

Diagnosi Automatica Dei Guasti



“FAULT DIAGNOSIS OF DYNAMIC SYSTEMS USING MODEL-BASED AND FILTERING APPROACHES”

Silvio Simani
January 2009

21/01/2009

1

2


Diagnosi Automatica dei Guasti by Silvio Simani



Annual Meetings on FDI

- IFAC SAFEPROCESS Symposium
- *Symposium on Fault Detection Supervision and Safety for Technical Processes*
 - 1st held in Baden–Baden, Germany in 1991
 - 2nd in Espo, Finland in 1994
 - 3rd at Hull, UK in 1997
 - 4th held in Budapest, Hungary in 2000
 - 5th at Washington DC in July 2003
 - 6th in Beijing, P.R. China, August 2006
 - 7th scheduled in Barcelona, Spain in 2009

21/01/2009



Nomenclature

1. *States and Signals*

Fault

An unpermitted deviation of at least one characteristic property or parameter of the system from the acceptable, usual or standard condition.

Failure

A permanent interruption of a system's ability to perform a required function under specified operating conditions.

Malfunction

An intermittent irregularity in the fulfilment of a system's desired function.

Error

A deviation between a measured or computed value of an output variable and its true or theoretically correct one.

21/01/2009



Nomenclature (cont'd)

1. *States and Signals*

Disturbance

An unknown and uncontrolled input acting on a system.


Residual

A fault indicator, based on a deviation between measurements and model-equation-based computations.

Symptom

A change of an observable quantity from normal behaviour.

21/01/2009



Nomenclature (Cont'd)

2. Functions

Fault detection

Determination of faults present in a system and the time of detection.

Fault isolation

Determination of the kind, location and time of detection of a fault. Follows fault detection.

Fault identification

Determination of the size and time-variant behaviour of a fault. Follows fault isolation.

Fault diagnosis

Determination of the kind, size, location and time of detection of a fault. Follows fault detection. Includes fault detection and identification.

Monitoring

A continuous real-time task of determining the conditions of a physical system, by recording information, recognising and indication anomalies in the behaviour.

Supervision

Monitoring a physical and taking appropriate actions to maintain the operation in the case of fault.

21/01/2009



Nomenclature (Cont'd)

3. Models

Quantitative model

Use of static and dynamic relations among system variables and parameters in order to describe a system's behaviour in quantitative mathematical terms.

Qualitative model

Use of static and dynamic relations among system variables in order to describe a system's behaviour in qualitative terms such as causalities and IF-THEN rules.


Diagnostic model

A set of static or dynamic relations which link specific input variables, the *symptoms*, to specific output variables, the faults.

Analytical redundancy

Use of more (not necessarily identical) ways to determine a variable, where one way uses a mathematical process model in analytical form.

21/01/2009



Nomenclature (Cont'd)

Reliability

Ability of a system to perform a required function under stated conditions, within a given scope, during a given period of time.

Safety

Ability of a system not to cause danger to persons or equipment or the environment.

Availability

Probability that a system or equipment will operate satisfactorily and effectively at any point of time.

21/01/2009



Nomenclature (Cont'd)

5. *Time dependency of faults*

Abrupt fault

Fault modelled as stepwise function. It represents bias in the monitored signal.

Incipient fault

Fault modelled by using ramp signals. It represents drift of the monitored signal.

Intermittent fault

Combination of impulses with different amplitudes.

NOTE: Incipient fault = hard to detect !!!

21/01/2009



Nomenclature (Cont'd)

6. *Fault terminology*

Additive fault

Influences a variable by an addition of the fault itself. They may represent, *e.g.*, offsets of sensors.

Multiplicative fault

Are represented by the product of a variable with the fault itself. They can appear as parameter changes within a process.

21/01/2009




Application Examples

- Simulated case studies
- Identification/FDI applications
- Real processes
- Research works
- Undergraduate theses topics

21/01/2009

Simulated Application Examples (Cont'd)

Simulated Gas Turbine



$u_1(t)$, Inlet Guide Vane (IGV) angular position (α);

$u_2(t)$, fuel mass flow rate (M_f).

$y_1(t)$, pressure at the compressor inlet (p_{ic});

$y_2(t)$, pressure at the compressor outlet (p_{oc});

$y_3(t)$, pressure at the turbine outlet (p_{ot});

$y_4(t)$, temperature at the compressor outlet (T_{oc});

$y_5(t)$, temperature at the turbine outlet (T_{ot});

$y_6(t)$, electrical power at the generator terminal (P_e).

21/01/2009

Simulated Application Examples (Cont'd)

Simulated Gas Turbine (SIMULINK®)




Figure 5.7: SIMULINK block diagram of the process.


Gas turbine main cycle parameters (ISO design conditions).

Air mass flow rate [kg/s]	24.4
Cycle pressure ratio (P_{oc}/P_{ic})	9.1
Electrical power (P_e) [kW]	5220
Exhaust temperature (T_{ot}) [K]	796
Fuel mass flow rate (M_f) [kg/s]	0.388
IGV angle range ($\Delta\alpha$) [deg]	17

21/01/2009

Simulated Application Examples (Cont'd)

Simulated Power Plant: *Pont sur Sambre*




1. super heater (radiation);
2. super heater (convection);
3. super heater;
4. reheater;
5. dampers;
6. condenser;
7. drum;
8. water pump;
9. burner.

