

# Velocity-free task-space regulator for robot manipulators with external disturbances <sup>★</sup>

Haiwen Wu <sup>a</sup>, Bayu Jayawardhana <sup>b</sup>, Dabo Xu <sup>c,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mechanical and Automation Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China*

<sup>b</sup>*Engineering and Technology Institute Groningen, Faculty of Science and Engineering, University of Groningen, Groningen 9747 AG, the Netherlands*

<sup>c</sup>*Shien-Ming Wu School of Intelligent Engineering, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 511442, China*

---

## Abstract

This paper addresses the problem of task-space robust regulation of robot manipulators subject to external disturbances. A velocity-free control law is proposed by combining the internal model principle and the passivity-based output-feedback control approach. The developed output-feedback controller ensures not only asymptotic convergence of the regulation error but also suppression of unwanted external step/sinusoidal disturbances. The potential of the proposed method lies in its simplicity, intuitively appealing, and simple gain selection criteria for synthesis of multi-joint robot manipulator control systems.

*Key words:* Output regulation, internal model principle, disturbance rejection, passivity-based control.

---

## 1 Introduction

Control of multi-joint robotic systems has been an active research area in both robotics and control communities for over three decades. Among various challenges, an interesting topic involves effectively mitigating external disturbances and/or measurement noises to achieve high precision control performance. From ubiquitous mechanical control applications, they often have to deal with the situations where the disturbances to reject are sinusoidal or periodic signals due to rotational elements such as motors and vibratory components [30, 36]. The presence of such disturbances motivates the use of internal model principle [12], which establishes that regulation can be achieved only if the feedback controller incorporates an augmented system that is a copy of the exogenous system responsible for generating the sinusoidal disturbances.

The internal model principle was fully studied for linear system in the seminal works [9, 12] and then generalized to solve the nonlinear output regulation problem [6, 10, 15, 16, 29]. We refer to [4] for a comprehensive recent survey in this subject. In recent years, the idea of internal model has been employed to control Euler-Lagrange systems subject to sinusoidal external disturbances. Several linear internal model-based controllers were proposed in [8, 10, 18, 32], assuming prior knowledge of the frequencies of external disturbances. To cope with unknown frequencies in disturbances, adaptive internal model-based controllers were proposed in [14, 25] and a nonlinear internal model-based controller was developed in [34] for online estimation the unknown frequencies.

A summary of the aforementioned literature is that the design of the controller usually assumes availability of the velocity (or velocity error) measurements. In fact, modern position sensors such as encoders and cameras are able to provide low-noise and high-accuracy measurements of incremental joint angles and end-effector displacements, respectively. On the contrary, velocity measurements (or time-derivative approximation) increase cost and are often subject to significant noise contamination. To further remedy the impact of noise in velocity measurements, there are mainly two classes of approaches. The first one is centered around making com-

---

<sup>★</sup> The work was supported in part by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 62073168, in part by the NXTGEN High-Tech program on Autonomous Factory, and in part by the InnoHK Clusters of the Hong Kong SAR Government via the Hong Kong Centre for Logistics Robotics.

\* Corresponding author.

*Email addresses:* haiwenwu@cuhk.edu.hk (Haiwen Wu), b.jayawardhana@rug.nl (Bayu Jayawardhana), dxu@scut.edu.cn (Dabo Xu).

pensations to counteract the effect of velocity noise, assuming that the noise can be modeled, for instance, as harmonic signals as explored in [5]. A notable result in this direction is proposed [36], where two groups of internal models are introduced for Euler-Lagrange system to make compensation for harmonic disturbances present in the input and the velocity measurements, respectively. The second approach aims to circumvent the use velocity measurements and instead focuses on developing controllers by employing velocity observers (e.g., [1]) or filters (e.g., [2, 20]). The present study specifically concentrates on the latter approach.

To avoid the use of joint velocities in robot manipulators, many efforts have been made towards velocity estimation. Among various approaches, special attention has been given to the globally convergent observer proposed in [3]. This observer relies on the construction of global change of coordinates to transform the Euler-Lagrange equation into a (partially) linearized form. However, finding such transformations for general Euler-Lagrange systems presents challenges, and as of now, these transformations are only known to exist for limited systems, as demonstrated in [3] for 1-DOF systems and see [35] for two-link revolute robot manipulators. In general, global stabilization or regulation is challenging for Euler-Lagrange systems, although it is a subclass of strict-feedback systems, see [1, 26] for pioneering studies toward global output feedback control of strict-feedback nonlinear systems. Toward global output feedback control of Euler-Lagrange systems, the independent papers [2] and [20] are pioneering works that first proposed filter-type linear dynamic compensators to solve this open problem. Since then, these methods has been extensively used both in practice and in the literature, see, e.g., [11, 13, 22, 24, 28].

