Theme project case: Quadruple tanks control with PLCs

J. Carrasco, W. P. Heath, M. C. Rodriguez Liñan, R. Alli-Oke, O. A. R. Abdel Kerim, and S. Rodriguez Gutierrez

Abstract

A themed project based on the control of a quadruple tank rig using PLCs has been successfully carried out as part of the MSc in Advanced Control and Systems Engineering at the University of Manchester. The themed project involves ten students who address a single multivariable control challenge under the supervision of two academics and four PhD students. As every student is required to write their own MSc dissertation, the key point is the possibility of using different control techniques to be implemented on different hardware platforms.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The University of Manchester has a long a proud tradition in control education [2]. The Control Systems Centre (previously a department in UMIST and now a research group within the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University of Manchester) was opened in 1966 and has been running an MSc course since 1968 [13]. At present our MSc course in Advanced Control and Systems Engineering attracts circa 60 students per year. A third of the course's credits are earned on a dissertation project; furthermore a Distinction in the project is necessary in order to gain a Distinction over all.

The themed projects were designed for our undergraduate course in order to improve the quality of the supervision [12], where academics supervise more than five students. In the academic year 2011-2012 we trialled so-called "themed projects" where students are assigned similar but separate projects; some of the supervision time is replaced by group meetings and group study. **Since the ratio of students per supervisor in our MSc is similar to the undergraduate ratio, a themed project model was also introduced in our MSc Course..** In this paper we report on one such themed-project where students were asked to control a four tanks apparatus and, as an option, to use PLCs to implement their controller. Ten students were allocated to the project leading to the dissertations of [1], [4], [5], [6], [8], [9], [10], [11], [14], [15][1].

B. Students' skills

Most students on our course come straight from undergraduate studies. Nevertheless a significant minority have worked in industry and have some experience of industrial control implementation.

In the first semester of the MSc they become well-versed in classical control, state-space and system identifation techniques. They also take a specialist course in process control relevant to this project. In the second semester they are introduced to more advanced linear and nonlinear control techniques. For this academic year we introduced a new course "Applied Control" in which students gained hands-on experience of real-time implementation issues; this course is supported directly by National Instruments.

C. Experimental apparatus

The project is focused on the quadruple tanks apparatus. This was introduced by [7] as a teaching laboratory suitable for teaching multivariable control. Four tanks are arranged as in Figs 1 and 2. In particular the rig may be configured to have a nonminimum phase zero making the control challenging. In his original design the zero can be adjusted continuously with a valve setting. For this rig we used the Quanser four tanks apparatus configured by combining a pair of coupled tank rigs. This has a discrete number of settings determined by width of pipe and

---

[1]Copies of any or all of these are available from the first author by request

Fig. 1: Schematic of the quadruple tank rig (adapted from the Quanser manual).

Fig. 2: The Quanser rig set up in our laboratory [14].

apperture size; some of these settings entail nonminimum phase dynamics. Although perhaps lacking the elegance of the original design, this set up is very useful for a shared resource; students can reconfigure the apparatus to their "own" setting regardless of usage history.

A further advantage of the Quanser rig is that it comes with hardware (e.g. the Quanser Real-time Control Board) and software (e.g. QuARC) that allows real-time interface between Matlab

Fig. 3: Siemens S7-314-2 PN/DP PLC CPU (Siemens AG Brochure, 2011).

and the sensors and actuators of the rig. It is then straightforward for students to test control designs in Matlab/Simulink and then implement them directly onto the actual device. All ten students transfered their control designs to practical implementation.

We have a number of PLCs, including Siemens, DirectLOGIC and Rockwell. For this project we opted to offer Siemens S-7 300 (Fig 3) and DirectLOGIC DL06 (Fig 5 PLCs. Several modules of each were available. The stated aim was to implement advanced control on a PLC, although students were welcome to focus on control design without PLC implementation. A fall back option was to use the PLC as a communication link between the rig and a PC via an OPC server, where the control would run; the availability of the Matlab/Simulink OPC toolbox means this is a relatively straightforward option while sufficiently interesting to stimulate the students, and changing significantly the bandwidth constraints of the system. We were not prescriptive for

the students' choices, save to encourage them each to choose different options.

