-ENSIEG, UMR CNRS 5528, BP. 46, 3402, Saint Martin d’Hères, France, canudas@lag.ensieg.inpg.fr

¹Preliminary versions of [8] have been presented in [7, 9].

grangian dynamics plus impact map) is expressed as a nonlinear system with impulse effects

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= f(x) + g(x)u & x^- \notin S \\ x^+ &= \Delta(x^-) & x^- \in S. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The impact or walking surface, S , is defined as

$$S := \{(q, \dot{q}) \in T\mathcal{Q} \mid p_2^v(q) = 0, p_2^h(q) > 0\}, \quad (2)$$

where p_2^v and p_2^h are the Cartesian coordinates of the swing leg end. The impact map $\Delta : S \rightarrow S$ computes the value of the state just after impact with S , $x^+ = (q^+, \dot{q}^+)$, from the value of the state just before impact, $x^- = (q^-, \dot{q}^-)$. Since the configuration coordinates necessarily involve the specification of which of the two the legs is in contact with the ground, the coordinates must be relabeled after each step to take into account the successive changing of the support leg. This is reflected in the impact map via a constant, invertible matrix R ,

$$q^+ := Rq^-. \quad (3)$$

The control design involves the choice of a set of holonomic constraints that are asymptotically imposed on the robot via feedback control. This is accomplished by interpreting the constraints as output functions depending only on the configuration variables of the robot, and then combining ideas from finite-time stabilization and computed torque. The outputs $y \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ are chosen as

$$y = h(q, \alpha) = H_0 q - h_d(\theta(q), \alpha), \quad (4)$$

with terms defined as follows.

1. H_0 is an $(N-1) \times N$ matrix of real coefficients specifying what is to be controlled.
2. $\theta(q) := cq$, where c is a $1 \times N$ row vector of real coefficients, is a scalar function of the configuration variables and should be chosen so that it is monotonically increasing along a step of the robot ($\theta(q)$ is playing the role of time). Define $\theta^+ = cq^+$ and $\theta^- = cq^-$ to be the initial and final values of θ , respectively, along a step.
3. Normalization of θ to take values between zero and one,

$$s(q) := \frac{\theta(q) - \theta^+}{\theta^- - \theta^+}. \quad (5)$$

4. Bézier polynomials of order $M \geq 3$

$$b_i(s) := \sum_{k=0}^M \alpha_k^i \frac{M!}{k!(M-k)!} s^k (1-s)^{M-k}. \quad (6)$$

5. For α_k^i as above, define the $(N-1) \times 1$ column vector $\alpha_k := (\alpha_k^1, \dots, \alpha_k^{N-1})'$ and the $(N-1) \times (M+1)$ matrix $\alpha := [\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_M]$.

6.

$$h_d(\theta(q), \alpha) := \begin{bmatrix} b_1 \circ s(q) \\ \vdots \\ b_{N-1} \circ s(q) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

The matrix of parameters α is said to be a regular parameter of output (4) if the output satisfies hypotheses

HH1–HH4 of Section III.A and hypothesis HH5 of Section III.B of [8], which together imply the invertibility of the decoupling matrix and the existence of a two-dimensional, smooth, zero dynamics associated with the single support phase of the robot. Let Z_α be the (swing phase) zero dynamics manifold. Let Γ_α be any feedback satisfying assumptions CH2–CH5 of Section III.C of [8] so that Z_α is invariant under the swing phase dynamics in closed loop with Γ_α and is locally finite-time attractive otherwise. Note that standard results imply that $\Gamma_\alpha|_{Z_\alpha} = -(L_g L_f h)^{-1} L_f^2 h$ [5], and thus (i) $\Gamma_\alpha|_{Z_\alpha}$ is uniquely determined by the choice of parameters used in the output and is completely independent of the choice of feedback used to drive the constraints to zero in finite time; and (ii) even though Γ_α is necessarily not smooth, $\Gamma_\alpha|_{Z_\alpha}$ is as smooth as the robot model.

