

University of Parma Research Repository

Hybridization methodology based on DP algorithm for hydraulic mobile machinery — Application to a middle size excavator

This is the peer reviewd version of the followng article:

Original

Hybridization methodology based on DP algorithm for hydraulic mobile machinery — Application to a middle size excavator / Casoli, Paolo; Gambarotta, Agostino; Pompini, Nicola; Ricco', Luca. - In: AUTOMATION IN CONSTRUCTION. - ISSN 0926-5805. - 61:(2016), pp. 42-57. [10.1016/j.autcon.2015.09.012]

Availability: This version is available at: 11381/2797616 since: 2021-09-29T14:37:13Z

*Publisher:* Elsevier

*Published* DOI:10.1016/j.autcon.2015.09.012

Terms of use:

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available

Publisher copyright

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

Elsevier Editorial System(tm) for Automation

in Construction

Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: AUTCON-D-15-00107R2

Title: Hybridization Methodology based on DP algorithm for Hydraulic Mobile Machinery - Application to a Middle Size Excavator

Article Type: Original Paper

Keywords: Hydraulic Hybrid Excavator; Hybridization Methodology; Dynamic Programming Optimization

Corresponding Author: Prof. PAOLO CASOLI, Master

Corresponding Author's Institution: University of Parma

First Author: PAOLO CASOLI, Master

Order of Authors: PAOLO CASOLI, Master; Agostino Gambarotta, PhD; Luca Riccò, Master; Nicola Pompini, Master

# HYBRIDIZATION METHODOLOGY BASED ON DP ALGORITHM FOR HYDRAULIC MOBILE MACHINERY – APPLICATION TO A MIDDLE SIZE EXCAVATOR

Casoli P., Gambarotta A., Pompini N., Riccò L.

Industrial Engineering Department, University of Parma Italy, Parco Area delle Scienze 181/A, 43124 Parma (PR) ITALY

Corresponding author: Paolo Casoli paolo.casoli@unipr.it; Industrial Engineering Department University of Parma Italy Parco Area delle Scienze 181/A 43124 Parma (PR) ITALY Phone: +390521 905868 FAX: +39 0521 905705

# **Answer to Reviewers**

# II round

Editor:

In addition to the reviewers' comments below, please address the following:

- Highlights: the first one is too long.

- Figures: if at all possible (this may be the case for most of your figures), please submit images in vector format (i.e. where text is text and lines are lines, as opposed to everything being pixels). Examples of formats supporting vector content are PDF and EPS. MS Office files are also accepted by the journal (e.g. EMF).

- Conclusions: Your conclusions should include opening statements that review the limitations of the work reported in the manuscript and suggest areas for further research.

Answer: the first highlight has been corrected; figures has been prepared as required; conclusions have been improved as required, a sentence has been added at the end and little modifications at the beginning have been introduced.

# Reviewer #2:

The authors have made substantial changes to this paper from their original submission. These changes have greatly improved the quality of this paper and it is now this reviewer's opinion that the paper be published in its current state.

The only minor suggestion, which if not addressed should not keep this paper from being published, is to include a zoomed-in view of Figure 30. This plot shows the command to a proportional valve but the time scale doesn't allow the reader to see if the valve is ever commanded to a position other than fully open or fully closed.

Answer: A figure has been added as required (fig. 31). Figs. 30 and 33 have been little modified.

Reviewer #3: Well written and well reworked. i have no further comments.

Answer: Thanks.

# Highlights

- 1. A methodology to compare different hydraulic hybrid system layouts is presented.
- 2. The methodology takes advantage of the dynamic programming (DP) algorithm.
- 3. Optimal hybrid layout configuration and its optimal control policies can be defined

# 1 Hybridization Methodology based on DP algorithm for

# 2 Hydraulic Mobile Machinery – Application to a Middle Size

# **3** Excavator

4

5 Casoli P., Gambarotta A., Pompini N., Riccò L.

6 Industrial Engineering Department, University of Parma Italy, Parco Area delle Scienze 181/A, 43124 Parma (PR)

7 ITALY

8

- 9 Corresponding author: Paolo Casoli
- 10 paolo.casoli@unipr.it;
- 11 Industrial Engineering Department
- 12 University of Parma Italy
- 13 Parco Area delle Scienze 181/A
- 14 43124 Parma (PR) ITALY
- **15** *Phone: +390521 905868*
- 16 FAX: +39 0521 905705
- 17

# 18 Abstract

19 Fuel consumption and pollutant emission reduction are and will continue to be the most important drivers in the 20 improvement of mobile machinery hydraulic system. Many different solutions and options are proposed in the literature 21 to improve the machinery fuel efficiency, and many of these are based on hybrid solutions. The aim of this paper is to 22 present a hybridization methodology which allows to compare different system layouts, to dimension the energy storage 23 devices, to define the optimal control policies, and finally to determine the more effective hybrid system layout. The 24 proposed methodology takes advantage of the dynamic programming (DP) algorithm. The machinery mathematical 25 model and information about working cycle have to be known "a priori" in order to take advantage of the presented 26 methodology.

The hybridization methodology has been applied to a hydraulic excavator as a guideline example, and the results arereported in the last section of the paper.

- 29
- 30 Keywords: Hydraulic Hybrid Excavator; Hybridization Methodology; Dynamic Programming Optimization.