The Siemens S-7 300 is a modular central processing unit (CPU) type programmable logic controller(PLC) developed and manufactured by Siemens. Students could use one of its versions, namely the SIMATIC S7-300 CPU 314-2 PN/DP. Salient features for this project were [4]:

- It is a high processing performance CPU especially in floating point and binary arithmetic.
- Onboard Message Passing Interface (MPI).
- It has comprehensive integrated system diagnosis.
- Supports the insert of Simatic Engineering tools.

The DirectLOGIC DL06 (D0-06DD1) is a micro PLC from the DL06 Micro PLC family that has 20 in-built inputs and 16 in-built outputs. It supports 4 option cards such as the analogue I/O module, high-speed counters module, and others. The DL06 PLC has a total of 14.8K words of memory. This memory capacity is split into two, that is, 7.6K words for ladder memory and 7.6K words of V-memory. The DL06 also includes a RAM with the CPU which stores system parameters, V-memory, and other variables not available in the application program. It has two in-built serial ports [1].

D. Supervision

There were two lead academic supervisors of the project - the first two authors of this paper. In addition there were four demonstrators - the latter four authors. Students and demonstrators met a as a team once a week with at least one of the lead academics present (usually both). Meanwhile students met with either a lead academic or a demonstrator individually at least once a week for a one-one session.

II. SCOPE OF PROJECTS

An overview of projects is shown in Table I. We can make the following observations. A wide range of control techniques were attemped, from simple PI to $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ and sliding mode techniques. However only two students implented their controller in nonminimum phase configuration on the rig (several considered it in simulation and posed the online implementation as "further work"). Perhaps coincidentally one of these was the only student not to test his design in simulation first. Half the students implemented their controllers on both Quanser and their chosen PLC. Only one student chose not to implement his controller on a PLC. The split between the choice

Fig. 4: Wiring between the Siemens PLC and the Quanser board [4].


Fig. 5: The DirectLOGIC DL06 configured to act as a communications link between the PC and the Quanser hardware [1].

of Siemens or DirectLOGIC PLC was fairly even, as was the split between using the PLC for communications only or as the control platform. However most students using the Siemens PLC opted to use the PLC as the control platform, while most students using the DirectLOGIC PLC used it for communication.

We discuss the project scope in more detail below. Two important aspects of the projects not highlighted in Table I are system identification and use of SCADA/OPC server. These are also discussed below.

A. Control structures

Table I shows the range of control structures successfully implemented on the hardware rig. Some of these structures are taught explicitly as part of the taught component of the MSc course. Others are, at best, mentioned in passing. Students reported several other control structures in their dissertations; typically different controllers (or control tuning) were compared in simulation and one of these chosen for final implementation.

One disappointment was that only two students [8], [11] addressed the nonminimum phase zero on the rig itself. We speculate that this is most likely a reflection of the severe time constraints under which the project was run. It is notable that one of these students skipped the simulation stage and experimented with his controller (model predictive control run in Matlab) directly on the plant; the other was the first to successfully configure communication between a PLC and the rig. An additional factor may be that at present there is little multivariable control taught on the course (the course covers several state space control designs including model predictive control and $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ control, but the specific structures of multivariable control systems are not emphasised); students may not have been immediately comfortable with the concept of a right half plane zero that cannot be seen directly in the transfer function numerator polynomials.

$$G(s) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1.8109}{65.033s+1} & \frac{1.5}{(65.033s+1)(26.462s+1)} \\ \frac{2.6823}{(114.72s+1)(38.0296s+1)} & \frac{3.4565}{114.72s+1} \end{bmatrix} \tag{1}$$

B. System identification

The plant is straightforward to model - the dynamics of each tank from *flow in* to *level height* may be well-approximated as a first order process. Hence the transfer function matrix can be expressed using first and second order transfer function elements. Additional dynamcis (for example motor response and sensor characteristics) are fast in comparison and can be ignored. A better approximation can be found if the parameters of the first order elements are considered height dependent - this was addressed in the gain-scheduling approach of [14].

Students on the course cover system identification in two separate modules. They were keen to test their new-found skills and most carried out tests using PRBS excitation signals. Although the option was given, none chose to make system identificaiton the *focus* of their project; rather they viewed it as a necessary (and interesting) preliminary to control design and implementation.

Fig. 6: Typical experimental data for system identification [4].

Fig. 7: Typical model validation experiment [4].

Typical experimental data for one channel is shown in Fig 6 with corresponding validation data shown in Fig 7 [4]. A typical model for the two-input two-output plant [4] is given in equation (1).