A primary research interest of the present study is to investigate an asymptotic task-space regulation with disturbance rejection without using velocity measurements. We shall develop a filter-based approach which integrates the ideas of internal model principle and passivity-based output-feedback techniques. It exploits the properties of nonlinear terms, rather than dominating them by functions with certain growth as often seen in conventional studies. Moreover, an interesting feature of the proposed result is that the stabilization component in the regulator is independent of the boundaries of the external disturbances, thereby simplifying the selection of controller gain design parameters. In summary, the main contribution of the present study is to develop an internal model-based velocity-free control law, leading to asymptotic convergence of the regulation error and meanwhile the complete rejection of external disturbances.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the kinematics and dynamics of the manipulator and formulates the problem. Section 3 presents

a full-state feedback disturbance rejection controller as a motivational design. Section 4 presents the main result of the present study. Simulation results are given in Section 5. Section 6 closes this technical note. *Notation:*  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space.  $\|\cdot\|$  is the Euclidean norm.  $\sigma(A)$  denotes the spectrum of matrix  $A$ . For a matrix  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ ,  $B^T$  denotes its transpose.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Mathematical model of robotic systems

Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be the task-space (e.g., Cartesian space) vector of a rigid robot manipulator, and it is described as a nonlinear function of the joint variable  $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$  as follows [7]

$$x = f(q) \quad (1)$$

whose time derivative gives the velocity kinematics

$$\dot{x} = J(q)\dot{q}, \quad J(q) := \partial f(q)/\partial q \quad (2)$$

where  $\dot{q} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the joint velocity vector, and  $J(q) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is the Jacobian matrix. The dynamic equation of a rigid  $n$ -link manipulator is given by

$$H(q)\ddot{q} + C(q, \dot{q})\dot{q} + g(q) = u + d \quad (3)$$

where  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the joint control torque vector,  $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the external disturbance,  $H(q) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is the inertia matrix,  $C(q, \dot{q}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is the Coriolis and centrifugal force matrix-valued function, and  $g(q) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the gravitational torque.

As in [27], we list two properties of robot dynamics (3):

*Property 1.*  $H(q)$  is uniformly positive definite; and

*Property 2.*  $\dot{H}(q, \dot{q}) - 2C(q, \dot{q})$  is skew-symmetric where  $\dot{H}(q, \dot{q}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i} \dot{q}_i$ .

In the present study, we consider disturbance  $d$  generated by the following system

$$\dot{w} = s(w), \quad d = \varphi(w, q) \quad (4)$$

where  $w$  is the state of the exosystem with appropriate dimension. As will be detailed later in Remark 1, system (4) can describe input disturbance torques as well as external forces at end-effector.

### 2.2 Problem formulation

Combining (1), (3) and (4), we can write the composite system in state-space representation

$$\dot{w} = s(w) \quad (5a)$$

$$\dot{q} = \xi \quad (5b)$$

$$H(q)\dot{\xi} = -C(q, \xi)\xi - g(q) + u + \varphi(w, q) \quad (5c)$$

$$e = f(q) - x_d \quad (5d)$$

where  $\xi := \dot{q}$ ,  $x_d$  is the constant desired position, and  $e$  is the regulated output.

In this paper, two classes of feedback control schemes will be considered, namely full-state feedback control and velocity-free control. The former serves as a foundational design, laying the groundwork for the later main contribution.

**Problem 1** Consider the composite system (5).

**Q1** If the joint velocity  $\xi$  is available, design a smooth controller of the form

$$u = h_c(x_c, e, q, \xi), \quad \dot{x}_c = f_c(x_c, e, q, \xi), \quad (6)$$

or,

**Q2** if only the relative end-effector position and the joint position measurements, namely  $(e, q)$ , are available, design a smooth controller of the form

$$u = h_c(x_c, e, q), \quad \dot{x}_c = f_c(x_c, e, q), \quad (7)$$

where  $x_c$  is the state of dynamic compensator of appropriate dimension, such that  $e(t) \rightarrow 0$  and  $\xi(t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

We investigate the problem under the following assumption.

**Assumption 1** For the exosystem (4), we assume that:  
i) the exosystem is linear, i.e.,

$$s(w) = Sw \quad (8)$$

for some matrix  $S \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$  whose eigenvalues are distinct and lie on the imaginary axis, and  $S$  is nonsingular; and  
ii)  $\varphi(w, q)$  can be decomposed as

$$\varphi(w, q) = D_1 w + J^T(q) D_2 w \quad (9)$$

where  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  are matrices of appropriate dimension.

**Remark 1** By (9), the external disturbances under consideration can be decomposed as

$$d = d_1 + J^T(q) d_2 \quad \text{with} \quad d_1 = D_1 w, \quad d_2 = D_2 w \quad (10)$$

where  $d_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  represents the input disturbance torques, typically stemming from actuators, and  $d_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  represents the external forces acting on the end-effector.

It should be noted that the system (8) of Assumption 1 is a linear harmonic oscillator. This implies that each  $j$ th component of  $d_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$  is a combination of a finite number of sinusoidal signals, i.e.,  $d_{ij}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_{ij}} F_{ijk} \sin(\sigma_{ijk} t + \Upsilon_{ijk}) + F_{ij0}$  for some

$N_{ij} \geq 0$  with unknown  $F_{ijk}$  and  $\Upsilon_{ijk}$ , and frequencies  $\sigma_{ijk}$  taken from the set of the eigenvalues of  $S$ . The unknown coefficients  $F_{ijk}$  and  $\Upsilon_{ijk}$  are related to the unknown initial condition  $w(0)$ . On the other hand, in many electro-mechanical control systems, disturbances typically manifest as harmonic or periodic signals, primarily resulting from the dynamic behavior of rotational elements such as electric motors, gearboxes, and various mechanical systems with vibrations (see, e.g., [30, 36]). It is well known from the Fourier analysis that any continuous periodic signal can be approximated with a truncated Fourier series. Therefore, if the disturbance signals  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  are periodic and can be expanded or approximated by a combination of a finite number of sinusoidal signals, they satisfy Assumption 1. In the literature, the rejection of such sinusoidal disturbances has been widely studied in the control of Euler-Lagrange systems [25, 34] and consensus of multiple Euler-Lagrange systems [31].