21/01/2009

Simulated Application Examples (Cont'd)

Simulated Power Plant: *Pont sur Sambre*



$u_1(t)$	C_b	gas flow
$u_2(t)$	O_s	turbine valves opening
$u_3(t)$	Q_d	super heater spray flow
$u_4(t)$	R_y	gas dampers
$u_4(t)$	Q_a	air flow
$y_1(t)$	P_v	steam pressure
$y_2(t)$	T_s	main steam temperature
$y_i(t)$	T_{rs}	reheat steam temperature

21/01/2009

Simulated Application Examples (Cont'd)

Small Aircraft Model

Table 1: Nomenclature

V	True Air Speed (TAS)	H	altitude
α	angle of attack	δ_e	elevator deflection angle
β	angle of sideslip	δ_a	aileron deflection angle
P	roll rate	δ_r	rudder deflection angle
Q	pitch rate	δ_{th}	throttle aperture percentage
R	yaw rate	γ	flight path angle
ϕ	bank angle	g	acceleration of gravity
θ	elevation angle	m	airplane mass
ψ	heading angle	I_x, I_y, I_z	principal-axis inertia moments
n	engine shaft angular rate	d_t	distance of c.g. from the Thrust line



21/01/2009

Simulated Application Examples (Cont'd)

6.1 SATELLITE OVERVIEW




Figure 6-1: Satellite dimensions

6.4 SOLAR ARRAYS DYNAMICS

A GLOBALSTAR solar array has been selected. Its dimensions are recalled on the Figure 6-2.




Figure 6-2: MARS-EXPRESS solar array

Simple SA model

Aerospace Satellite

21/01/2009

Simulated Application Examples (Cont'd)

Aerospace Satellite




Figure 6-3 : Thrusters implementation





Fig. 1: Mars Express spacecraft (MEX) (www.esa.int)

21/01/2009


Simulated Application Examples (Cont'd)

Manufacturing Process



21/01/2009

Simulated Application Examples (Cont'd)



21/01/2009

Introduction




Figure 1.1: Comparison between hardware and analytical redundancy schemes.

21/01/2009

Introduction (Cont'd)




Figure 1.2: Scheme for the model-based fault detection.

21/01/2009

Introduction (Cont'd)

■ Model-Based FDI Methods:

1. Output observers (OO, estimators, filters);
2. Parity equations;
3. Identification and parameter estimation.

21/01/2009



Introduction (Cont'd)

■ Signal Model-Based Methods:

1. Bandpass filters;
2. Spectral analysis (FFT);
3. Maximum-entropy estimation.

■ Change Detection: Residual Analysis

1. Mean and variance estimation;
2. Likelihood-ratio test, Bayes decision;
3. Run-sum test.

21/01/2009



Introduction (Cont'd)

■ Model Uncertainty and FDI

- Model-reality mismatch
- Sensitivity problem: incipient faults!

■ Robustness in FDI

- Disturbance, modelling errors, uncertainty
- UIO and Kalman filter: robust residual generation

■ System Identification for FDI

- Estimation of a reliable model
- Modelling accuracy
- Disturbance estimation (recall: ARX, ARMAX, BJ)

21/01/2009

Introduction (Cont'd)

■ Fault Identification Methods

■ Fault nature (type, shape) & size (amplitude)

1. Geometrical distance and probabilistic methods;
2. Artificial neural networks;
3. Fuzzy clustering.

■ Approximate Reasoning Methods:

1. Probabilistic reasoning;
2. Possibilistic reasoning with fuzzy logic;
3. Reasoning with artificial neural networks.

21/01/2009

Introduction (Cont'd)

■ FDI applications status & review

Table 1.1: FDI applications and number of contributions.

Application	Number of contributions
Simulation of real processes	55
Large-scale pilot processes	44
Small-scale laboratory processes	18
Full-scale industrial processes	48

Table 1.2: Fault type and number of contributions.

Fault type	Number of contributions
Sensor faults	69
Actuator faults	51
Process faults	83
Control loop or controller faults	8

21/01/2009

Introduction (Cont'd)

■ FDI applications status & review

Table 1.3: FDI methods and number of contributions.

Method type	Number of contributions
Observer	53
Parity space	14
Parameter estimation	51
Frequency spectral analysis	7
Neural networks	9

Table 1.4: Residual evaluation methods and number of contributions.

Evaluation method	Number of contributions
Neural networks	19
Fuzzy logic	5
Bayes classification	4
Hypothesis testing	8

21/01/2009

Introduction (Cont'd)

■ FDI applications status & review

Table 1.5: Reasoning strategies and number of contributions.

Reasoning strategy	Number of contributions
Rule based	10
Sign directed graph	3
Fault symptom tree	2
Fuzzy logic	6

Table 1.6: Applications of model-based fault detection.

FDD	Number of contributions
Milling and grinding processes	41
Power plants and thermal processes	46
Fluid dynamic processes	17
Combustion engine and turbines	36
Automotive	8
Inverted pendulum	33
Miscellaneous	42
DC motors	61
Stirred tank reactor	27
Navigation system	25
Nuclear process	10

21/01/2009

Model-based FDI Techniques




Figure 2.1: Structure of model-based FDI system.

21/01/2009

Model-based FDI Techniques (Cont'd)

1. **Residual generation:** this block generates residual signals using available inputs and outputs from the monitored system. This residual (or fault symptom) should indicate that a fault has occurred. It should normally be zero or close to zero under no fault condition, whilst distinguishably different from zero when a fault occurs. This means that the residual is characteristically independent of process inputs and outputs, in ideal conditions. Referring to Figure 2.1, this block is called *residual generation*.
2. **Residual evaluation:** This block examines residuals for the likelihood of faults and a decision rule is then applied to determine if any faults have occurred. The *residual evaluation* block, shown in Figure 2.1, may perform a simple threshold test (geometrical methods) on the instantaneous values or moving averages of the residuals. On the other hand, it may consist of statistical methods, *e.g.*, generalised likelihood ratio testing or sequential probability ratio testing [Isermann, 1997, Willsky, 1976, Basseville, 1988, Patton et al., 2000].

21/01/2009

Model-based FDI Techniques (Cont'd)

➤ Modelling of Faulty Systems




Figure 2.2: Fault diagnosis in a closed-loop system.

21/01/2009

Model-based FDI Techniques (Cont'd)




Figure 2.3: The rearranged fault diagnosis scheme.

21/01/2009

Model-based FDI Techniques (Cont'd)




Figure 2.4: The controlled system and fault topology.

21/01/2009

Model-based FDI Techniques (Cont'd)

Fault Location:

- Actuators
- Process or system components
- Input sensors
- Output sensors
- Controllers




Figure 2.4: The controlled system and fault topology.