In addition, several students worked together to obtain models. In many cases they peformed the experiment together but analyse the data separately - this mode of work is typical for more formal laboratory work when part of taught courses. One difficulty was that this made it hard to accredit the specific contributions of this aspect of the work.

C. Results

Control of the plant using Quanser hardware and software is relatively straightforward. As students had implemented practical controllers in previous courses they were prepared to deal

Fig. 8: Results using Quanser hardware and software [15].

Fig. 9: Results using PLC implementation compared with results using Quanser hardware and software [15].

with signal offsets etc. Fig 8 shows a typical set of results, in this case from [15] using sliding mode control and demonstrating decoupling.

The intention of allowing the option of using PLCs as a communication tool was that students could focus on real-time implementation aspects without worrying further about control design. It turned out that this option entailed two additional design considerations:

1) The sample rate was typically slower than using direct connections. Control design had to take this into account - in particular with respect to performance at high frequency.

2) The PLC wiring was less well shielded than the direct connections (see Section II-D), so

that there was more noise in the loop. This affected the choice of closed-loop bandwidth. Of course, similar issues arose when controllers were implemented directly on the PLCs. Fig 9 compares typical performance using PC and PLC control. Once again, this is from [15].

Of the designs using PLCs as a communication channel, the most interesting was probably that of [8]. Here the Matlab MPC toolbox was used to control the plant when configured to have a nonminimum phase zero. In other designs classical PI and lead-lag controllers, internal model control and sliding mode control were all implemented directly on PLCs (see Table I).

D. SCADA and OPC server

Several students built their own SCADA interfaces, using tools such as the IGSS SCADA system developed by 7-Technologies A/S. This SCADA has a free version limited to 50 objects (IGSS FREE50[2]), sufficient and suitable for all students' projects. Four such examples are shown in Figs 12a, 12b, 12c and 12d. All were built using the IGSS FREE50.

The communication between the SCADA and the PLC required an OPC server (see Fig. 5). The OPC server used by the students was the demo version of KEPServerEX v5[3]; this demo restricts the experiments to two hours, which was enough for the projects. If the original motivation of using the OPC server was to support the communication between the SCADA and the PLC, it became a versatile tool. It provides students a straightforward implementation of their controllers via PLC (see Fig. 10) with minimal code on the PLC itself. It makes an interesting exercise in control design for the student since sampling time and noise levels are significantly different in comparison with the Quanser hardware. Since students began the project more familiar with Simulink than with PLC programming, they were comfortable using this to test controller designs before coding the PLC.

A further configuration that can be used with the OPC server is the proposed in Fig. 11. Both configurations run the controller in the PLC, but with significantly different levels of noise. This configuration was not used by our students but will be proposed for future projects.

---

[2]This version can be downloaded on http://igss.schneider-electric.com/products/igss/download/free-scada.aspx

[3]A demo version can be downloaded on http://www.kepware.com/Products/kepserverex_features.asp

Fig. 10: Different communications between Simulink and the tanks. In both cases the controller is running in Simulink. In the red path, the OPC server provides a comunication between MATLAB and the PCL via the OPC toolbox; the signals reach the plant with additional wiring. In the green path, the communication is based on the Quanser configuration, where the signals reach the plant via the Quaser board.

III. Discussion on the themed project

The themed project was popular and students succeeded in working as a team while at the same time demonstrating independent work that could be individually assessed and credited. For example, they managed the use of the plant by themselves and with no conflict. The themed project allowed students to exploit their own motivations and strengths, and thus adapt their individual project to fit with their own skills. Students did well: four students received a Distinction level grade for their dissertation (of whom two received Distinction overall). In fact students' average grade for the disseration was 3.3 marks (out of 100) higher than for their examination results; the average for the whole cohort is a rise of 1.3 marks.

One challenging issue within the themed project is the allocation of credit for team work. For instance, system identification was a task where they shared data due to the time constraints of the

Fig. 11: Different communications between PLC and the tanks. In both cases the controller is running on the PLC. In the red path, the PLC signals reach the plant with additional wiring. In the green path, the SCADA system is used for the communication between the PLC and MATLAB; then the signals reach the plant via Quaser board.

project. Students were asked to process the identification data independently, acknowledging that data was the result of a team work. However, it was difficult to credit the different performance of the students on the system identification problem. Similarly, student using the SCADA and OPC server made use of the same software packages, which were not provided by the supervisors. Again, it is difficult to identify and credit the innovator.