For a regular parameter value of output (4), α , the definition of the outputs and basic properties of Bézier polynomials yield a very simple characterization of $S \cap Z_\alpha$, the configuration and velocity of the robot at the end of a phase of single support. Define

$$q_\alpha^- = H^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_M \\ \theta_\alpha^- \end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

$$\omega_\alpha^- = H^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{M}{\theta_\alpha^- - \theta_\alpha^+} (\alpha_M - \alpha_{M-1}) \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where $H := [H'_0 \ c]'$, and the initial and final values of θ corresponding to this output are denoted by θ_α^+ and θ_α^- , respectively. Then $S \cap Z_\alpha = \{(q_\alpha^-, \dot{q}_\alpha^-) \mid \dot{q}_\alpha^- = a \omega_\alpha^-, a \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and is determined by the *last two columns* of the parameter matrix α . In a similar fashion $\Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha)$, the configuration, q_α^+ , and velocity, \dot{q}_α^+ , of the robot at the beginning of a subsequent phase of single support, may be simply characterized and are determined by the *first two columns* of the parameter matrix α .

Let β also be a regular parameter value of output (4). Then using arguments almost identical to those in the proof of Theorem 4 of [8], it follows that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \beta_0 \\ \theta_\beta^+ \end{bmatrix} = H R H^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_M \\ \theta_\alpha^- \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

implies $h(\cdot, \beta) \circ \Delta|_{(S \cap Z_\alpha)} = 0$, while, if $\dot{q}_\alpha^+ := \Delta_{\dot{q}}(q_\alpha^-) \omega_\alpha^-$, results in $c\dot{q}_\alpha^+ \neq 0$, then

$$\beta_1 = \frac{\theta_\beta^- - \theta_\alpha^+}{M c \dot{q}_\alpha^+} H_0 \dot{q}_\alpha^+ + \alpha_0 \quad (11)$$

implies $L_f h(\cdot, \beta) \circ \Delta|_{(S \cap Z_\alpha)} = 0$. The key thing to note is that these two conditions involve, once again, only the *first two columns* of the parameter matrix β . In a similar fashion the *last two columns* of the parameter matrix β may be chosen so that $h(\cdot, \beta)|_{(S \cap Z_\alpha)} = 0$, and $L_f h(\cdot, \beta)|_{(S \cap Z_\alpha)} = 0$.

Taking $\beta = \alpha$, conditions (10) and (11) imply that $\Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha) \subset Z_\alpha$, in which case Z_α is then controlled-invariant for the full hybrid model of the robot. The resulting restriction dynamics is called the *hybrid zero dynamics*. Necessary and sufficient conditions can be given

for the hybrid zero dynamics to admit an exponentially² stable, periodic orbit, \mathcal{O}_α , [8]. When these conditions are met, the matrix of parameters α is said to give rise to an exponentially stable walking motion. Under controller Γ_α , the exponentially stable orbit in the hybrid zero dynamics is also exponentially stable in the full order model, (1). The domain of attraction of \mathcal{O}_α in the full dimensional model cannot be easily estimated; however, its domain of attraction intersected with $S \cap Z_\alpha$, that is, the domain of attraction of the associated fixed-point of the restricted Poincaré map, $\rho_\alpha : S \cap Z_\alpha \rightarrow S \cap Z_\alpha$, is computed analytically in Section IV of [8]; denote this set by \mathcal{D}_α , which is a subset of $S \cap Z_\alpha$.

Finally, define the average walking rate over a step³, $\bar{\nu}$ (m/s), to be step length (m) divided by the elapsed time of a step (s). Since the controllers employed are not smooth, $\bar{\nu} : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is not a smooth function of the states. However, if α is a regular parameter value of output (4) giving rise to a hybrid zero dynamics, $\Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha) \subset Z_\alpha$, then $\bar{\nu}$ restricted to $S \cap Z_\alpha$ depends smoothly on the states and the parameter values α used to define the outputs, (4); an explicit formula for $\bar{\nu}$ is given in Section VI of [8].