### 2.3 Passivity of transpose Jacobian feedback control

An important property of the robot manipulator is that it exhibits passivity properties in both joint and task spaces.<sup>1</sup>

**Proposition 1** Consider system (1), (2) and (3) with Properties 1 and 2. Suppose that  $d = 0$ . Then the following properties hold:

**P1** System (1), (2) and (3) with control input

$$u = -kJ^T(q)x + v + g(q), \quad k > 0 \quad (11)$$

is passive with input  $v$  and output  $\dot{q}$ .

**P2** System (1), (2) and (3) with control input

$$u = -kJ^T(q)x + J^T(q)F + g(q), \quad k > 0 \quad (12)$$

is passive with input  $F$  and output  $\dot{x}$ .




Fig. 1. Passivity interpretation of the controllers in Proposition 1.

<sup>1</sup> For the definition of passivity, we refer to [21, Chapter 6].

**Proof.** Define a storage function  $V_1 = \frac{1}{2}x^T kx + \frac{1}{2}\dot{q}^T H(q)\dot{q}$ . Differentiation along the trajectories of (2), (3), (11) yields  $\dot{V}_1 = \dot{q}^T v$ , which implies that the system is passive with input  $v$  and output  $\dot{q}$ .

Further differentiating  $V_1$  along the trajectories of (2), (3), (12) yields  $\dot{V}_1 = \dot{q}^T J^T(q)F = [J(q)\dot{q}]^T F = \dot{x}^T F$ , which implies that the system is passive with input  $F$  and output  $\dot{x}$ .  $\square$

The proof shows that the system (2), (3) and (11) (or (12)) is also lossless [21]. Figure Fig. 1 illustrates the closed-loop passive (lossless) mappings. Note that the effect of the external disturbances is not given in Proposition 1. In the following, we will use these passivity properties to study interactions with external disturbances as well as internal model-based dynamic compensators.

### 3 Full-state feedback control

This section introduces a solution to problem **Q1** as the first design step. Subsequently, in the next section, we will focus on addressing problem **Q2**. The methodology used in this section follows closely the one in [18] and uses the passivity properties described in the previous section. In particular, inspired by the internal model principle, a pair of internal model candidates are employed to make compensation for the two external disturbances in (10), respectively.

- 1) To counteract the effect of  $d_1$ , we introduce an internal model of the following form

$$\dot{\eta}_1 = A_1\eta_1 - B_1\xi, \quad \hat{d}_1 = B_1^T\eta_1 \quad (13)$$

with state  $\eta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell_1}$ .

- 2) To counteract the effect of  $d_2$  at the end-effector, we introduce an internal model of the following form

$$\dot{\eta}_2 = A_2\eta_2 - B_2J(q)\xi, \quad \hat{d}_2 = B_2^T\eta_2 \quad (14)$$

with state  $\eta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell_2}$ . Since  $\dot{x} = J(q)\xi$ , internal model (14) can be written as  $\dot{\eta}_2 = A_2\eta_2 - B_2\dot{x}$ , which is driven by  $\dot{x}$ .

In (13) and (14), we designed two internal models for counteracting the external disturbances. By interconnecting these internal models and the exosystem appropriately as in Figure Fig. 2, the resulting system has a passivity (lossless) property if the design parameters  $(A_i, B_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$  are chosen such that the following condition holds.

**Assumption 2** For each  $i = 1, 2$ , there exists a matrix  $\Sigma_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell_i \times p}$  such that

$$\Sigma_i S = A_i \Sigma_i, \quad B_i^T \Sigma_i + D_i = 0. \quad (15)$$




Fig. 2. Modules of exosystem and internal models (13) and (14) in closed-loop system block diagram.

Moreover,  $(A_i, B_i^T)$  is observable, and  $A_i$  is skew-symmetric and nonsingular.

Define error variables  $\tilde{\eta}_i = \eta_i - \Sigma_i w$ ,  $\tilde{d}_i = d_i + \hat{d}_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $\tilde{d} = \tilde{d}_1 + J^T(q)\tilde{d}_2$ . Then, under Assumption 2,

$$\dot{\tilde{\eta}}_1 = A_1\tilde{\eta}_1 - B_1\xi, \quad \dot{\tilde{\eta}}_2 = A_2\tilde{\eta}_2 - B_2J(q)\xi \quad (16)$$

and  $\tilde{d} = B_1^T\tilde{\eta}_1 + J^T(q)B_2^T\tilde{\eta}_2$ . With the storage function  $V_2 = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\eta}_1^T\tilde{\eta}_1 + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\eta}_2^T\tilde{\eta}_2$ , it can be verified that the error system (16) is lossless with input  $\xi$  and output  $\tilde{d}$ .