21/01/2009

Model-based FDI Techniques (Cont'd)

Fault and System Modelling




Figure 2.5: The monitored system and fault topology.

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}^*(t) \\ \mathbf{y}^*(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) \end{cases}$$

21/01/2009

Model-based FDI Techniques (Cont'd)

Fault and System Modelling




Figure 2.5: The monitored system and fault topology.

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}^*(t) \\ \mathbf{y}^*(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{x}(t+1) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}^*(t) + \mathbf{f}_c(t)$$

$$\mathbf{f}_c(t) = \mathbf{I}_i \Delta a_{ij} x_j(t)$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u}(t) &= \mathbf{u}^*(t) + \mathbf{f}_u(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{y}^*(t) + \mathbf{f}_y(t) \end{cases}$$

21/01/2009

Model-based FDI Techniques (Cont'd)

Fault and System Modelling




Figure 2.6: The structure of the plant sensors.


$$\begin{cases} u(t) &= u^*(t) + \tilde{u}(t) \\ y(t) &= y^*(t) + \tilde{y}(t) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} u(t) &= u^*(t) + \tilde{u}(t) + f_u(t) \\ y(t) &= y^*(t) + \tilde{y}(t) + f_y(t) \end{cases}$$

21/01/2009

Model-based FDI Techniques (Cont'd)

Fault and System Modelling




$$u^*(t) = u_R(t) + f_a(t)$$

$$\begin{cases} x(t+1) &= Ax(t) + f_c(t) + Bu^*(t) \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) + f_y(t) \\ u(t) &= u^*(t) + f_u(t) \end{cases}$$

21/01/2009

Model-based FDI Techniques (Cont'd)




■ Modelling of Faulty Systems

Figure 2.7: Fault topology with actuator input signal measurement.


$$\mathbf{f}(t) = [\mathbf{f}_a^T, \mathbf{f}_u^T, \mathbf{f}_c^T, \mathbf{f}_y^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^k \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{f}_c(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{f}_a(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}^*(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{f}_y(t) \\ \mathbf{u}(t) &= \mathbf{u}^*(t) + \mathbf{f}_u(t) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}^*(t) + \mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{f}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{L}_2\mathbf{f}(t) \\ \mathbf{u}(t) &= \mathbf{u}^*(t) + \mathbf{L}_3\mathbf{f}(t) \end{cases}$$



21/01/2009

Model-based FDI Techniques (Cont'd)



■ Modelling of Faulty Systems

Figure 2.7: Fault topology with actuator input signal measurement.

$$\mathbf{y}(z) = \mathbf{G}_{yu^*}(z)\mathbf{u}^*(z) + \mathbf{G}_{yf}(z)\mathbf{f}(z)$$

■ Transfer function description:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{G}_{yu^*}(z) &= \mathbf{C}(z\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{G}_{yf}(z) &= \mathbf{C}(z\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{L}_1 + \mathbf{L}_2 \end{cases}$$

21/01/2009

Residual Generator Structure





Figure 2.8: Residual generator general structure.

Under fault-free assumptions, the residual signal $r(t)$ is “almost zero”

21/01/2009

Residual General Structure (Cont'd)



Residual generation via system simulator


$$r(t) = z(t) - y(t)$$

$z(t)$ is the simulated plant output

Figure 2.9: Residual generation via system simulator.

21/01/2009

Residual General Structure (Cont'd)



$$y(z) = G_{yu^*}(z)u^*(z) + G_{yf}(z)f(z)$$

Residual generator:

$$r(z) = \begin{bmatrix} H_{u^*}(z) & H_y(z) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u^*(z) \\ y(z) \end{bmatrix} =$$

$$= H_{u^*}(z)u^*(z) + H_y(z)y(z)$$

$$r(t) = 0 \text{ if and only if } f(t) = 0$$

Constraint conditions: *design*

$$H_{u^*}(z) + H_y(z)G_{yu^*} = 0$$

Figure 2.10: Residual generator general structure.
21/01/2009


General Residual Evaluation

$$\begin{cases} J(r(t)) \leq \varepsilon(t) & \text{for } f(t) = 0 \\ J(r(t)) > \varepsilon(t) & \text{for } f(t) \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

Detection thresholds
 $\varepsilon(t)$


Faulty residual

Fault free residual




General Residual Evaluation *(example)*

Detection thresholds



Fault free residual



Fault-free & **faulty** residuals

21/01/2009

Residual Generation Techniques

□ Fault detection via parameter estimation


➤ Observer-based approaches

✓ Parity (vector) relations

21/01/2009

Residual General Structure

■ Observer-based approach



Output estimation approach!

21/01/2009

Residual Generator Structure

Plant model

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t+1) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t). \end{cases}$$

Observer model

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t+1) = \mathbf{A}\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{e}(t) \\ \mathbf{e}(t) = \mathbf{y}(t) - \mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t). \end{cases}$$

State estimation model

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{e}_x(t) = \mathbf{x}(t) - \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) \\ \mathbf{e}_x(t+1) = (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{C})\mathbf{e}_x(t). \end{cases}$$

State estimation property

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{e}_x(t) = 0 \quad (\text{fault-free case!!!})$$

21/01/2009

Residual Generator Property

+ disturbance signals and fault




Figure 2.14: MIMO process with faults and noises.

21/01/2009

Residual Generator Property (Cont'd)

+ fault signals

System model

$$\begin{cases} x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + Qv(t) + L_1f(t) \\ y(t) = Cx(t) + Rw(t) + L_2f(t) \end{cases}$$

Observer model

$$e_x(t+1) = (A - HC)e_x(t) + L_1f(t) - HL_2f(t)$$

**Output estimation error
with faults *but noise-free***

$$e(t) = Ce_x(t) + L_2f(t).$$

Both $e(t)$ and $e_x(t)$ are suitable residuals!