III. PROVABLY STABLE COMPOSITION OF WALKING MOTIONS

Let α and β be two regular sets of parameters of output (4) with corresponding zero dynamics manifolds, Z_α and Z_β . Suppose that $\Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha) \subset Z_\alpha$ and $\Delta(S \cap Z_\beta) \subset Z_\beta$, and that there exist exponentially stable periodic orbits⁴, \mathcal{O}_α and \mathcal{O}_β ; denote the corresponding controllers by Γ_α and Γ_β . The goal is to be able to transition from \mathcal{O}_α to \mathcal{O}_β without the robot falling (i.e., with stability guaranteed). If it were known that the domains of attraction of the two orbits had a non-empty intersection, then the method of [3] could be applied directly. Numerically evaluating the domains of attraction on the full-order model is unpleasant, so another means of assuring a stable transition is sought that is based on easily computable quantities, the domains of attraction of the restricted Poincaré maps associated with \mathcal{O}_α and \mathcal{O}_β .

Since in general $Z_\alpha \cap Z_\beta = \emptyset$, the method for providing a stable transition from \mathcal{O}_α and \mathcal{O}_β will be to introduce a one-step transition controller $\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ whose (swing phase) zero dynamics manifold $Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ connects the zero dynamics manifolds Z_α and Z_β (see Figure 2). More precisely, switching will be synchronized with impact events and the zero dynamics manifold $Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ will be chosen to map exactly from the one-dimensional manifold $\Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha)$ (i.e., the state of the robot just after impact with S under controller Γ_α) to the one-dimensional manifold $S \cap Z_\beta$ (i.e., the state of the robot just before impact with S under controller Γ_β). The one-step transition controller $\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ differs from a deadbeat controller in that $\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ takes *all*

points in a subset of manifold $\Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha)$ into a subset of the manifold $S \cap Z_\beta$ as opposed to a deadbeat controller that would map a subset of $\Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha)$ to a *point* in $S \cap Z_\beta$. The design of multi-step transition controllers is also possible but not addressed here.

From (8)–(11), any zero dynamics manifold $Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ with parameters

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)_0 &= \alpha_0 \\ (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)_1 &= \alpha_0 - \frac{\theta_\beta^- - \theta_\alpha^+}{\theta_\alpha^- - \theta_\alpha^+} (\alpha_0 - \alpha_1) \\ (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)_{M-1} &= \beta_M + \frac{\theta_\beta^- - \theta_\alpha^+}{\theta_\beta^- - \theta_\beta^+} (\beta_{M-1} - \beta_M) \quad (12) \\ (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)_M &= \beta_M \\ \theta_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}^+ &= \theta_\alpha^+ \\ \theta_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}^- &= \theta_\beta^- \end{aligned}$$

satisfies $Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)} \cap \Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha) = \Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha)$ and $\Delta(S \cap Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}) = \Delta(S \cap Z_\beta)$. The choice of the intermediate parameter values, $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)_i$, $i = 2$ to $M - 2$ affects the walking motion, and one could choose their values through optimization, for example, to minimize the torques required to evolve along the surface $Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$. However, the simple choice

$$(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)_i = (\alpha_i + \beta_i)/2, \quad i = 2 \text{ to } M - 2, \quad (13)$$

has proven effective in examples worked by the authors. The reason for this seems to be intimately linked the use of Bézier polynomials; see Section V.B of [8].

Assume that the parameter matrix given in (12) and (13) is regular and let $\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ be an associated controller; then $\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}|_{Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}}$ is uniquely determined by the matrix of parameters $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$. The goal now is to determine under what conditions $\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ will effect a transition from the region of attraction of \mathcal{O}_α to the region of attraction of \mathcal{O}_β .