Based on the aforementioned passivity analysis, we propose a full-state feedback controller for **Q1** in the following proposition.

**Proposition 2** Consider the system (5) under Assumptions 1 and 2, and feedback-interconnected with the controller

$$\dot{\eta}_1 = A_1\eta_1 - B_1\xi \quad (17a)$$

$$\dot{\eta}_2 = A_2\eta_2 - B_2J(q)\xi \quad (17b)$$

$$u = -k_p J^T(q)e - k_d \xi + g(q) + B_1^T \eta_1 + J^T(q)B_2^T \eta_2 \quad (17c)$$

where  $k_p, k_d > 0$ . Then, for a finite task space in which the Jacobian matrix  $J(q)$  has full rank, the regulation error and velocity asymptotically converges to zero as time  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e.,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e(t) = 0$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \xi(t) = 0$ .

**Proof.** By Assumption 2, there exist matrices  $\Sigma_1$  and

$\Sigma_2$  such that the equations in (15) hold. Denote

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} D_1 \\ D_2 \end{bmatrix}, \Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_1 \\ \Sigma_2 \end{bmatrix}, \Gamma(q) = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ J(q) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & 0 \\ 0 & B_2 \end{bmatrix}, \eta = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

Using (18), the closed-loop system (5) and (17) under the coordinate transformation  $\bar{\eta} = \eta - \Sigma w$  can be written as

$$\dot{\bar{\eta}} = A\bar{\eta} - B\Gamma(q)\xi \quad (19a)$$

$$\dot{q} = \xi \quad (19b)$$

$$H(q)\dot{\xi} = -k_p J^\top(q)e - k_d \xi - C(q, \xi)\xi + \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top \bar{\eta} \quad (19c)$$

in which  $\Gamma^\top(q)B^\top \Sigma w + \Gamma^\top(q)Dw$  has been cancelled by (15).

Define a Lyapunov function candidate  $V := V(\bar{\eta}, q, \xi)$  by  $V = \frac{1}{2}(f(q) - x_d)^\top k_p (f(q) - x_d) + \frac{1}{2}\xi^\top H(q)\xi + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\eta}^\top \bar{\eta}$  whose time derivative, along the trajectories of (19), satisfies

$$\dot{V} = e^\top k_p J(q)\xi + \xi^\top [-k_p J^\top(q)e - k_d \xi + \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top \bar{\eta}] + \bar{\eta}^\top (A\bar{\eta} - B\Gamma(q)\xi) = -\xi^\top k_d \xi.$$

Since  $\dot{V} \leq 0$  and  $V \geq 0$ ,  $V$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . Hence,  $(\bar{\eta}(t), e(t), \xi(t))$  are all bounded over the time interval  $[0, \infty)$ .

In the following, we will apply LaSalle's invariance theorem [21, Theorem 4.4] to establish the asymptotic stability of invariant set. To this end, we need to find the largest invariant set in  $\{(\bar{\eta}, q, \xi) : \dot{V} = 0\} = \{(\bar{\eta}, q, \xi) : \xi = 0\}$ . Substituting  $\xi = 0$  into (19) gives

$$\dot{\bar{\eta}} = A\bar{\eta} \quad (20a)$$

$$\dot{q} = 0 \quad (20b)$$

$$0 = -k_p J^\top(q)e + \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top \bar{\eta}. \quad (20c)$$

Differentiating (20c) with respect to  $t$ ,  $\ell$  times, where  $\ell = \ell_1 + \ell_2$ , and using  $\dot{J}(q) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial J}{\partial q_i} \xi_i = 0$  and  $\dot{e} = J(q)\xi = 0$  when  $\xi = 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top A\bar{\eta} \\ \vdots \\ 0 = \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top A^{\ell-1}\bar{\eta} \\ 0 = \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top A^\ell \bar{\eta} \end{cases} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} 0 = \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top (\alpha_{l-1}A)\bar{\eta} \\ \vdots \\ 0 = \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top (\alpha_1 A^{\ell-1})\bar{\eta} \\ 0 = \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top A^\ell \bar{\eta} \end{cases}$$

in which  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell$  are real numbers such that (by the Cayley-Hamilton theorem)  $A^\ell + \alpha_1 A^{\ell-1} + \dots +$

$\alpha_{l-1}A + \alpha_l I = 0$  and  $\alpha_l \neq 0$ . Hence,  $\alpha_l \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top \bar{\eta} = \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top (\alpha_l I)\bar{\eta} = \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top (-\alpha_{l-1}A - \dots - \alpha_1 A^{\ell-1} - A^\ell)\bar{\eta} = 0$ . It follows that  $\Gamma^\top(q)B^\top \bar{\eta} = 0$  holds in the invariant set. Substituting  $\Gamma^\top(q)B^\top \bar{\eta} = 0$  into (20) results in  $0 = -k_p J^\top(q)e$ . This means that  $e = 0$  as long as  $J(q)$  is full rank. Hence the largest invariant set in  $\{(\bar{\eta}, q, \xi) : \dot{V} = 0\}$  w.r.t. (19) is  $\Omega := \{(\bar{\eta}, q, \xi) : \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top \bar{\eta} = 0, e = 0, \xi = 0\}$ .