The success of this and other themed projects has led to their extension to other MSc courses in the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering. The number of proposed themed projects has increased by 30% for the academic year 2012-2013. The main advantage of the themed project is the significant improvement of the supervision. Student were encouraged to, and did, form a one-one rapport with a postgraduate student in addition to their time with academic staff. Meanwhile academic supervision becomes more efficient since all student are working on the same problem. It was clear that students enjoyed the team spirit of the themed

Student	Control structure	Simulation	Quanser	Siemens (comms)	Siemens (control)	DL (comms)	DL (control)	NMP
Asabor	Discrete LQG	Y				Y		
Date	Lead-lag with decoupler	Y	Y		Y			
Goewam	$\mathcal{H}_\infty$	Y	Y			Y		
Gopalkrishnan	Fuzzy logic	Y				Y		
Kumar	MPC					Y		Y
Li	LQG	Y	Y					
Okolo	Decentralised IMC	Y	Y				Y	
Pachemanov	IMC	Y			Y			Y
Subramanian	Gain scheduled PI	Y			Y			
Zhang	Sliding mode	Y	Y	Y	Y			

TABLE I: Range of projects. All but one student first implemented their control in simulation. Exactly half the students implemented their controller using Quanser hardware interfaced with Matlab on the PC alone. Four students coded their controller on the Siemens PLC. Five students implemented their controller via the DirectLOGIC PLC, but only one of these actually coded the controller on the PLC. Only two students implemented their controller on the actual rig in nonminimum phase mode.

project. Nevertheless, the question remains open whether some of the students would have benefited from more direct individual contact with a member of academic stuff.

REFERENCES

[1] E. Asabor. PLC implementation of a multivariable discrete LQG control for a quadruple tank process. MSc Dissertation, University of Manchester, 2012.

[2] D. P. Atherton. Control engineering at the University of Manchester in the post war years. UKACC, Manchester, 2008.

[3] J. Carrasco, W. P. Heath, M. C. Rodriguez Liñan, R. Alli-Oke, O. A. R. Abdel Kerim, and S. Rodriguez Gutierrez. Controlling a quadruple tanks rig with PLCs as a Masters dissertation project. Submitted to the 10th IFAC Symposium Advances in Control Education, Sheffield, 2013.

[4] V. S. Date. Implementation of a decoupled lead-lag compensator on a PLC for the quadruple tank system. MSc Dissertation, University of Manchester, 2012.

[5] M. S. Goewam. OPC-PLC based H_∞ control of a quadruple tank process. MSc Dissertation, University of Manchester, 2012.

[6] A. Gopalkrishnan. Fuzzy logic implementation on the quadruple tank system. MSc Dissertation, University of Manchester, 2012.

(a) SCADA interface built by [11]

(b) SCADA interface built by [4]

(c) SCADA interface built by [1]

(d) SCADA interface built by [15]

Fig. 12: SCADA interfaces

[7] K. H. Johansson. The quadruple-tank process: a multivariable laboratory process with an adjustable zero. IEEE Trans on Control Systems Technology, Vol 8, pp456-465, 2000.

[8] V. P. Kumar Implementation of model predictive control on the quadruple tank system. MSc Dissertation, University of Manchester, 2012.

[9] P. Li. Linear quadratic Gaussian control for quadruple tank process. MSc Dissertation, University of Manchester, 2012.

[10] J. E. Okolo. PLC implementation of decentralised modified internal model control (IMC) of a quadruple tank. MSc Dissertation, University of Manchester, 2012.

[11] L. Pachemanov. Internal model control for a quadruple tank system. MSc Dissertation, University of Manchester, 2012.

[12] **R. van Silfhout, I. Cotton, B. Grieve, A. Lanzon, A. Renfrew, and A. Gibson. Introduction of student initiated and themed multi-student projects International Conference on Engineering Education 2012, pp. 716–722.**

[13] M. Smith. United Kingdom (control education). IEEE Control Systems Magazine, vol. 16, pp. 51-56, 1996.

[14] A. Subramanian. PLC implementation of a gain scheduling controller for a quadruple tank system. MSc Dissertation, University of Manchester, 2012.

[15] H. Zhang Sliding mode control for the quadruple tank process MSc Dissertation, University of Manchester, 2012.