Let $P_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)} : S \rightarrow S$ be the Poincaré return map of the model (1) in closed loop with $\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ and consider $P_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}|_{(S \cap Z_\alpha)}$. By construction of $Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$, $\Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha) \subset Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$. Since $Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ is invariant under $\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$, it follows that $P_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}(S \cap Z_\alpha) \subset S \cap Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$. But by construction, $S \cap Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)} = S \cap Z_\beta$. Thus, the restriction of the Poincaré return map to $S \cap Z_\alpha$ induces a (partial) map

$$\rho_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)} : S \cap Z_\alpha \rightarrow S \cap Z_\beta. \quad (14)$$

In Section IV.A of [8], a closed-form expression for $\rho_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ is computed on the basis of the two-dimensional zero dynamics associated with $Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$.

Let $\mathcal{D}_\alpha \subset S \cap Z_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{D}_\beta \subset S \cap Z_\beta$ be the domains of attraction of the restricted Poincaré maps $\rho_\alpha : S \cap Z_\alpha \rightarrow S \cap Z_\alpha$ and $\rho_\beta : S \cap Z_\beta \rightarrow S \cap Z_\beta$ associated with the orbits \mathcal{O}_α and \mathcal{O}_β , respectively. (Since the existence of exponentially stable, periodic orbits has been assumed, these domains are non-empty and open.) It follows that $\rho_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_\beta)$ is precisely the set of states in $S \cap Z_\alpha$ that can be steered into the domain of attraction of \mathcal{O}_β under the control law

²Note that finite-time stabilization is used only to constrain ($N - 1$) of the N degrees of freedom while the stability properties of the uncontrolled degree of freedom is determined by the resulting closed-loop system dynamics.

³A step starts with the swing leg on the ground and behind the robot and ends with the swing leg on the ground and in front of the robot.

⁴Typically, these would correspond to walking at different average walking rates.

$\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$. In general, from stability considerations, one is more interested in $\mathcal{D}_\alpha \cap \rho_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_\beta)$, the set of states in the domain of attraction of \mathcal{O}_α that can be steered into the domain of attraction of \mathcal{O}_β in one step under the control law $\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$.

Theorem 1: (Serial composition of stable walking motions) Assume that α and β are regular parameters of output (4) and that $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$ defined by (12) and (13) is also regular. Suppose furthermore that

1. $\Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha) \subset Z_\alpha$ and $\Delta(S \cap Z_\beta) \subset Z_\beta$;
2. there exist exponentially stable, periodic orbits \mathcal{O}_α and \mathcal{O}_β in Z_α and Z_β , respectively, so that the domains of attraction $\mathcal{D}_\alpha \subset S \cap Z_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{D}_\beta \subset S \cap Z_\beta$ of the associated restricted Poincaré maps are non-empty and open.

Then the set of states in \mathcal{D}_α that can be steered into \mathcal{D}_β in one step under any control law $\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ satisfying assumptions CH2–CH5 of Section IV.C of [8] is equal to $\mathcal{D}_\alpha \cap \rho_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_\beta)$. \square

Proof: This follows directly from the definition of $\rho_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$. \blacksquare

An example is given in Section V.

IV. EVENT-BASED PI CONTROL OF THE AVERAGE WALKING RATE

The previous section demonstrated how to achieve walking at several *discrete* walking rates through a switching law and a one-step transition controller. The goal here is to design an event-based controller⁵ that adjusts the parameters in the output (4) to achieve walking at a *continuum* of rates. The controller design is based, once again, on the hybrid zero dynamics.

Let α be a regular parameter value of output (4) for which there exists an exponentially stable periodic orbit. Let z_α^* be the corresponding fixed point of the restricted Poincaré map, $\rho_\alpha : S \cap Z_\alpha \rightarrow S \cap Z_\alpha$. To emphasize the dependence on the parameter value, for $z \in S \cap Z_\alpha$, let $\rho(z, \alpha) := \rho_\alpha(z)$.