Nomenclature									
Abbreviations									
AUX	Auxiliary		VCO	Variable Control Orifice					
DoE	Design of Experiment		ICE	Internal Combustion Engine					
DP	Dynamic Programming		JCMAS	Japan Construction Machinery A	ssociation				
ECU	Electronic Control Unit		LS	Load Sensing					
Symbol	Description	Unit	Symbol	Description	Unit				
$A_A$	Hydraulic Actuator Piston Area	[m <sup>2</sup> ]	V	Volume	[m <sup>3</sup> ]				
$A_B$	Hydraulic Actuator Piston Area	[m <sup>2</sup> ]	Vd	Volumetric Displacement	[m <sup>3</sup> /r]				
$c_d$	Discharge Coefficient	[-]	w	System Disturbance					
F	Force	[N]	x	System State					
J	Cost Function		<i>xi</i>	Spool Linear Position	[m]				
mf	Fuel Burned Rate	[g/s]	У	System Output					
n	Angular Velocity	[r/min]	γ	Polytropic Index					
р	Pressure	[Pa]	$\eta_{hm}$	Hydraulic-Mechanical Efficiency	[-]				
Q	Volumetric Flow Rate	[m <sup>3</sup> /s]	$\eta_V$	Volumetric Efficiency	[-]				
Т	Torque	[N·m]	π	Control Policy					
и	System Input		ρ	Hydraulic Density	$[kg/m^3]$				
v	Linear Velocity	[m/s]	ω	Angular Velocity	[rad/s]				
Superscript									
*	Optimal								

# 32 1. Introduction

33 In the field of mobile machinery the increasing interest in the reduction of pollutant emissions, supported by more and 34 more tight regulations, and of fuel consumption are leading the R&D activities towards new energy saving solutions. 35 Focusing on hydraulic mobile machinery, especially on hydraulic excavators, there are different options to reduce fuel 36 consumption. A first way is the improvement of single components efficiency, achieved by reducing friction losses 37 and/or enhancing their flow dynamics characteristics. A second path concerns the adoption of new system layouts, e.g., 38 drive hydraulic actuators in closed loop hydraulic system using variable displacement machines (thus avoiding 39 throttling losses in valves) [1], or adopting hydraulic transformers [2]. A further solution is the optimization of the 40 matching between the internal combustion engine (ICE) and the hydraulic system taking account of the mission profile 41 [3, 4]. Furthermore, new electro-hydraulic solutions are also under investigation, e.g., Electro Flow Matching (EFM) [5] and Electro Positive Control (EPC) [6]. Hybridization techniques, i.e., the use of two or more distinct power sources, 42 43 combined with energy recovery systems, represent a further solution. Hybridization technology is widely used on on-44 road vehicles, where the ICE and an electric system (generator, motor, inverter and battery) are coupled, with 45 significant advantages in the improvement of fuel efficiency and pollutant emissions reduction, when optimized energy
46 management strategies and a proper design of components and overall architecture are adopted [7].

47 Concerning hydraulic excavators, during a typical working cycle the required power and torque vary periodically in a 48 wide range, influencing consequently the engine working conditions. Moreover, kinetic energy of the turret and 49 gravitational energy of the boom are typically dissipated as heat in the flow control valves. Thus, hybrid excavators 50 with energy recovery systems seem to be an effective solution to improve fuel efficiency, thanks to the possibility of a 51 better shaping of the load request to the ICE and the storage of otherwise wasted energy.

52 Developing an optimized hybrid system involves several topics such as the system layout definition, components size 53 specification and optimal energy management strategy definition. Many researchers have studied hybrid electric 54 excavators focusing on the optimal control strategy definition of some proposed electric hybrid excavator layouts [8, 9, 55 10, 11]. As previously mentioned, during the typical working cycle of a hydraulic excavator the required power and 56 torque change rapidly, periodically and in a very wide range. Furthermore, since boom and turret movements are very 57 fast, a hydraulic energy recovery system seems better than electrical one for this specific application [12], thanks to its 58 higher power density instead of a higher energy density.

The aim of this paper is to define a methodology to compare different proposed hybrid system layouts. The methodology has been applied to a middle size (9 t) excavator. For this machinery, four different hydraulic hybrid layouts were proposed and compared. For each layout it has been necessary to define both the new components required for the energy recovery and the optimal energy management strategy in order to achieve the best fuel economy.

63 The proposed methodology takes advantage of the dynamic programming (DP) algorithm [13] in order to define the 64 optimal control policy (in this specific case minimizing fuel consumption) for the non-linear, time dependent problem 65 of excavator dynamics during a defined typical working cycle. This powerful optimization technique has been used 66 widely for defining optimal control strategy for hybrid on-road vehicles [14] and to investigate novel hydraulic hybrid 67 architectures for on-road vehicles [15]. Using the DP algorithm for each considered/proposed layout it is possible to 68 optimally size the components of interest through a DoE (Design of Experiment) procedure. Then it is finally possible 69 to determine the hybrid layout which guarantees the lower fuel consumption after comparing all the studied layouts in 70 their best energy saving configuration.

71 For applying the presented hybridization methodology some necessary steps have to be done:

- starting from the standard machinery mathematical model (with a direct causality), an inverse causality model has to
be defined and validated. The direct causality model is also exploited to define the inputs required by the inverse model;

- a representative working cycle for the considered machine has to be defined; for hydraulic excavators, a typical
working cycle has been identified in the JCMAS H020:2007 [*16*], where no interaction between bucket and ground is
considered;

- different hybrid layouts have to be defined for the considered machinery as well as their inverse causality model;

- the optimization problem has to be formulated;

- finally the hybrid layouts can be compared in order to define the best energy saving solution.

The paper is organized as follows: section 2 presents the standard machinery hydraulic layout previously analyzed and modelled by the authors (assumed as reference for the current analysis), the standard machinery inverse modelling and its validation on the selected reference working cycle; section 3 describes the optimization problem definition and the dynamic programming algorithm; section 4 describes the proposed hydraulic hybrid layouts and their inverse causality model schemes, as well as the DoE performed for the optimal components sizing; section 5 shows the optimization results obtained applying the presented methodology.

86

#### 87 **2.** Physical Modeling

#### 88 2.1 Direct causality model

The machinery taken into account for this study is a middle size excavator whose simplified hydraulic circuit ISO scheme is reported in Fig.1. The hydraulic layout of this kind of machinery can be divided in three parts [17]: the generator section composed of the hydraulic pumps which transform the power output of the ICE into hydraulic power; the conductive section which transfers pressurized fluid to actuators via pipes and valves; the motor related section where fluid is used to move hydraulic cylinders, motors and auxiliaries.