21/01/2009

Output Observer & UIO: *intro*




Figure 2.15: Process and output observer.


$$\mathbf{e}_x(t) = \hat{\mathbf{z}}(t) - \mathbf{z}(t) = \hat{\mathbf{z}}(t) - \mathbf{T}\mathbf{x}(t)$$

21/01/2009

General Residual Evaluation

$$\begin{cases} J(\mathbf{r}(t)) \leq \varepsilon(t) & \text{for } \mathbf{f}(t) = \mathbf{0} \\ J(\mathbf{r}(t)) > \varepsilon(t) & \text{for } \mathbf{f}(t) \neq \mathbf{0} \end{cases}$$

Detection thresholds
 $\varepsilon(t)$



21/01/2009

Change Detection & Residual Evaluation

$$\begin{cases} J(\mathbf{r}(t)) \leq \varepsilon(t) & \text{for } \mathbf{f}(t) = \mathbf{0} \\ J(\mathbf{r}(t)) > \varepsilon(t) & \text{for } \mathbf{f}(t) \neq \mathbf{0} \end{cases}$$

$$J(\mathbf{r}(t)) \equiv |\mathbf{r}(t)|$$

Detection thresholds
 $\varepsilon(t)$


$$\bar{r}_i = E\{r_i(t)\}; \quad \bar{\sigma}_i^2 = E\{[r_i(t) - \bar{r}_i]^2\}$$

$$\varepsilon(t) = \bar{r}_i \pm \delta \times \bar{\sigma}_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, m)$$

with $\delta \geq 3$

Faulty residual

Fault free residual



21/01/2009

Residual Generation

✓ Output Observers

➤ Unknown Input Observers

✓ Fault Detection

➤ Fault Isolation, *i.e. where is the fault?*

21/01/2009

Output Observer

Process model with faults

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{f}_c(t)) + \mathbf{f}_s(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t), \end{aligned}$$


Input-output sensor faults

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}(t) &= \mathbf{f}_u(t) + \mathbf{u}^*(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{f}_y(t) + \mathbf{y}^*(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

Observer for the i-th output $y_i(t)$

$$\mathbf{x}^i(t+1) = \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}^i(t) + \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{K}_i (y_i(t) - \mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{x}^i(t))$$

$(\mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{B}_i, \mathbf{C}_i)$ is the state-space process model



21/01/2009

Output Observer for *Fault Detection*

Given the observer model

$$\mathbf{x}^i(t+1) = \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}^i(t) + \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{K}_i (y_i(t) - \mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{x}^i(t))$$

Under fault-free assumptions

$$r_i(t) = y_i^*(t) - \hat{y}_i(t) = \mathbf{C}_i (\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}^i(t)) \text{ is equal to zero.}$$

Fault detection logic

fixed threshold ϵ ,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}(t) &\leq \epsilon && \text{for } \mathbf{f}(t) = \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{r}(t) &> \epsilon && \text{for } \mathbf{f}(t) \neq \mathbf{0} \end{aligned} \right\}$$

$\mathbf{f}(t)$ being a generic failure vector.

21/01/2009

Output Observer for *Fault Isolation*

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{f}_u(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{f}_y(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

Process model


$$\mathbf{x}^i(t+1) = \mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{x}^i(t) + \mathbf{B}_i\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{K}_i(y_i(t) - \mathbf{C}_i\mathbf{x}^i(t))$$

$$r_i(t) = y_i^*(t) - \hat{y}_i(t) = \mathbf{C}_i(\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}^i(t))$$

$$y_i(t) = y_i^*(t) + f(t)$$

21/01/2009

Bank of output observers



Output Observer for *Fault Isolation* (Cont'd)

$$\mathbf{x}^i(t+1) = \mathbf{A}_i\mathbf{x}^i(t) + \mathbf{B}_i\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{K}_i(y_i(t) - \mathbf{C}_i\mathbf{x}^i(t))$$

$$r_i(t) = y_i^*(t) - \hat{y}_i(t) = \mathbf{C}_i(\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}^i(t))$$

Fault-free case:


$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} r_i(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (y_i(t) - \mathbf{C}_i\mathbf{x}^i(t)) = 0$$

Faulty case

$$y_i(t) = y_i^*(t) + f(t)$$

21/01/2009

Bank of output observers



Output Observer for *Fault Isolation* (Cont'd)

Table 4.1: Fault signatures.

	u_1	u_2	$\dots$	u_r	y_1	y_2	$\dots$	y_m
r_{O_1}	1	1	$\dots$	1	1	0	$\dots$	0
r_{O_2}	1	1	$\dots$	1	0	1	$\dots$	0
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
r_{O_m}	1	1	$\dots$	1	0	0	$\dots$	1

$$\mathbf{x}^i(t+1) = \mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}^i(t) + \mathbf{B}_i \mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{K}_i (y_i(t) - \mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{x}^i(t))$$

Fault-free case:


$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} r_i(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (y_i(t) - \mathbf{C}_i^i \mathbf{x}^i(t)) = 0$$

Faulty case

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} r_i(t) \neq 0$$


$$y_i(t) = y_i^*(t) + f(t)$$

Bank of output observers



21/01/2009

Unknow Input Observer (UIO)



Definition: An observer is defined as an **Unknown Input Observer** for the system with disturbance (above), if its state estimation error vector $e_x(t)$ approaches zero asymptotically, regardless of the presence of the unknown input term in the system.

UIO Model

Given:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{d}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

The full-order UIO has the following mathematical form

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}(t+1) &= \mathbf{F}\mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{T}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y}(t) \\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= \mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{y}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

where $\mathbf{z}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state of the UIO, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ the estimated state vector $\mathbf{x}(t)$, whilst $\mathbf{F}$, $\mathbf{T}$, $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{K}$ are matrices to be designed to achieve the unknown input de-coupling.

21/01/2009

UIO Structure

Plant Model

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{d}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

UIO Model

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}(t+1) &= \mathbf{F}\mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{T}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y}(t) \\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= \mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{y}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

Observer Design???





Figure 4.3: The UIO structure.