Suppose there exists at least one pair of indices (k, i) such that $\partial \bar{v} \circ \rho(z_\alpha^*, \alpha) / \partial \alpha_k^i \neq 0$, with $2 \leq k \leq M - 2$. Then there exists $\delta\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1) \times (M+1)}$ such that

$$(\delta\alpha)_0 = (\delta\alpha)_1 = (\delta\alpha)_{M-1} = (\delta\alpha)_M = 0 \quad (15)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^M \delta\alpha_k^i \frac{\partial \bar{v} \circ \rho(z_\alpha^*, \alpha)}{\partial \alpha_k^i} \neq 0. \quad (16)$$

For $w \in \mathbb{R}$ sufficiently small in magnitude, $\alpha + w\delta\alpha$ is also regular. From (15)

$$\begin{aligned} S \cap Z_{\alpha+w\delta\alpha} &= S \cap Z_\alpha \\ \Delta(S \cap Z_{\alpha+w\delta\alpha}) &= \Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Thus, $\rho_{\alpha+w\delta\alpha} : S \cap Z_\alpha \rightarrow S \cap Z_\alpha$, and the following dynamic system can be defined,

$$\begin{aligned} z(k+1) &= \rho(z(k), \alpha + w(k)\delta\alpha) \\ \eta(k) &= \bar{v}(z(k)), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

⁵That is, one that acts step-to-step with updates occurring at impacts.

with one-dimensional state space $S \cap Z_\alpha$, input $w \in \mathbb{R}$ and output equal to average walking rate, $\eta = \bar{v} \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, the equilibrium point z_α^* for $w = 0$ is exponentially stable since the periodic orbit is exponentially stable, while the condition (16) implies that the linearization of the system (18) about the equilibrium has a well-defined relative degree equal to one. Therefore, by standard arguments, the following holds:

Theorem 2: (Event-based PI control of average walking rate) Let α be a regular parameter value for which there exists an exponentially stable periodic orbit in Z_α . Assume there exists $\delta\alpha$ satisfying (15) and (16). Then average walking rate can be regulated via PI control. In particular, there exist $\epsilon > 0$, and scalars K_p and K_I such that for all η^* such that $|\eta^* - \bar{v}(z_\alpha^*)| < \epsilon$, the system with proportional plus integral control

$$\begin{aligned} z(k+1) &= \rho(z(k), \alpha + w(k)\delta\alpha) \\ \eta(k) &= \bar{v}(z(k)) \\ e(k+1) &= e(k) + (\eta^* - \eta(k)) \\ w(k) &= K_p(\eta^* - \eta(k)) + K_I e(k) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

has an exponentially stable equilibrium, and thus, when initialized sufficiently near the equilibrium, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\eta^* - \eta(k)) = 0$. \square

The above controller is realized on the full-hybrid model as follows:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= f(x) + g(x)\Gamma_{\alpha+w\delta\alpha} \\ \dot{e} &= 0 \\ \dot{w} &= 0 \end{aligned} \right\} x^- \notin S \quad (20)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} x^+ &= \Delta(x^-) \\ e^+ &= e^- + (\eta^* - \bar{v}(x^-)) \\ w^+ &= K_p(\eta^* - \bar{v}(x^-)) + K_I e^- \end{aligned} \right\} x^- \in S$$

V. EXAMPLE: STARTING AND ENDING FROM A STANDING POSITION

Sections III and IV demonstrated a means to achieve walking at several discrete walking rates and at a continuum of rates. This section summarizes the application of these techniques to the five-link model studied in [4, 6, 8] (see Figure 1) and gives a simple technique for starting and another for stopping the robot from a standing position. For reasons of space the details of the model are omitted and the reader is referred to [8]. This example will illustrate the following: the robot will start from a standing position, increase in walking rate to approximately 0.8 m/s, and then slow to a stop.