Finally, by LaSalle's invariance principle, we can conclude that the state trajectories  $(e, \xi)$  asymptotically converge to  $(0, 0)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

Notice that the proposed controller (17) is internal model-based and specifically incorporates a pair of parallel internal models. Assumption 2 asks for the existence of matrices  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  for the condition (15) to hold. This condition is assumed separately for  $i = 1, 2$  and is generally not necessary for achieving asymptotic regulation with disturbance rejection. Particularly, if  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  have the same spectrum, a combined form of this condition for  $i = 1, 2$  may also be effective. Conversely, if  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  have no common eigenvalues, and the two internal models are designed to counteract the effects of  $d_1$  and  $d_2$ , respectively, the condition (15) becomes necessary. To demonstrate this necessity property, let us focus on the invariant set  $\Omega' = \{(\eta, q, \xi) : e = 0, \xi = 0\}$ , where  $e = f(q) - x_d$ , within the closed-loop system consisting of (5) and (17). On the invariant set  $\Omega'$ ,

$$\dot{\eta} = A\eta \quad (21a)$$

$$\dot{q} = 0 \quad (21b)$$

$$0 = \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top \eta + \Gamma^\top(q)Dw. \quad (21c)$$

Differentiating (21c) with respect to  $t$ ,  $\ell - 1$  times, gives

$$\Phi_1 \eta + \Phi_2 w = 0 \quad (22)$$

$$\text{where } \Phi_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top \\ \vdots \\ \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top A^{\ell-1} \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \Phi_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma^\top(q)D \\ \vdots \\ \Gamma^\top(q)DS^{\ell-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

To proceed, we use an intermediate technical lemma whose proof is put in Appendix.

**Lemma 1** Consider  $n_i$ -dimensional  $q_i$ -output observable pairs  $(\mathbf{A}_i, \mathbf{C}_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Let  $\mathbf{T}$  be a  $q_1 \times q_2$  matrix of rank  $q_2$ . Denote

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{A}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{C} = [\mathbf{C}_1 \quad \mathbf{TC}_2].$$

If  $\sigma(\mathbf{A}_1) \cap \sigma(\mathbf{A}_2) = \emptyset$ , then  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C})$  is observable.

Suppose that  $\sigma(A_1) \cap \sigma(A_2) = \emptyset$ . Since  $(A_1, B_1^\top)$  and  $(A_2, B_2^\top)$  are observable, and  $J(q)$  has full rank, we can conclude from Lemma 1 that  $(A, \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top)$  is observable. Consequently,  $\Phi_1$  has full rank and  $\Phi_1^\top \Phi_1$  is invertible. Combining this with (22), we obtain

$$\eta(t) = \Sigma w(t) \quad \text{where} \quad \Sigma = -(\Phi_1^\top \Phi_1)^{-1} \Phi_1^\top \Phi_2. \quad (23)$$

On the set  $\Omega'$ , we have the following chain of implications

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\eta} &\stackrel{(21a)}{=} A\eta \stackrel{(23)}{=} A\Sigma w \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma \dot{w} \stackrel{(4),(8)}{=} \Sigma S w \\ \dot{\eta} &\stackrel{\Sigma w}{=} A\Sigma w = \Sigma S w \stackrel{(18)}{=} A_i \Sigma_i w = \Sigma_i S w, \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

By substituting  $\eta = \Sigma w$  into (21c), we obtain  $\Gamma^\top(q)B^\top \Sigma w + \Gamma^\top(q)Dw = 0$ . This implies that if the spectrum of  $A_1$  is different to that of  $A_2$  and the two internal models are designed to counteract the effects of  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  respectively, then

$$B_i^\top \Sigma_i w + D_i w = 0, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (25)$$

Since (24) and (25) hold for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $w(0)$  is such that all modes of the exosystem are excited, this implies that the equations in (15) hold for the closed-loop system (5) and (17) on the invariant set  $\Omega'$ .




Fig. 3. Modules of exosystem and internal model (26) in closed-loop system block diagram.

#### 4 Velocity-free control

This section is devoted to developing a velocity-free controller for solving **Q2**. To avoid using velocity measurements in the internal model dynamics, we propose to modify internal models (13) and (14), respectively, as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\zeta}_i &= A_i \zeta_i - B_i y_i, \quad y_1 = q, \quad y_2 = e \\ \dot{d}_i &= B_i^\top (A_i \zeta_i - B_i y_i) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ , with  $\zeta_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell_i}$  and  $A_i, B_i$  as in (13) and (14).

Similar to that in full-state feedback control, interconnecting internal models (26) and the exosystem as in Figure Fig. 3 gives rise to a system having lossless property for appropriate design parameters. To this end, let us define error variables  $\zeta_i = A_i \zeta_i - B_i y_i - \Sigma_i w$ ,  $\bar{d}_i = d_i + \dot{d}_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $\bar{d} = \bar{d}_1 + J^\top(q)\bar{d}_2$ . Then, under Assumption 2,

$$\dot{\bar{\zeta}}_1 = A_1 \bar{\zeta}_1 - B_1 \xi, \quad \dot{\bar{\zeta}}_2 = A_2 \bar{\zeta}_2 - B_2 J(q)\xi \quad (27)$$

and  $\bar{d} = B_1^\top \bar{\zeta}_1 + J^\top(q)B_2^\top \bar{\zeta}_2$ . With the storage function  $V_3 = \frac{1}{2} \bar{\zeta}_1^\top \bar{\zeta}_1 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\zeta}_2^\top \bar{\zeta}_2$ , it can be verified that the error system (27) is lossless with input  $\xi$  and output  $\bar{d}$ .