21/01/2009



UIO Design

$$\left. \begin{aligned} x(t+1) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t) + Ed(t) \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \text{Plant Model}$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} z(t+1) &= Fz(t) + TBu(t) + Ky(t) \\ \hat{x}(t) &= z(t) + Hy(t) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \text{UIO Model}$$

$$e_x(t+1) = x(t+1) - \hat{x}(t+1) \quad \text{State estimation error}$$

$$\begin{aligned} e_x(t+1) &= [A - HCA - K_1C]e_x(t) + [F - (A - HCA - K_1C)]z(t) \\ &+ [K_2 - (A - HCA - K_1C)]y(t) \\ &+ [T - (I - HC)]Bu(t) + (HC - I)Ed(t) \end{aligned}$$

21/01/2009



UIO Design (Cont'd)

$$\begin{aligned} e_x(t+1) &= [A - HCA - K_1C]e_x(t) + [F - (A - HCA - K_1C)]z(t) \\ &+ [K_2 - (A - HCA - K_1C)]y(t) \\ &+ [T - (I - HC)]Bu(t) + (HC - I)Ed(t) \end{aligned}$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} z(t+1) &= Fz(t) + TBu(t) + Ky(t) \\ \hat{x}(t) &= z(t) + Hy(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (HC - I)E &= 0 \\ I - HC &= T \\ A - HCA - K_1C &= F \\ FH &= K_2 \end{aligned}$$

the state estimation error will then be:

$$e_x(t+1) = Fe_x(t).$$

21/01/2009

UIO Design (Cont'd)

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{d}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}(t+1) &= \mathbf{F}\mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{T}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y}(t) \\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= \mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{y}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{H}\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{E} &= \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{C} &= \mathbf{T} \\ \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{K}_1\mathbf{C} &= \mathbf{F} \\ \mathbf{F}\mathbf{H} &= \mathbf{K}_2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{e}_x(t+1) = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{e}_x(t).$$

This means that, if all the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{F}$ are stable, $\mathbf{e}_x(t)$ will approach zero asymptotically, i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) \rightarrow \mathbf{x}(t)$. Hence, according to the definition of the UIO described by the model above, it is an UIO for the monitored system. The design of this UIO consists of solving the equation system and making all eigenvalues of the system matrix $\mathbf{F}$ be stable.

21/01/2009

UIO Design (Cont'd)

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{E}\mathbf{d}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad **$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}(t+1) &= \mathbf{F}\mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{T}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y}(t) \\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= \mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{y}(t) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad *$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{H}\mathbf{C} - \mathbf{I})\mathbf{E} &= \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{C} &= \mathbf{T} \\ \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{H}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{K}_1\mathbf{C} &= \mathbf{F} \\ \mathbf{F}\mathbf{H} &= \mathbf{K}_2 \end{aligned} \quad ***$$

Theorem Necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of an UIO
 * for the system defined by Equation ** are [Chen & Patton, 1999]:

1. $\text{rank}(\mathbf{C}\mathbf{E}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{E})$,
2. $(\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{C})$ is a detectable pair,

where $\mathbf{A}_1 = \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{C}\mathbf{E})^+\mathbf{C}\mathbf{A}$.

A special solution for the matrix $\mathbf{H}$ in conditions *** is given by [Chen & Patton, 1999]:

$$\mathbf{H}^* = \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{C}\mathbf{E})^+$$

where $(\cdot)^+$ is the pseudoinverse of the matrix $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{E}$.

21/01/2009

UIO for Fault (Detection) + Isolation

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{E}d(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$


General system

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}(t+1) &= \mathbf{F}\mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{T}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y}(t) \\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= \mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{y}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

UIO model

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{f}_u(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{f}_y(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

Process with input faults



Output sensors
are fault-free


21/01/2009

UIO for FDI

With reference to the devices for the FDI of the inputs, depicted in Figure 4.5, the structure of the i -th UIO ($i = 1, 2, \dots, r$) for residual generation [Chen & Patton, 1999], under the assumptions $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t) \cong \mathbf{0}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}(t) \cong \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{f}_y(t) = \mathbf{0}$, is the following

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}^i(t+1) &= (\mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{K}^i \mathbf{C})\mathbf{z}^i(t) + \mathbf{J}^i \mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{S}^i \mathbf{y}(t) \\ \mathbf{r}^i(t) &= \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{z}^i(t) + \mathbf{L}_2^i \mathbf{y}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

UIO for Residual Generation




21/01/2009

UIO for FDI (Cont'd)

UIO for Residual Generation

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}^i(t+1) &= (\mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{K}^i \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{z}^i(t) + \mathbf{J}^i \mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{S}^i \mathbf{y}(t) \\ \mathbf{r}^i(t) &= \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{z}^i(t) + \mathbf{L}_2^i \mathbf{y}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$




where $\mathbf{z}^i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the observer state vector, $\mathbf{r}^i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the residual vector and $\mathbf{F}^i$, $\mathbf{J}^i$, $\mathbf{S}^i$, $\mathbf{L}_1^i$ and $\mathbf{L}_2^i$ are matrices to be designed with appropriate dimensions. Let $\mathbf{T}^i$ be a linear transformation of the state $\mathbf{x}(t)$ of the system and define the state estimation error as $\mathbf{e}_x^i(t) = \mathbf{z}^i(t) - \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{x}(t)$.