94 The actuators considered in the mathematical model are those required for the defined working cycle [16]. As can be 95 seen in Fig.1, the arm, boom and bucket cylinders and the turret (or swing) and travels motors have been considered, 96 along with the related hydraulic flow control valves.

97 The main hydraulic circuit is a Load-Sensing (LS) system, where the highest load pressure level of parallel operating 98 hydraulic drives is detected and fed back to the pump regulators and to the valves pressure compensators. This allows to 99 control the inlet line pressure and keep a constant pressure drops across metering valves, even in flow saturation 100 conditions.



- 102
- 103

Fig. 1. ISO scheme of the standard excavator hydraulic circuit.

105 The main pump is a LS variable displacement axial piston pump and its mathematical model has been already 106 developed and validated both in steady state and dynamic conditions [18, 19]. The main valve is a LS full flow sharing 107 sectional valve. The valve block mathematical model has been already presented and validated with the comparison 108 between numerical and experimental results [20]. The mathematical model considers also the front excavation tools, in 109 order to reproduce the real forces acting on the hydraulic actuators during the implements movements. A detailed 110 description of the standard machinery mathematical modelling is presented in [21]. The pilot circuit (AUX), powered 111 by a fixed displacement external gear pump, operating at a constant pressure level, has been considered since it has a 112 significant impact on the fuel consumption. The ICE is a Diesel engine and its mathematical model has been presented in [22]. The direct causality models are dynamic models based on differential equation. Pressures inside the chambers 113 114 are calculated through the pressure rise rate equation applied to the chambers volume, the shaft speed is defined through 115 the momentum equilibrium of the engine/pump shaft and forces acting on the hydraulic actuators are defined thought 116 the second Newton's law applied to the moving bodies of the kinematics. Figure 2 reports the direct causality 117 mathematical model scheme.





Fig. 2. Direct causality model of the standard excavator.

120

#### 121 2.2 Inverse Causality Model

122 The presented optimization methodology, as previously mentioned, is based on the DP algorithm which has the 123 characteristic of solving dynamic optimization problems backward-in-time. In order to solve the optimization problem 124 the causality of the developed model has to be reverted. Due to the exponentially increasing complexity and 125 computation time required to solve a DP problem with a large number of states (i.e. a model with many differential 126 equations), all the non-essential dynamics of the model have been neglected. For this reason, when reversing the 127 causality of the model, all sub-models have been reduced to pure algebraic models based on a Quasi-Steady 128 formulation. This is justified by the fact that the time constants associated with the hydraulic components are very low 129 compared to the characteristics time of a duty cycle. The comparison between excavator direct and inverse causality 130 models presented in section 2.4 proves the validity of this assumption.

On the other hand, when introducing an energy recovery device, i.e. a hydraulic accumulator, it becomes clear that its dynamics cannot be neglected as they are considerably slower than the hydraulics one and greatly affects the behavior of the system.

Regarding the control of expander movements, in the direct causality case the forces applied to the moving parts depend on the inputs imposed by the driver (control valves positions) and the trajectories of the excavator components are calculated (i.e., boom, arm, bucket and swing); in this case, a driver model (namely a PI controller has been used to guarantee that the actual excavator tools trajectories match the desired profile set by the reference working cycle. In the

- 138 reverse causality case on the other hand, kinematics of the actuators are known a priori (being defined by the working
- 139 cycle) and the forces acting on the actuators can be easily derived from the dynamic equilibrium equation.

#### 140 2.2.1 Hydraulic Linear Actuator

141 Figure 3 shows the hydraulic linear actuator inverse model causality. The piston velocity (*v*) is assumed to be positive

during the extension movement of the piston while the piston force (F) is positive when the piston pulls the connected

143 kinematics element. The following assumptions were done for the modelling: no internal leakages are considered,

144 friction forces are neglected and the cavitation of the fluid is not considered.



145

146

Fig. 3. Hydraulic Linear Actuator Inverse Model Causality.

According to the assumption done and to the defined conventions the flow rate at port A, Eq.(1), and at port B, Eq.(2),

147 are calculated respectively as:

$$Q_A = A_A \cdot v \tag{1}$$

$$Q_B = -A_B \cdot v \tag{2}$$

148

149 The chambers pressures are defined knowing the piston velocity (v) sign, which discriminates the utilized equations. If

the piston velocity is greater or equal to zero, the exploited equations are (3) and (4); otherwise (5) and (6):

$$p_B = p_C \tag{3}$$

$$p_A = \frac{F}{A_A} + p_B \cdot \frac{A_B}{A_A} \tag{4}$$

151

$$p_A = p_C \tag{5}$$

$$p_B = -\frac{F}{A_B} + p_A \cdot \frac{A_A}{A_B} \tag{6}$$

152

153 The counter pressure  $(p_c)$  is due to the resistance introduced by the outlet orifice of the valve section controlling the 154 user.

155

#### 156 2.2.2 Hydraulic Motor

157 Figure 4 shows the hydraulic motor inverse model causality. No internal and external leakages are considered, friction

158 forces are neglected and the fluid cavitation is not considered.



Fig. 4. Hydraulic Motor Inverse Model Causality.

160 If the turret angular velocity ( $\omega$ ) is greater or equal to zero (i.e. a clockwise turret rotation is performed) the flow rates at

161 ports A and B as well as the pressures A and B are defined through Eq.s (7) - (10):

$$Q_A = \frac{\omega_{TURRET} \cdot V_d}{\eta_v} \tag{7}$$

$$Q_B = -Q_A \tag{8}$$

$$p_B = p_C \tag{9}$$

$$p_A = p_B + \frac{T_{TURRET} \cdot 2\pi}{V_d \cdot \eta_{hm}} \tag{10}$$

162

163 If a counter clockwise turret rotation is performed, i.e. the turret angular velocity ( $\omega$ ) is lower than zero, the flow rates 164 and the pressures at ports A and B are calculated with Eq.s (11) – (14):

165

$$Q_A = -Q_B \tag{11}$$

$$Q_B = -\frac{\omega_{TURRET} \cdot V_d}{\eta_v} \tag{12}$$

$$p_A = p_C \tag{13}$$

$$p_B = p_A + \frac{T_{TURRET} \cdot 2\pi}{V_d \cdot \eta_{hm}} \tag{14}$$

166

167 The volumetric and the hydraulic-mechanical efficiencies are considered as constants.

168

#### 169 2.2.3 Valve Section

170 Figure 5 shows the valve section inverse model causality assumed for the input/output variables. If an extension

- 171 movement of the linear actuator or a clockwise rotation for the turret is performed  $Q_A$  will be positive, otherwise for a
- 172 retraction movement of the linear actuator or a counter clockwise rotation of the turret  $Q_A$  will be negative.