To eliminate the need for velocity measurements in the stabilization part, we introduce a filter-type dynamic compensator that uses its output as a substitute for joint velocity measurements. Although this approach, rooted in the seminal works of [2, 20], is commonly employed in the control of Euler-Lagrange systems, it remains essential to investigate whether the integration of the designed filter with the lossless internal model-based disturbance compensator will maintain stability and ensure the asymptotic convergence of regulation error. The main result of the present study is given as follows.

**Proposition 3** Consider the system (5) under Assumptions 1 and 2, and feedback-interconnected with the controller

$$\dot{\zeta}_1 = A_1 \zeta_1 - B_1 q \quad (28a)$$

$$\dot{\zeta}_2 = A_2 \zeta_2 - B_2 e \quad (28b)$$

$$\dot{\chi} = -h(\chi + hq) \quad (28c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} u &= -k_p J^\top(q)e - k_d(\chi + hq) + g(q) \\ &\quad + B_1^\top (A_1 \zeta_1 - B_1 q) + J^\top(q)B_2^\top (A_2 \zeta_2 - B_2 e) \end{aligned} \quad (28d)$$

where  $k_p, k_d > 0$ . Then, for a finite task space in which the Jacobian matrix  $J(q)$  has full rank, the regulation error and velocity asymptotically converges to zero as time  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e.,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e(t) = 0$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \xi(t) = 0$ .

**Proof.** By Assumption 2, there exist  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  satisfying (15). Define  $\zeta = [\zeta_1^\top, \zeta_2^\top]^\top$ . Applying the linear coordinate transformation  $\bar{\zeta} = A\zeta - B y - \Sigma w$  to the closed-loop system (5) and (28) gives

$$\dot{\bar{\zeta}} = A\bar{\zeta} - B\Gamma(q)\xi \quad (29a)$$

$$\dot{\chi} = -h(\chi + hq) \quad (29b)$$

$$\dot{q} = \xi \quad (29c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} H(q)\dot{\xi} &= -k_p J^\top(q)e - k_d(\chi + hq) \\ &\quad - C(q, \xi)\xi + \Gamma^\top(q)B^\top \bar{\zeta}. \end{aligned} \quad (29d)$$

Define  $\bar{V} := \bar{V}(\bar{\zeta}, \chi, q, \xi) = \frac{1}{2}\bar{\zeta}^T\bar{\zeta} + \frac{1}{2}k_d(\chi + hq)^T h^{-1}(\chi + hq) + \frac{1}{2}k_p(f(q) - x_d)^T(f(q) - x_d) + \frac{1}{2}\xi^T H(q)\xi$ . Its time derivative, along the trajectories of (29), satisfies  $\dot{\bar{V}} = -k_d(\chi + hq)^T(\chi + hq)$ . Since  $\dot{\bar{V}} \leq 0$  and  $\bar{V} \geq 0$ ,  $\bar{V}$  is bounded for all  $t \geq 0$ . Hence,  $(\bar{\zeta}(t), \dot{\chi}(t), e(t), \xi(t))$  are all bounded over the time interval  $[0, \infty)$ .

As before, LaSalle's invariance theorem can be applied to complete the proof. To find the largest invariance set in

$$\{(\bar{\zeta}, \chi, q, \xi) : \dot{\bar{V}} = 0\} \text{ or } \{(\bar{\zeta}, \chi, q, \xi) : \dot{\chi} = 0\} \quad (30)$$

we notice that  $\dot{\chi} = 0$  implies  $\chi$  is a constant vector, and hence by (29b),  $q$  is also a constant vector. It follows that  $\xi = 0$ .

In a similar manner as the proof of Proposition 2, we can claim that the largest invariant set in (30) w.r.t. (29) is the set  $\bar{\Omega} := \{(\bar{\zeta}, \chi, q, \xi) : \Gamma^T(q)B^T\bar{\zeta} = 0, \dot{\chi} = 0, e = 0, \xi = 0\}$  in which  $\dot{\chi} = -h(\chi + hq)$  and  $e = f(q) - x_d$ . Finally, by LaSalle's invariance principle, we conclude that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e(t) = 0$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \xi(t) = 0$ .  $\square$