21/01/2009

UIO for FDI (Cont'd)

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}^i(t+1) &= (\mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{K}^i \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{z}^i(t) + \mathbf{J}^i \mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{S}^i \mathbf{y}(t) \\ \mathbf{r}^i(t) &= \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{z}^i(t) + \mathbf{L}_2^i \mathbf{y}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$



define the state estimation error as $\mathbf{e}_x^i(t) = \mathbf{z}^i(t) - \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{x}(t)$. On the suppositions $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t) = \mathbf{0}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}(t) = \mathbf{0}$, and $\mathbf{f}_y(t) = \mathbf{0}$, it can be shown that the dynamics of the state estimation error become

$$\mathbf{e}_x^i(t+1) = \mathbf{F}^i \mathbf{e}_x^i(t) + (\mathbf{F}^i \mathbf{T}^i - \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{S}^i \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{x}(t) + (\mathbf{J}^i - \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{B}) \mathbf{u}(t) - \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{B} \mathbf{f}_u(t),$$

whilst the residual vector is given by

$$\mathbf{r}^i(t) = \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{e}_x^i(t) + (\mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{T}^i + \mathbf{L}_2^i \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{x}(t).$$

21/01/2009

UIO for FDI (Cont'd)

whilst the residual vector is given by

$$\mathbf{r}^i(t) = \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{e}_x^i(t) + (\mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{T}^i + \mathbf{L}_2^i \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{x}(t).$$

It can be seen that if

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}^i \mathbf{T}^i - \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{S}^i \mathbf{C} &= \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathbf{J}^i &= \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{B}, \\ \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{T}^i + \mathbf{L}_2^i \mathbf{C} &= \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned} \right\}$$

UIO for input
sensor $\mathbf{f}_u(t)$
fault isolation

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_x^i(t+1) &= \mathbf{F}^i \mathbf{e}_x^i(t) + \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{B} \mathbf{f}_u(t), \\ \mathbf{r}^i(t) &= \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{e}_i(t). \end{aligned} \right\}$$

21/01/2009

UIO for FDI (Cont'd)

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}^i(t+1) &= (\mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{K}^i \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{z}^i(t) + \mathbf{J}^i \mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{S}^i \mathbf{y}(t) \\ \mathbf{r}^i(t) &= \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{z}^i(t) + \mathbf{L}_2^i \mathbf{y}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_x^i(t+1) &= \mathbf{F}^i \mathbf{e}_x^i(t) + \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{B} \mathbf{f}_u(t), \\ \mathbf{r}^i(t) &= \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{e}_i(t). \end{aligned} \right\}$$

If the linear transformation $\mathbf{T}^i$ is chosen as [Chang & Hsu, 1995]

$$* \quad \mathbf{T}^i = \mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{B}_i (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}_i)^+ \mathbf{C} \quad (4.25)$$

where $\mathbf{B}_i$ is the i -th column of $\mathbf{B}$ matrix and $\mathbf{K}^i$ is selected such that $\mathbf{F}^i = \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{K}^i \mathbf{C}$ is asymptotically stable, then, the solutions of Equation are obtained as

$$** \quad \left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}^i &= \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{K}^i \mathbf{C}, \\ \mathbf{S}^i &= \mathbf{K}^i + \mathbf{F}^i \mathbf{B}_i (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}_i)^+, \\ \mathbf{J}^i &= \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{B}, \\ \mathbf{L}_1^i &= -\mathbf{C}, \\ \mathbf{L}_2^i &= [\mathbf{I}_m - (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}_i)(\mathbf{C} \mathbf{B}_i)^+]. \end{aligned} \right\} \left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{F}^i \mathbf{T}^i - \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{S}^i \mathbf{C} &= \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathbf{J}^i &= \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{B}, \\ \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{T}^i + \mathbf{L}_2^i \mathbf{C} &= \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned} \right\}$$


The selection of the $\mathbf{B}_i$ matrix in Equations * and ** sets to zero the i -th column of the $\mathbf{J}^i$ matrix. That is, the estimation error and then the residual of the i -th UIO become independent of the i -th system input.

21/01/2009

UIO for FDI (Cont'd)

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_x^i(t+1) &= \mathbf{F}^i \mathbf{e}_x^i(t) + \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{B} \mathbf{f}_u(t), \\ \mathbf{r}^i(t) &= \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{e}_x^i(t). \end{aligned} \right\} *$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}^i(t+1) &= (\mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{K}^i \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{z}^i(t) + \mathbf{J}^i \mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{S}^i \mathbf{y}(t) \\ \mathbf{r}^i(t) &= \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{z}^i(t) + \mathbf{L}_2^i \mathbf{y}(t) \end{aligned} \right\} **$$




The selection of the $\mathbf{B}_i$ matrix in Equations * and ** sets to zero the i -th column of the $\mathbf{J}^i$ matrix. That is, the estimation error and then the residual of the i -th UIO become independent of the i -th system input.

21/01/2009

UIO for FDI (Cont'd)

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_x^i(t+1) &= \mathbf{F}^i \mathbf{e}_x^i(t) + \mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{B} \mathbf{f}_u(t), \\ \mathbf{r}^i(t) &= \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{e}_x^i(t). \end{aligned} \right\}$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}^i(t+1) &= (\mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{K}^i \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{z}^i(t) + \mathbf{J}^i \mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{S}^i \mathbf{y}(t) \\ \mathbf{r}^i(t) &= \mathbf{L}_1^i \mathbf{z}^i(t) + \mathbf{L}_2^i \mathbf{y}(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$




Under the hypothesis of observability of the system Σ and in the absence of input faults ($\mathbf{f}_u(t) = \mathbf{0}$), it can be seen that the i -th residual vector reaches zero as t approaches infinity and the rate of convergence depends on the position of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{T}^i \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{K}^i \mathbf{C}$ matrix inside the unit circle.

In the presence of a fault on the i -th input, the i -th residual reaches zero asymptotically while the residuals of the $r - 1$ remaining observers are sensitive to the fault signal. This situation leads to the possibility of unique detection and isolation of all process input faults.

21/01/2009

Fault Isolation with UIO



Each observer is insensitive to one input sensor:


Table 4.1: Fault signatures.

	u_1	u_2	$\dots$	u_r	y_1	y_2	$\dots$	y_m
r_{UIO_1}	0	1	$\dots$	1	1	1	$\dots$	1
r_{UIO_2}	1	0	$\dots$	1	1	1	$\dots$	1
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
r_{UIO_r}	1	1	$\dots$	0	1	1	$\dots$	1


$$\left. \begin{aligned} z^i(t+1) &= (T^i A - K^i C) z^i(t) + J^i u(t) + S^i y(t) \\ r^i(t) &= L_1^i z^i(t) + L_2^i y(t) \end{aligned} \right\}$$

21/01/2009

Multiple FDI



Input sensor FDI



Input sensor FDI

21/01/2009

Multiple FDI (Cont'd)

Table 4.1: Fault signatures.