Fig. 5. Valve Section Inverse Model Causality.

173 If  $Q_A$  is greater or equal to zero the Eq.s (15) – (18) are exploited in order to evaluate the output variable from the valve

section inverse model:

$$Q_P = Q_A \tag{15}$$

$$p_{LS} = p_A \tag{16}$$

$$A_{IN}(x) = A_A(x) = \frac{Q_P}{cd} \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{2 \cdot \Delta p_{LS}'}}$$
(17)

Form Eq.(17) the metering area is defined. The spool position (*x*) can be defined taking advantage of the correlation defined by the valve constructor. Always exploiting the valve constructor correlation the correspondent outlet area  $(A_{OUT}(x) = A_B(x))$  can be defined.

$$p_{C}(x) = \frac{Q_{B}^{2} \cdot \rho}{2 \cdot cd^{2} \cdot A_{OUT}(x)^{2}} + p_{T}$$
(18)

178

179 If  $Q_A$  is lower than zero the Eq.s (19) – (22) are exploited in order to evaluate the output variable from the valve section 180 inverse model:

$$Q_P = Q_B \tag{19}$$

$$p_{LS} = p_B \tag{20}$$

$$A_{IN}(x) = A_B(x) = \frac{Q_P}{cd} \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{2 \cdot \Delta p_{LS}'}}$$
(21)

Form Eq.(21) the metering area is defined. The spool position (*x*) can be defined taking advantage of the correlation defined by the valve constructor. Always exploiting the valve constructor correlation the correspondent outlet area  $(A_{OUT}(x) = A_A(x))$  can be defined.

$$p_{C}(x) = \frac{Q_{A}^{2} \cdot \rho}{2 \cdot cd^{2} \cdot A_{OUT}(x)^{2}} + p_{T}$$
(22)

184

## 185 2.2.4 Pump and Regulators

186 Figure 6 shows the pump and its regulators inverse model causality assumed for the input/output variables.



Fig. 6. Pump and Regulators Inverse Model Causality.

188 The required torque from the pump is defined taking advantage of a map based correlation defined with the aid of the 189 pump direct causality mathematical model. The map inputs are the pump delivery flow rate ( $Q_P$ ), the pump differential 190 pressure ( $\Delta p_P$ ) and the engine speed ( $n_{ICE}$ ). The following Eq.s are utilized to define the required variables:

$$\Delta p_P = p_D - p_{Tank} \tag{23}$$

$$p_D = p_{LS} + \Delta p_{LS}' \tag{24}$$

191

Being the pump torque limited by its torque limiter, in order to avoid engine stall or shutdown, the instantaneous LS margin pressure ( $\Delta p_{LS}'$ ) is defined according Eq.s (25) or (26):

$$\Delta p_{LS}' = \Delta p_{LS} \qquad \qquad if \ T_P < T_{ICE_{MAX}}(n) \tag{25}$$

$$\Delta p_{LS}' = \Delta p_{LS} - \Delta p_{LIM}(Q_P, p_{LS}, T_P) \qquad if \ T_P \ge T_{ICE_{MAX}}(n) \tag{26}$$

194

## 195 *2.2.5 Engine*

Figure 7 shows the engine inverse model causality assumed for the input/output variables. The fuel mass flow rate (*mf*) is defined taking advantage of a map based correlation defined with the aid of the engine direct causality mathematical model. The map inputs are the engine speed ( $n_{ICE}$ ) set to be constant and the pump required torque ( $T_P$ ).



Fig. 7. Engine Inverse Model Causality.

199

#### 200 2.2.6 Hydraulic Accumulator

A bladder type hydraulic accumulator has been considered in order to allow energy recovery during braking and load lowering phases in the working cycle. The accumulator (pre-charged with gaseous Nitrogen) is modeled assuming an

adiabatic compression following a polytropic gas law (27):

$$p \cdot V^{\gamma} = const \tag{27}$$

204

205 Differentiating Eq. (27), pressure changes in the accumulator are obtained from the differential Eq. (28):

$$\frac{dp}{dt} = -\gamma \cdot \frac{p}{V} \cdot \frac{dV}{dt}$$
(28)

206

207 The volume variations depend on the inlet and outlet oil flow rate.

208

#### 210 2.2.7 Complete excavator inverse causality model

Figure 8 depicts the complete model of the basic excavator layout (Figure 1) in the inverse causality representation.

- 212 This model has been implemented in the Simulink<sup>®</sup> environment and will be used to perform the optimizations
- 213 presented in the following sections.



Fig.8. Inverse Causality Model of the Standard Excavator.