Initiating walking from a stable standing position — defined as a configuration where $\dot{q} = 0$, both leg ends are on the ground, and where the projection of the robot's center of mass is between the end of the legs — was accomplished by moving the projection of the robot's center of mass in front of what will become the stance leg — thus moving the robot to an unstable standing position — while not violating the no-slip condition for that leg. This task can be accomplished using traditional control techniques as the system is fully actuated (in fact, it is over actuated). To that end, simple, hand-crafted joint trajectories that move the torso and hips forward were tracked at each joint. When the ground reaction forces became zero on

what will become the swing leg, the control was switched from joint trajectory tracking to a transition controller of the kind designed in Section III. The transition controller steers the robot from the unstable standing position to the domain of attraction of an exponentially stable controller.

During the application of each exponentially stable controller, event-based PI control was applied to hasten convergence to the desired walking rate. The transition from one exponentially stable controller to another was done with a transition controller designed according to (12) and (13).

To transition from walking to a stable standing position, event-based PI control was used on a controller with a slow average walking rate, 0.25 m/s , with a set-point of $\eta^* = 0$. Using this technique slowed the robot until it did not have enough energy to make a step, thus stopping the robot⁶.

Table I lists which controllers were applied during which steps. Note that (i) in both Tables I and II, the step-initiation controller (based on tracking) that was applied just prior to the first transition controller is not listed; (ii) in Table II, the exponentially stable controllers are identified by their average walking rate fixed points in m/s ; and (iii) the event-based PI control was only used during the application of exponentially stable controllers and not during the application of transition controllers. Adding event-based PI control increased the rate of convergence to the respective controller's fixed point while preserving exponential stability. This idea is similar to that presented in [2], but is more general in its approach.

The left half of Table I lists the transition controllers that were applied while the right half lists the exponentially stable controllers and the desired fixed points, η^* 's, used for the PI control. In each application of PI control, the gains were chosen to be $K_p = -1.7$ and $K_I = 1$. Finite differences were used to compute $\partial \bar{v} \circ \rho(z_\alpha^*, \alpha) / \partial \alpha_k^i$ for several values of i and k . In this way, it was determined that adjusting the angle of the swing leg femur during mid-step would have a sufficiently strong effect on the average walking speed (this corresponded to $i = 2$ and $k = 3$). Hence, $\delta \alpha$ was chosen to be all zeros with the exception of $\delta \alpha_3^2$ which was set to 1. Each exponentially stable controller was initialized with e^- of (20) set to zero (i.e., $e^- = 0$ on steps 2, 5, 18, etc.).

Table II lists the time to impact (step duration), T_I , for each step and average velocity, \bar{v} , for each step. The robot begins in an unstable standing position at the start of step one; increases in average walking rate to a maximum of approximately 0.8 m/s on the sixteenth step; and then is slowed to a stop on the thirtieth step, where the robot begins to step forward but then rocks backward to a stop. The peak torque for this example is 63 Nm , less than half of the 150 Nm that is possible with the motors and gearing of the robot studied in [4,6,8]. Figure 3 gives the commanded versus actual average walking rate. For an animation of this example as well as additional supporting plots, see [1].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by NSF grants INT-9980227 and IIS-9988695. The authors wish to thank Daniel Koditschek for insightful conversations regarding control via parameter adjustment.