UIO

Dynamic Observers

	u_1	u_2	...	u_r	y_1	y_2	...	y_m
r_{UIO_1}	0	1	...	1	1	1	...	1
r_{UIO_2}	1	0	...	1	1	1	...	1
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
r_{UIO_r}	1	1	...	0	1	1	...	1
r_{O_1}	1	1	...	1	1	0	...	0
r_{O_2}	1	1	...	1	0	1	...	0
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
r_{O_m}	1	1	...	1	0	0	...	1

Fault Signature

21/01/2009

Multiple FDI (Cont'd)

Table 4.1: Fault signatures.

	u_1	u_2	...	u_r	y_1	y_2	...	y_m
r_{UIO_1}	0	1	...	1	1	1	...	1
r_{UIO_2}	1	0	...	1	1	1	...	1
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
r_{UIO_r}	1	1	...	0	1	1	...	1
r_{O_1}	1	1	...	1	1	0	...	0
r_{O_2}	1	1	...	1	0	1	...	0
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
r_{O_m}	1	1	...	1	0	0	...	1

- i) The residuals which are affected by the input and output faults are described by an entry '1' in the corresponding table entry, while an entry '0' means that the input or output fault does not affect the corresponding residual.
- ii) Note how multiple faults in the system outputs can be isolated since a fault on the i -th output signal affects only the residual function r_{O_i} of the output observer driven by the i -th output, but all the UIO or UIKF residual functions r_{UIO_i} . On the other hand, multiple faults on the inputs cannot be isolated by means of this technique since all the residual functions are sensitive to faults regarding different inputs.

21/01/2009

Residual Disturbance *Robustness*

- Residuals decoupled from disturbance
- Robust residual generator
- Disturbance effect minimisation
- Measurement errors




Figure 2.14: MIMO process with faults and noises.

21/01/2009

FDI with *Noisy Measurements*


$$\begin{cases} x(t+1) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t) + Qv(t) + L_1f(t) \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) + Rw(t) + L_2f(t) \end{cases}$$

✓ Model with fault and noise

$$\begin{cases} x(t+1) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t) + Qv(t) \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) + Rw(t) \end{cases}$$

➤ Model with noise only: Kalman filter!

21/01/2009



Kalman Filter Design

$$* \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{w}(t) \end{cases}$$

With reference to the time-invariant, discrete-time, linear dynamic system described by Equation * the i -th KF for the i -th output has the structure [Jazwinski, 1970]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_F^i(t+1|t) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_F^i(t|t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) \\ y_F^i(t+1|t) &= \mathbf{C}_i\mathbf{x}_F^i(t+1|t) \end{aligned}$$

(State and Output Prediction)

21/01/2009



Kalman Filter Design (Cont'd)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(t+1|t) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}(t|t)\mathbf{A}^T + \mathbf{Q} \\ \mathbf{K}_i(t+1) &= \mathbf{P}(t+1|t)\mathbf{C}_i^T [\mathbf{C}_i\mathbf{P}(t+1|t)\mathbf{C}_i^T + \mathbf{R}]^{-1} \\ \mathbf{x}_F^i(t+1|t+1) &= \mathbf{x}_F^i(t+1|t) + \mathbf{K}_i(t+1)[y_i(t+1) - \hat{y}_F^i(t+1|t)] \\ \mathbf{P}(t+1|t+1) &= [\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K}_i(t+1)\mathbf{C}_i]\mathbf{P}(t+1|t)[\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K}_i(t+1)\mathbf{C}_i]^T + \\ &\quad + \mathbf{K}_i(t+1)\mathbf{R}\mathbf{K}_i^T(t+1). \end{aligned}$$

(Vector Updates)

The variables $\mathbf{x}_F^i(t+1|t)$ and $y_F^i(t+1|t)$ are the one step prediction of the state and of the output of the process, respectively. $\mathbf{x}_F^i(t|t)$ is the state estimation given by the filter, $\mathbf{C}_i$ the i -th row of the output distribution matrix $\mathbf{C}$, $\mathbf{P}(t+1|t)$ is the covariance matrix of the one step prediction error $\mathbf{x}(t+1) - \mathbf{x}_F^i(t+1|t)$ whilst $\mathbf{P}(t|t)$ is the covariance matrix of the filtered state error $\mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{x}_F^i(t|t)$.

21/01/2009

Kalman Filter Design (Cont'd)

$$\mathbf{P}(t+1|t) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}(t|t)\mathbf{A}^T + \mathbf{Q}$$

$$\mathbf{K}_i(t+1) = \mathbf{P}(t+1|t)\mathbf{C}_i^T [\mathbf{C}_i\mathbf{P}(t+1|t)\mathbf{C}_i^T + \mathbf{R}]^{-1}$$

$$\mathbf{x}_F^i(t+1|t+1) = \mathbf{x}_F^i(t+1|t) + \mathbf{K}_i(t+1)[y_i(t+1) - \hat{y}_F^i(t+1|t)]$$

$$\mathbf{P}(t+1|t+1) = [\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K}_i(t+1)\mathbf{C}_i]\mathbf{P}(t+1|t)[\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{K}_i(t+1)\mathbf{C}_i]^T + \mathbf{K}_i(t+1)\mathbf{R}\mathbf{K}_i^T(t+1).$$

(Vector Updates)

$\mathbf{Q}$ is the covariance matrix of the input vector noise $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(t)$ and $\mathbf{R}$ is the variance of the i -th component of the output noise $\tilde{y}(t)$. $\mathbf{K}_i(t+1)$ is the time-variant gain of the filter and $y_i(t)$ is the i -th component of the measured output $\mathbf{y}(t)$.