We note that the proposed internal model-based velocity-free controller does not rely on high-gain error feedback or high-gain observers, which are commonly used in internal model-based output regulation designs, see for example [17]. Additionally, its design does not require a prior knowledge of the boundaries of external disturbances. To close this section, we present the following remarks concerning the proposed controller (28). First, in practice, we can construct the matrices  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  using the spectrum of  $S$ , which is based on *a priori* knowledge of vibrations that we can gather from the environment where the robots are operated. For a practical way of constructing  $(A_i, B_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , we refer to [18]. Second, the asymptotic convergence of  $(e, \xi)$  is still ensured by modifying the stabilization part in (28) with saturation functions as follows

$$u = -k_p J^T(q) \frac{e}{1 + e^T e} - k_d \text{Tanh}(\chi + hq) + g(q) + B_1^T(A_1 \zeta_1 - B_1 q) + J^T(q)B_2^T(A_2 \zeta_2 - B_2 e) \quad (31)$$

where the vector function  $\text{Tanh}(\cdot)$  is defined as  $\text{Tanh}(x) = [\text{tanh}(x_1), \dots, \text{tanh}(x_n)]^T$  for all  $x = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^T$ . The proof can be completed by following the steps as in the proof of Proposition 3 and using the following storage function:  $U = \frac{1}{2}\bar{\zeta}^T\bar{\zeta} + \frac{1}{2}k_d h^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln(\cosh(\hat{\xi}_i)) + \frac{1}{2}k_p \ln(1 + e^T e) + \frac{1}{2}\xi^T H(q)\xi$  where  $\hat{\xi}_i$  is the  $i$ th element of  $\hat{\xi} = \chi + hq$ .

## 5 Simulation result

To demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed velocity-free controller, a two-link planar manipulator is used for validation. We refer to [20] for the dynamic model and parameter setting of the manipulator. The kinematic equation (1) of the manipulator is given by  $x = f(q) = [l_1 \cos(q_1) + l_2 \cos(q_1 + q_2), l_1 \sin(q_1) + l_2 \sin(q_1 + q_2)]^T$ , where  $l_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$  is the length of the  $i$ th link and  $q = [q_1, q_2]^T$  is the joint angle vector. Correspondingly, the manipulator Jacobian matrix is

$$J(q) = \begin{bmatrix} -l_1 \sin(q_1) - l_2 \sin(q_1 + q_2) & -l_2 \sin(q_1 + q_2) \\ l_1 \cos(q_1) + l_2 \cos(q_1 + q_2) & l_2 \cos(q_1 + q_2) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The external disturbances in (10) are set as  $d_1 = 0.1[\sin(\omega_1 t), \sin(\omega_3 t)]^T$  and  $d_2 = 0.1[\sin(\omega_2 t), \sin(\omega_4 t)]^T$  with known frequencies  $\omega_i = i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . The initial joint position and joint velocity are  $q(0) = [0, \pi/4]^T$  and  $\xi(0) = [0, 0]^T$ , respectively. The end-effector is considered fixed at the end of the second link, and the desired end-effector position is chosen as  $x_d = [0.064, 0.290]^T$  in the robot base frame. Based on this setup, two simulations are conducted:

- 1) In the first simulation, the velocity-free controller (28) proposed in Theorem 3 is used. Simulation results are shown in Fig. 4.
- 2) In the second simulation, we use the controller (31) in which saturation functions are introduced to  $e$  and  $\hat{\xi}$ . Simulation results are shown in Fig. 5.

Both sets of controller parameters are selected as follows:  $h = 100$ ,  $k_p = 50$ ,  $k_d = 10$ , and  $A_i = \text{diag} \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \omega_i \\ -\omega_i & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \omega_{i+2} \\ -\omega_{i+2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right)$ ,  $B_i = \text{diag}([1, 0]^T, [1, 0]^T)$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . The initial states of the internal models and the filter are all zero.

Fig. 4a and Fig. 5a demonstrate that, in both cases, the regulation error  $e$  converges to zero as expected despite the presence of external disturbances. A comparison between Fig. 4b and Fig. 5b shows that the control input of the first simulation can peak to large values during an initial transient period, whereas the control input of the second simulation is limited to a more acceptable level due to the use of saturation functions. It should be noted that the steady-state input signals of both simulations are sinusoidal waves capable of counteracting the effect of the external disturbances. Fig. 4c and Fig. 5c demonstrate the joint velocity  $\xi$  and the output of the filter  $\hat{\xi} = \chi + hq$  of the two simulations. Fig. 4c illustrates the peaking phenomenon of the filter without saturation. Fig. 5c shows that the peaking is reduced by saturating the estimates.




Fig. 4. Simulation results for the controller without saturation (controller (28)).




Fig. 5. Simulation results for the controller with saturation (controller (31)).

## 6 Conclusions

This paper considered task-space regulation of robot manipulators subject to sinusoidal external disturbances with known frequencies. We developed both full-state feedback and velocity-free controllers utilizing tools from internal model-based and passivity-based approaches. The results demonstrate complete disturbance rejection and asymptotic convergence of the regulation error to zero.

Relating to the current research, there comes up with an interesting question of a future study on velocity-free regulation problems with uncertain exosystems. We shall note that it would never be a trivial task because of the technical challenge in constructing suitable control Lyapunov functions when nonlinear or adaptive internal models (see [4] for a quick overview) were incorporated. In this regard, one may refer to [23] for a recent study of tracking control in joint space by output feedback. To some extent, one must overcome the above hurdle due to the indispensable role of internal models for the problem when merely using output feedback. Furthermore, an extension of the proposed approach will be explored to investigate the tracking of exogenous signals [33] for robotic systems without using velocity measurements.