REFERENCES

- [1] <http://www.eecs.umich.edu/~grizzle/papers/robotics.html>.
- [2] Y. Aoustin and A. Formal'sky. Design of reference trajectory to stabilize desired nominal cyclic gait of a biped. In *Proc. of the First Workshop on Robot Motion and Control, Kiekrz, Poland*, pages 159–164, June 1999.
- [3] R. Burridge, Rizzi A., and D. Koditschek. Sequential composition of dynamically dexterous robot behaviors. *International Journal of Robotics Research*, 18(6):534–555, June 1999.
- [4] C. Chevallereau and Y. Aoustin. Optimal reference trajectories for walking and running of a biped robot. *Robotica*, 19(5):557–569, September 2001.
- [5] A. Isidori. *Nonlinear Control Systems: An Introduction*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 1995.
- [6] F. Plestan, J.W. Grizzle, E.R. Westervelt, and G. Abba. Stable walking of a 7-dof biped robot. In *Accepted for publication in IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, February 2001.
- [7] E. Westervelt and J. Grizzle. Design of asymptotically stable walking for a 5-link planar biped walker via optimization. In *ICRA 2002, Washington D.C.*, May 2002.
- [8] E. Westervelt, J. Grizzle, and D. Koditschek. Hybrid zero dynamics of planar biped walkers. *Accepted for publication in IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2002. See [1] for a preprint.
- [9] E. Westervelt, J. Grizzle, and D. Koditschek. Zero dynamics of underactuated planar biped walkers. In *IFAC 2002, Barcelona, Spain*, July 2002.

APPENDIX

I. TABLES AND FIGURES




Fig. 1. Schematic of five-link model studied.

⁶In fact, due to rigid impacts, the robot will continue to rock back and forth, alternating impacts with each leg, and decreasing the robot's kinetic energy with each impact.

Step num.	Transition Controller	Step nums.	Controller	η^* (m/s)
1	S.P. \rightarrow 0.45	2-3	0.45	0.45
4	0.45 \rightarrow 0.75	5-16	0.75	0.8
17	0.75 \rightarrow 0.55	18-21	0.55	0.55
22	0.55 \rightarrow 0.35	23-26	0.35	0.35
27	0.35 \rightarrow 0.25	28	0.25	0.00

TABLE I

APPLIED CONTROL (NOTES: S.P. IS STANDING POSITION, AND $A \rightarrow B$ INDICATES A TRANSITION CONTROLLER FROM A CONTROLLER AT AVERAGE WALKING RATE A TO AVERAGE WALKING RATE B).

Step num.	T_I (s)	\bar{v} (m/s)	Step num.	T_I (s)	\bar{v} (m/s)
1	0.619	0.516	16	0.486	0.801
2	1.199	0.266	17	0.441	0.775
3	0.875	0.365	18	0.478	0.715
4	0.915	0.425	19	0.520	0.657
5	0.692	0.562	20	0.569	0.600
6	0.594	0.655	21	0.609	0.561
7	0.535	0.727	22	0.528	0.499
8	0.510	0.763	23	0.535	0.492
9	0.498	0.781	24	0.584	0.450
10	0.492	0.791	25	0.656	0.401
11	0.489	0.796	26	0.726	0.362
12	0.487	0.798	27	0.659	0.318
13	0.486	0.800	28	0.642	0.327
14	0.486	0.800	29	0.690	0.272
15	0.486	0.801	30	0.875	0.000

TABLE II

EXAMPLE COMPOSITION STEP STATISTICS: STARTING FROM A STANDING POSITION, INCREASING AVERAGE WALKING RATE, \bar{v} , TO 0.8 m/s, THEN DECREASING \bar{v} TO 0 m/s, A STOP.




Fig. 2. Abstraction of the composition of two controllers Γ_α and Γ_β via transition controller $\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$. Under the action of Γ_α the dynamics evolve on Z_α . Switching to $\Gamma_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ when the state enters $\Delta(S \cap Z_\alpha)$ causes the dynamics to evolve along $Z_{(\alpha \rightarrow \beta)}$ to $S \cap Z_\beta$. Switching to Γ_β when the state enters $S \cap Z_\beta$ causes the dynamics to evolve on Z_β .




Fig. 3. Command (dashed) versus actual (solid) average walking rate (Note: the sloped portions of the command curve correspond to transition controllers, and average walking rate is computed at the end of each step).