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{w}(t) \end{cases}$$

21/01/2009

Kalman Filter Properties (Cont'd)

- Defined: $e(t) = \mathbf{x}(t) - \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)$
 - It minimises: $E[e^T(t)e(t)] \equiv P(t)$
 - *i.e.* the mean square error & the error covariance matrix
- Filter gain $\mathbf{K}(t)$
 - Solution of the difference equation:

$$\mathbf{P}(t+1) = -\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}(t)\mathbf{C}^T [\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{C}\mathbf{P}(t)\mathbf{C}^T]^{-1} \mathbf{C}\mathbf{P}(t)\mathbf{A}^T + \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}(t)\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{Q}$$

21/01/2009

Kalman Filtering for FDI

$$* \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}(t) + \mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{f}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{w}(t) + \mathbf{L}_2\mathbf{f}(t) \end{cases}$$

1) It can be proved that the innovation $e_i(t+1) = y_i(t+1) - y_F^i(t+1|t) = y_i(t+1) - \mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{x}_F^i(t+1|t)$ is a zero-mean white process when all the assumptions regarding the system $*$ and the statistical characteristics of the noises described by Equation $*$ are completely fulfilled. A Riccati equation is ob-

2) In the presence of a fault on the i -th output ($f_{y_i}(t) \neq 0$), the stochastic properties (mean-value, variance and whiteness, etc) of the innovation process $e_i(t)$ change abruptly so that the fault detection can be based on these variations [Basseville, 1988].

3) Finally, note how multiple faults in outputs can be isolated since a fault on the i -th output affects only the innovation of the KF driven by the i -th output and all the innovation of the filters with unknown input.

21/01/2009

Kalman Filtering for FDI (Cont'd)

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}(t) + \mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{f}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{w}(t) + \mathbf{L}_2\mathbf{f}(t) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{w}(t) \end{cases}$$

Innovation $e_i(t+1) = y_i(t+1) - y_F^i(t+1) = y_i(t+1) - \mathbf{C}_i \mathbf{x}_F^i(t+1|t)$

(i) Because of the linear property of the identified model and because of the additive effect of the faults on the system, it may easily be shown that the effect of the change on the innovation is also additive.

(ii) Any abrupt change in measurements due to a fault is reflected in a change in the mean value and in the standard deviation of innovations.

21/01/2009

Kalman Filtering for FDI (Cont'd)

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}(t) + \mathbf{L}_1\mathbf{f}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{w}(t) + \mathbf{L}_2\mathbf{f}(t) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(t+1) &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t) + \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}(t) \\ \mathbf{y}(t) &= \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{w}(t) \end{cases}$$

Innovation $e_i(t+1) = y_i(t+1) - y_F^i(t+1) = y_i(t+1) - C_i x_F^i(t+1|t)$

In particular, since the KF produces zero-mean and independent white residuals with the system in normal operation, a method for FDI consists of testing

how much the sequence of innovations has deviated from the white noise hypothesis.

21/01/2009

KF Residual Evaluation...

Which thresholds???

$$\begin{cases} J(\mathbf{r}(t)) \leq \varepsilon(t) & \text{for } \mathbf{f}(t) = \mathbf{0} \\ J(\mathbf{r}(t)) > \varepsilon(t) & \text{for } \mathbf{f}(t) \neq \mathbf{0} \end{cases}$$

Innovation $e_i(t+1) = y_i(t+1) - y_F^i(t+1) = y_i(t+1) - C_i x_F^i(t+1|t)$

21/01/2009

Kalman Filtering for FDI (Cont'd)

$$r(t) \equiv e_i(t+1) = y_i(t+1) - y_F^i(t+1) = y_i(t+1) - C_i x_F^i(t+1|t)$$

*Innovation or
Residual $r(t)$*

(i) Statistical Tests

Zero-mean

$$\bar{r}(t) = E[r(t)] = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t r(j)$$

&

variance

$$\sigma_r^2(t) = E[r^2(t)] = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t r^2(j)$$

21/01/2009

Kalman Filtering for FDI (Cont'd)

$$r(t) \equiv e_i(t+1) = y_i(t+1) - y_F^i(t+1) = y_i(t+1) - C_i x_F^i(t+1|t)$$

*Innovation or
Residual $r(t)$*

(ii) Statistical Tests

Whiteness test

$$R_r^t(\tau) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t r(j)r(j+\tau),$$

χ^2 -type

$$\zeta_r^M(t) = \frac{t}{R_r^t(0)^2} \sum_{\tau=1}^M (R_r^t(\tau))^2$$

which are computed in a growing window. The parameter $\zeta_r^M(t)$ is a chi-squared random variable with M degrees of freedom.

21/01/2009

Kalman Filtering for FDI (Cont'd)

Whiteness test

$$R_r^t(\tau) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{j=1}^t r(j)r(j+\tau),$$

χ^2 - type


$$\zeta_r^M(t) = \frac{t}{R_r^t(0)^2} \sum_{\tau=1}^M (R_r^t(\tau))^2$$

If a system abnormality occurs, the statistics of $r(t)$ change, so the comparison of $\bar{r}(t)$ and $\zeta_r^M(t)$ with a threshold ϵ fixed under no faults conditions, becomes the detection rule 2.17. In particular, such a threshold can be settled as previously seen or, with the aid of chi-squared tables, $\epsilon = \chi_{\beta}^2(M)$ can be computed as a function of the false-alarms probability β and of the window size M .

21/01/2009

KF Residuals: Mean-value (example)


**Fault-free
&
faulty
residuals**



21/01/2009

KF Residuals: Standard deviation (example)


**Fault-free
&
faulty
residuals**



21/01/2009

KF Residuals: Whiteness test (example)

**Fault-free
&
faulty
residuals**



21/01/2009



Conclusion

- ✓ Model-Based FDI
- ✓ Analytical Redundancy
- ✓ State-Space Models
- ✓ Residual Generation
 - ✓ Unknown Input Observers UIO
 - ✓ Dynamic Observers / Kalman Filters
- ✓ Residual Evaluation/Change Detection