#### 214

## 215 2.3 Reference Working Cycle

216 Fuel consumption is strictly related to the machinery overall efficiency and is actually one of the main performance 217 parameter used when comparing different machinery. Since fuel consumption strongly depends on the operating 218 conditions as well as on the machinery layout and management strategy, the definition of a proper "benchmark" in 219 terms of a significant working cycle is crucial. Many different working cycles have been defined, some commercial and 220 others standardized. The Japan Construction Mechanization Association (JCMAS) has defined a standardized earth-221 moving machinery test procedure to evaluate the fuel consumption on hydraulic excavators, the JCMAS H20:2007 [16]. 222 This standardized working cycle does not involve any bucket-soil interaction, in order to not introduce stochastic effect 223 on the measuring, and it is composed of four different operating modes: digging and loading motion; leveling motion; 224 travelling motion and idling functioning. For each of them the JCMAS standard defines the sequential movements and 225 the kinematics elements positioning, the engine rotational speed and the timing. Once fuel consumption has been 226 calculated for each operating mode, the overall fuel consumption during a typical working hour can be estimated 227 according with the procedure defined by the standard. The direct causality model of the standard excavator was 228 exploited to performing the simulations of the previously mentioned standardized working cycles, defining the references (i.e. standard machine fuel consumption) for the comparisons. 229

Starting from the trajectories prescribed by the standard and knowing masses and geometries of the excavator components, the velocities of the hydraulic actuators and, from dynamic equilibrium, the exerted forces to the actuators can be obtained from the direct excavator model. This forces and velocities are also used for the simulations of the reverse causality model.

Figures 9 – 12 show the boom, arm, bucket and turret inputs relative to the digging and loading motion of the actuated
user during the cycle.

236















Figures 13, 14 report the boom and arm defined inputs throughout the leveling motion respectively. During thisoperating mode the bucket and the swing are not actuated.



Fig.13. Boom Inputs – Leveling motion.



The travelling motion and the idling functioning were only performed with the direct causality model of the standard excavator because during these operating modes the energy recovery and reuse system will be never activated. Thus no differences between the proposed hybrid layouts will be pointed out.

248

## 249 2.4 Inverse Model Validation

To perform a comprehensive comparison between the proposed hybrid layouts and the reference one (the standard machinery layout), a validation of the inverse causality model of the standard excavator has to be performed firstly. The two models have been compared with reference to the previously described typical machinery working cycle. Starting from the illustrated profiles of forces and velocities of the various actuators, the remaining variables are calculated by means of the inverse causality model described in section 2.2.

Figures 15 – 18 report the comparison between the direct and the inverse causality models output variables during the
simulations of the digging and loading motion of the JCMAS cycle.



Fig.15. Comparison of pump outlet flow rate estimated from direct and inverse causality models.



Fig.16. Comparison of pump delivery pressure estimated from direct and inverse causality models.



Fig.17. Comparison of engine torque estimated from direct and inverse causality models.



Fig.18. Comparison of fuel consumption estimated from direct and inverse models.

260 It is noticeable that, despite of the quasi-steady assumption, there is a great agreement between inverse and direct

## 262 **3. Optimization problem definition**

In order to apply the DP methodology to the fuel consumption minimization problem, system equations are rearranged in a discrete state space representation form, Eq.(29). Actuators solicitations are treated as known external disturbances, thus obtaining time invariant correlations f and g.

266

For the examined problem, the state variable x(k) corresponds to the accumulator pressure p and the state update equation [f(x(k),u(k),w(k))] is derived from Eq. (28) with the term  $\frac{dV}{dt}$  accounting for the net inlet flow rate, function of external disturbances and control valves actuation. The term u(k) is a vector representing the behavior of the set of controls valves regulating the flow to and from the accumulator, in the proposed hybrid layout under investigation. Its dimension is correlated to the specific adopted layout. Finally, w(k) represents the external disturbances acting on the actuators. Its components are listed in Eq.(30).

$$[F_{BOOM}(k), v_{BOOM}(k), F_{ARM}(k), v_{ARM}(k), F_{BUCKET}(k), v_{BUCKET}(k), T_{TURRET}(k), \omega_{TURRET}(k)]$$
(30)

273 274

275

where *F*,  $v(T, \omega)$  represent the force and velocity (torque and rotational speed) on the generic actuator, derived in the previous section, and whose profile is determined from the simulated working cycles with the aid of the direct causality

276 mathematical model of the standard machinery.

The output y(k) is the fuel mass flow rate burned by the ICE at every time step in order to guarantee the required power output. The time step  $\Delta t$  has been set to 0.01 *s*, which has been found to guarantee low computational time for problem resolution and good accuracy in the integration of the state space equation.

Some boundary constraints are added on accumulator pressure (to maintain safe operating conditions) and ICE enginetorque (the torque request must be feasible):

$$x(k) \in \left[ x_{\min}, x_{\max} \right] \tag{31}$$

282

$$T_{ICE}(k) \in \left[T_{ICE,min}(n_{ICE}), T_{ICE,max}(n_{ICE})\right]$$
(32)

283

284

where 
$$x_{min} \in [p_{MIN 1}, ..., p_{MIN i}, ..., p_{MIN N}]$$
 bar (depending on the accumulator design),  $x_{max} = 4 \cdot x_{min}$  and

285 minimum/maximum engine torques  $T_{ICE,min/max}$  are correlated to the instantaneous ICE speed ( $n_{ICE}$ ).

The objective of the optimization is the minimization of the J cost corresponding to the fuel consumption during the working cycle:

$$J_{\pi}(x_0) = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} y(k) \cdot \Delta t$$
(33)

Where  $x_0 = x(p_{MIN i})$  is the initial accumulator pressure, chosen equal to  $x_{min}$ , and  $\pi = \{\vec{u_0}, \vec{u_1}, ..., \vec{u_N}\}$  is the generic control policy adopted on the valve controlling the energy storage. No additional terms are introduced regarding accumulator final state  $x_f = x(N)$ .

For the various proposed layouts and for the every combination of the bladder accumulator parameters (volume, initial pressure), the objective of the optimization is the determination of the optimal control policy  $\pi^*$  minimizing fuel consumption:

$$\pi^* = \arg \min_{\pi} J_{\pi}(x_0) \tag{34}$$

296 The corresponding cost  $J^* = J_{\pi^*}(x_0)$  would be used in the comparison of different system layouts and pressure 297 accumulator sizing.

298

#### **3.1 DP algorithm**

300 The evaluation of the optimal control policy is carried out by means of a DP algorithm which exploits Bellman principle 301 of optimality [13] stating that an optimal policy has the property that whatever the initial state and initial decision are, 302 the remaining decisions must constitute an optimal policy with regard to the state resulting from the first decision, 303 which is equal to say that, given an optimal control policy  $\pi^* = \{ \overrightarrow{u_0}, ..., \overrightarrow{u_l}, ..., \overrightarrow{u_N} \}$ , for the optimization problem  $min_{\pi} J_{\pi}(x_0)$ , the truncated policy  $\pi^*_{K} = \{\overrightarrow{u_k}, \overrightarrow{u_{k+1}}, \dots, \overrightarrow{u_{k+\nu}}, \dots, \overrightarrow{u_N}\}$  with k > 1 is still optimal for the "tail sub-304 305 problem"  $min_{\pi} J_{\pi}(x_k)$ . Thus, the principle of optimality suggests that an optimal policy can be constructed in 306 piecemeal fashion, first constructing an optimal policy for the "tail sub-problem" involving the last stage, then 307 extending the optimal policy to the "tail sub-problem" involving the last two stages, and continuing in this manner 308 backward until an optimal policy for the entire problem is constructed.

The implementation of the DP algorithm to the excavator model is done by means of a Matlab<sup>®</sup> function developed by
[23].

311

# 312 4. Hydraulic Hybrid Excavator Layouts

#### 313 4.1 Proposed Hybrid Layouts

In this section the investigated hydraulic hybrid layouts of the excavator under study are presented. Although many different combinations of solution could be in general proposed and investigated for excavators, in this paper only energy recovery from boom and turret have been considered. The proposed layouts features are reported in Tab.1. The actuators involved in energy recovery and the numbers of energy storage devices (bladder accumulators) are stated for each case.

CIRCUIT LAYOUT	ACTUATOR(S)	NUMBER OF ACCUMULATOR(S)
А	Boom	1
В	Turret	1
С	Boom - Turret	1
D	Boom - Turret	2

Tab.1. Considered Layouts for the Hybrid System.

319

320 The ISO schemes of the proposed layouts of Tab.1 are shown in Figs. 19 - 22. The travel motors and the relative flow 321 control valve sections have not been reported for simplicity because the layouts do not involve those users for energy 322 recovery. A common component for each of the layouts is a fixed displacement external gear hydraulic motor, installed 323 to reuse the energy stored during the accumulation phases. The hybrid configurations exploiting boom lowering are also 324 equipped with a variable flow control orifice (VCO), placed between the hydraulic actuator and the accumulator, which 325 prevents cavitation into the actuator rod side and maintains control on the user velocity during the energy recovery 326 phase. The VCO spool displacement is proportional and synchronized with the main spool displacement of the boom 327 valve section. The proposed optimization methodology, based on the DP algorithm, has been exploited to define the 328 optimal control laws for the introduced components (i.e. recovery and reuse valves) in the presented hybrid layouts. The 329 recovery and reuse valves opening are assumed to be ON/OFF. Considering the solution A, Fig.19, the control laws  $(u_1, v_2)$ 330 u<sub>2</sub>) govern the opening of the corresponding valves, enabling or avoiding energy storage and/or recovery. For solution 331 B, Fig.20, concerning the swing deceleration phases, the DP algorithm has been only used to define the recovery control 332 law (u<sub>1</sub>) which enables the energy reuse only, since the energy recovery phases are directly dependent by the user main 333 valve spool positioning ( $f(x_{TURRET})$ ). Solutions C and D, Figs. 21 – 22, are a combination of the solutions A and B, and 334 for each of them the DP algorithm has been used to define  $(u_1)$ ,  $(u_2)$  and  $(u_1)$ ,  $(u_2)$ ,  $(u_3)$ ,  $(u_4)$  respectively.





Fig.19. ISO Scheme of the Hybrid Layout A.









Fig.21. ISO Scheme of the Hybrid Layout C.





Fig.22. ISO Scheme of the Hybrid Layout D.

- 345 On the basis of the inverse causality model of the standard excavator, the inverse causality models of the proposed
- 346 hybrid layouts under investigation were defined. As examples Figs. 23 24 depict the inverse causality models of the
- 347 hybrid layouts A and B; layouts C and D are a combination of these.
- 348



350

Fig.23. Inverse Causality Scheme of the Hybrid Layout A.

351



Fig.24. Inverse Causality Scheme of the Hybrid Layout B.

#### 354 4.2 Hybrid Layouts Optimal Sizing

To perform a comprehensive comparison in order to define the solution which enables the best fuel saving performance, the different proposed hybrid layouts have to be compared in their optimal configuration. This means that the components introduced into the hybrid layouts have to be optimally sized.

The optimization target is that of minimize the fuel consumption during the performed working cycle. As for an excavator the digging and loading movement are the most important phases during the typical working hour defined in [16], this sub-cycle has been selected for the components optimization procedure.

- The parameters of interest for the optimal dimensioning procedure are the accumulator minimum working pressure  $(p_{MIN})$  and the accumulator volume ( $V_0$ ) for all the proposed hybrid layouts. When the energy recovery from the boom is also an option, the equivalent diameter ( $d_{EO}$ ) of the VCO is an additional parameter to be optimally sized.
- 364 The dimensioning procedure has been done through a DoE (Design of Experiment) methodology, where a discrete grid 365 of possible values for the parameters of interest has been defined in order to explore the different parameter 366 combination still maintaining a reliable functioning of the system and the components. The variation ranges of the parameters involved in the optimization are:  $p_{MIN} \in [10; 50]$  bar with an increasing step of 5 bar for the layout A and 367 368  $p_{MIN} \in [10; 100]$  bar with an increasing step of 10 bar for the layout B;  $V_0 \in [2.5, 4, 5, 6, 10]$  L according with the 369 available accumulators;  $d_{EQ} \in [1; 8]$  mm with an increasing step of 0.5 mm (only for layout A, C, D). For each hybrid 370 layout and for each possible parameter combination the DP algorithm defines the optimal control strategy for governing 371 the recovery and reuse valves.
- 372

#### 373 5. Hybrid Layout Comparison

374 This section present the results of the optimization performed with the aim of define the optimal combination of the 375 accumulator minimum pressure, accumulator volume and the equivalent diameter of the VCO of the boom (only for the 376 layouts that involve the energy recovery from it) as previously stated. The optimization has been performed for the 377 digging and loading motion defined in [16]. Sections 5.1 and 5.2 report the results concerning layouts A and B 378 respectively, while results about layouts C and D have not been reported for brevity. Finally once defined the optimal 379 sizing of the components of interest the complete JCMAS working cycle has been performed for all the proposed 380 layouts. The final results are reported in section 5.3 where a quantitative comparison based on fuel consumption is 381 presented. The fuel saving percentages are referred to the standard layout fuel consumption.

# 383 5.1 DP Results: Layout A

Figures 25 – 29 report some of the results obtained through the DoE methodology presented in section 4.2 and applied to the layout A. Being the energy recovery from the boom considered in this configuration, the sizing procedure involves the accumulator minimum pressure  $(p_{MIN})$ , the accumulator volume  $(V_0)$  and the equivalent diameter of the VCO  $(d_{EQ})$ . The reported charts represent the fuel saving percentage, referring to the standard layout, during the digging and loading motion defined in [16] at different accumulator minimum pressure levels.





**Fig. 25**. Layout A Fuel Saving Percentage  $[p_{MIN} = 10 \text{ bar}]$ .







**Fig. 26**. Layout A Fuel Saving Percentage  $[p_{MIN} = 20 \text{ bar}]$ .





394

Fig. 27. Layout A Fuel Saving Percentage  $[p_{MIN} = 30 \text{ bar}]$ .







Fig. 29. Layout A Fuel Saving Percentage  $[p_{MIN} = 50 \text{ bar}]$ .

400 As can be observed from the Figs. 25 - 29, for each combination of the considered parameters is possible to define a 401 maximum percentage of fuel saving. Comparing the overall results obtained for the layout A, the best parameters 402 combination which achieves the overall maximum fuel saving percentage could be identified: minimum accumulator working pressure  $p_{MIN} = 45 \text{ bar}$ , accumulator volume  $V_0 = 10 L$ ; VCO equivalent diameter  $d_{EQ} = 6.5 \text{ mm}$ . This 403 404 parameter setting define the layout A best configuration while the DP optimal control laws (u1, u2) are applied 405 governing the opening of the corresponding valves of Fig. 19 defining the instantaneous accumulator pressure. Figure 406 30 reports the layout A optimal control laws and the correspondent accumulator pressure during a complete digging 407 cycle (five sequential repetitions), while Fig.31 shows an intermediate digging cycle for a better understanding of the 408 optimal control laws.









Fig. 32. Layout B Fuel Saving Percentage Chart.

Figure 33 reports the optimal control law, associated to the optimal accumulator sizing parameter, governing the reuse valve opening  $(u_1)$  and the correspondent accumulator pressure  $(p_{ACC})$ , referring to Fig. 24 layout, during the digging and loading cycle performed.







429 5.3 Layout Comparison

Once defined the optimal sizing parameters for the accumulator and for the VCO (where required), for each proposed hybrid layout, it is possible to evaluate the fuel consumption over the complete working cycle defined in [*16*], with reference to the baseline configuration (i.e., the original configuration), thus obtaining the percentage reduction in fuel consumption per working hour. This final procedure makes possible to compare in a comprehensive manner the proposed hybrid layout in their optimal configuration. Table 2 summarizes the overall fuel saving percentages.

Tab.2. Percentage of fuel savings from the baseline for the considered Hybrid Circuit

Layouts.								
CIRCUIT LAYOUT	ACTUATOR(S)	NUMBER OF ACCUMULATOR(S)	FUEL SAVED					
А	Boom	1	10 - 11 %					
В	Turret	1	2-3%					
С	Boom - Turret	1	11 – 12 %					
D	Boom - Turret	2	13 - 14 %					

Optimizations A and B yields an optimal accumulator size of respectively 10 L (energy recovery from boom lowering), and 2.5 L (energy recovery from turret swing). As the two values are very different, when using a single common accumulator for the two energy recovery tasks (layout C) the sizing of the accumulator is somehow a compromise between the two and the resulting fuel consumption reduction is lower than what can be achieved in design D where the two accumulators allow for a better exploitation of the available energy.

441

## 442 **6.** Conclusion

A hybridization comparison methodology based on DP algorithm has been presented in detail in this paper. The methodology require some essential steps in order to be exploited: 1, the definition and the validation of the inverse causality mathematical model for the considered system; 2, the definition of a reference working cycle, 3, the definition of the different hybrid layout to be investigated and compared; 4, the definition of the solution of the control optimization problem through a DP algorithm (for each proposed layout); 5, a DoE based optimization of the additional components sizing.

The presented methodology defines for each proposed hybrid layout both the optimal components size and the optimal control strategy. The optimal control strategy defined represents only a benchmark for a further definition of online control strategies.

This hybridization comparison methodology has been successfully applied to a middle size hydraulic excavator as a baseline example. The machinery hydraulic system mathematical model has been realized and validated in both direct and inverse causality. Several different hybrid layouts of the excavator under study have been proposed and compared by means of the presented hybridization methodology.

456 On the basis of the obtained results on the JCMAS working cycle for this machine size, it is understood that energy457 recovery from the boom is far more effective then energy recovery from the turret.

458 Finally, this approach permits to obtain the best components sizing combination for the hybrid layouts considered, an 459 optimal control policy for each layout, and allows to choose the hybrid layout configuration able to yield the highest 460 fuel saving percentage with reference to the standard configuration.

Future works, based on the presented methodology, will concern the development of algorithms for the definition and the implementation of online control strategy starting from the defined optimal control strategy of the selected hybrid layout.

# 465 **References**

- J. Zimmermann, M. Ivantysynova.. Reduction of Engine and Cooling Power by displacement Control. Proc. of 6<sup>th</sup>
   FPNI-PhD Symp. (2010) West Lafayette, USA.
- 468
  2. M. Inderelst, S. Losse, S. Sgro, H. Murrenhoff. Energy efficient system layout for work hydraulic of excavators.
  2011. The twelfth Scandinavian International Conference on Fluid Power.
- 470 3. A. Gambarotta, P. Casoli, N. Pompini, L. Riccò (2014) .Co-simulation and control-orientated modeling in the development of a hydraulic hybrid system", 14th Stuttgart International Symposium "Automotive and Engine Technology" Stoccarda (D) 18-19 Marzo 2014.
- 4. P. Casoli, A. Gambarotta N. Pompini, L. Riccò (2015) "Coupling excavator hydraulic system and internal combustion engine models for the Real-Time simulation" Control Engineering Practice (2015), pp. 26-37 DOI information: 10.1016/j.conengprac.2015.04.003.
- 476 5. R. Finzel, S.Helduser. Energy-Efficient Electro-Hydraulic Control Systems for Mobile Machinery/ Flow Matching, 6<sup>th</sup> IFK, Dresden, Germany, 2008.
- 478 6. Y.L. Cho, D.S. Jang, K.Y. Kim. Development of Energy Efficient Electro-Hydraulic System for Excavator. 7<sup>th</sup>
  479 IFK, Aachen 2010.
- C. Musardo, G. Rizzoni, Y. Guezennec, B. Staccia. A\_ECMS: An adaptive algorithm for hybrid electric vehicle
   energy management. European Journal of Control (2005) 11: 509-524.
- 482 8. Q. Xiao, Q. Wang, Y. Zhang. Control strategy of power system in hybrid hydraulic excavator. Automation in construction 17 (2008) 361-367. doi: 10.1016/j.autcon.2007.05.014.
- 484
  9. D. Wang, C. Guan, S. Pan, M. Zhang, X. Lin. Performance analysis of hydraulic excavator powertrain hybridization. Automation in construction 18 (2009) 249-257. doi: 10.1016/j.autcon.2008.10.001.
- T. Lin, Q. Wang, B. Hu, W. Gong. Research on the energy regeneration systems for hybrid hydraulic excavators.
   Automation in construction 19 (2010)1016-1026. doi: 10.1016/j.autcon.2010.08.002.
- 11. T. Wang, Q. Wang, T. Lin. Improvement of boom control performance for hybrid hydraulic excavator with
  potential energy recovery. Automation in construction 30 (2013) 161-169.
  http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2012.11.034.
- 491
  12. M. Erkkila, F. Bauer, D. Feld. Universal energy storage and recovery system A novel approach for hydraulic hybrid. The 13<sup>th</sup> Scandinavian International Conference on Fluid Power, SICFP2013, June 3-5, 2013, Linkoping, Sweden. ISBN 978-91-7519-572-8.
- 494 13. R.E. Bellman. 1957. Dynamic Programming. Princeton University Press, NJ, USA.
- 495 14. B.C. Chen, Y.Y. Wu, H.C. Tsai. Design and analysis of power management strategy for range extend electric
  496 vehicle using dynamic programming. Applied energy 113(2014)1764-1774.
  497 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.08.018.
- 498 15. M. Sprengel and M. Ivantysynova. Investigation and Energetic Analysis of a novel Hydraulic Hybrid Architecture 499 for On-Road Vehicles. The 13<sup>th</sup> Scandinavian International Conference on Fluid Power, SICFP2013, June 3-5, 2013, Linkoping, Sweden. ISBN 978-91-7519-572-8.
- 501 16. JCMAS H020:2007. Earth-moving machinery Fuel consumption on hydraulic excavator Test Procedure.
- 502 17. M. Inderelst. Energy improvements in mobile hydraulic systems. Reihe Fluidtechnik. RWTH Aachen University.
   503 ISBN: 978-3-8440-1726-7.
- 18. P. Casoli, A. Anthony, M. Rigosi (2011) "Modeling of an Excavator System Semi empirical hydraulic pump model" SAE - International Journal of Commercial Vehicles October 2011 vol. 4, Issue 1, pp. 242- 255. ISSN: 1946-391X. doi:10.4271/2011-01-2278. Scopus code: 2-s2.0-84859342015.
- 507 19. P. Casoli, N. Pompini, L. Riccò. Simulation of an Excavator Hydraulic System Using Nonlinear Mathematical
   508 Models. Journal of Mechanical Engineering (ISSN: 00392480). Under Review.
- 20. P. Casoli, L. Riccò, C. Dolcin. Modeling and verification of an excavator system –Axial Piston Pump, Kinematics
  and Load Sensing Flow Sharing Valve Block. Proceeding of the 13th Scandinavian International Conference on
  Fluid Power, June 3-5, 2013, Linköping, Sweden. http://dx.doi.org/10.3384/ecp1392. ISBN (print): 978-91-7519572-8.
- 513 21. P. Casoli, L. Riccò, F. Campanini, A. Lettini, C. Dolcin (2015) "Mathematical Model of a Hydraulic Excavator for fuel Consumption Predictions" ASME/BATH 2015 Symposium on Fluid Power & Motion Control. Chicago, Illinois, USA, 12-14 October 2015. FPMC2015-9566.
- 22. P. Casoli, A. Gambarotta, N. Pompini, L. Riccò (2014). Development and application of co-simulation and controloriented modeling in the improvement of performance and energy saving of mobile machinery., Energy Procedia, Volume 45, 2014, Pages 849–858. Elsevier. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2014.01.090. Codice Scopus: 2s2.0-84893640233.
- 520 23. O. Sundstrom, L. Guzzella, "A Generic Dynamic Programming Matlab Function", In Proceedings of the 18th IEEE
   521 International Conference on Control Applications, pp. 1625-1630, Saint Petersburg, Russia, 2009.

Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_25.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_26.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_27.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_28.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_29.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_31.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_32.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_33.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_30.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_9.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_10.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_11.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_12.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_13.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_14.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_15.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_16.fig Supplementary MATLAB .fig files Click here to download Supplementary MATLAB .fig files: Figure\_18.fig