## A Appendix: Proof of Lemma 1

We prove the result by using the PBH observability test [19, p. 366]: The pair  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C})$  is observable if and only if  $\begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix}$  has rank  $n_1 + n_2$  for all  $s$ . The proof falls naturally into three parts.

- 1) For all  $s \notin \sigma(\mathbf{A}_1) \cap \sigma(\mathbf{A}_2)$ , we have

$$\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix} = \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & sI - \mathbf{A}_2 \\ \mathbf{C}_1 & \mathbf{TC}_2 \end{bmatrix} = n_1 + n_2.$$

- 2) For all  $s \in \sigma(\mathbf{A}_1)$ , using  $\sigma(\mathbf{A}_1) \cap \sigma(\mathbf{A}_2) = \emptyset$ , we have  $\text{rank}[sI - \mathbf{A}_2] = n_2$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix} &= \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & sI - \mathbf{A}_2 \\ \mathbf{C}_1 & \mathbf{TC}_2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A}_1 \\ \mathbf{C}_1 \end{bmatrix} + n_2 = n_1 + n_2. \end{aligned}$$

- 3) Similarly, for all  $s \in \sigma(\mathbf{A}_2)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix} &= n_1 + \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A}_2 \\ \mathbf{TC}_2 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= n_1 + \text{rank} \left( \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{T} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A}_2 \\ \mathbf{C}_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned}$$



In the above, since  $\mathbf{T}$  has full column rank, it gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}\left(\begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{T} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A}_2 \\ \mathbf{C}_2 \end{bmatrix}\right) &= \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A}_2 \\ \mathbf{C}_2 \end{bmatrix} \\ \Rightarrow \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix} &= n_1 + \text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A}_2 \\ \mathbf{C}_2 \end{bmatrix} = n_1 + n_2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we can conclude that the matrix  $\begin{bmatrix} sI - \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix}$  has rank  $n_1 + n_2$  for all  $s$ , which implies that  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C})$  is observable. The proof is complete.

## References

- [1] V. Andrieu and L. Praly. A unifying point of view on output feedback designs for global asymptotic stabilization. *Automatica*, 45(8):1789–1798, 2009.
- [2] H. Berghuis and H. Nijmeijer. Global regulation of robots using only position measurements. *Systems & Control Letters*, 21(4):289–293, 1993.
- [3] G. Besançon. Global output feedback tracking control for a class of Lagrangian systems. *Automatica*, 36(12):1915–1921, 2000.
- [4] M. Bin, J. Huang, A. Isidori, L. Marconi, M. Mischianti, and E. Sontag. Internal models in control, bioengineering, and neuroscience. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 5:55–79, 2022.
- [5] C. I. Byrnes, D. S. Gilliam, A. Isidori, Y. Ikeda, and L. Marconi. Internal model based design for the suppression of harmonic disturbances. In *Directions in Mathematical Systems Theory and Optimization*, pages 51–70. Springer–Verlag, 2003.
- [6] C. I. Byrnes and A. Isidori. Limit sets, zero dynamics, and internal models in the problem of nonlinear output regulation. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48(10):1712–1723, 2003.
- [7] C.-C. Cheah. Task-space PD control of robot manipulators: Unified analysis and duality property. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 27(10):1152–1170, 2008.
- [8] B. S. Chen, Y. C. Chang, and T. C. Lee. Adaptive control in robotic systems with  $H_\infty$  tracking performance. *Automatica*, 33(2):227–234, 1997.
- [9] E. Davison. The robust control of a servomechanism problem for linear time-invariant multivariable systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 21(1):25–34, 1976.
- [10] C. De Persis and B. Jayawardhana. On the internal model principle in the coordination of nonlinear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 1(3):272–282, 2014.
- [11] D. A. Dirksch and J. M. A. Scherpen. On tracking control of rigid-joint robots with only position measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 21(4):1510–1513, 2012.
- [12] B. A. Francis and W. M. Wonham. The internal model principle of control theory. *Automatica*, 12(5):457–465, 1976.
- [13] C. He and J. Huang. Leader-following consensus for multiple Euler–Lagrange systems by distributed position feedback control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(11):5561–5568, 2021.
- [14] X. He and M. Lu. Output feedback control of uncertain Euler–Lagrange systems by internal model. *Automatica*, 156:111189, 2023.
- [15] J. Huang and Z. Chen. A general framework for tackling the output regulation problem. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(12):2203–2218, 2004.
- [16] A. Isidori and C. I. Byrnes. Output regulation of nonlinear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 35(2):131–140, 1990.
- [17] A. Isidori, L. Marconi, and L. Praly. Robust design of nonlinear internal models without adaptation. *Automatica*, 48(10):2409–2419, 2012.
- [18] B. Jayawardhana and G. Weiss. Tracking and disturbance rejection for fully actuated mechanical systems. *Automatica*, 44(11):2863–2868, 2008.
- [19] T. Kailath. *Linear Systems*. Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1980.
- [20] R. Kelly. A simple set-point robot controller by using only position measurements. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 26(2):527–530, 1993.
- [21] H. K. Khalil. *Nonlinear Systems*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 3rd edition, 2002.
- [22] N. Li, P. Borja, J. M. A. Scherpen, A. van der Schaft, and R. Mahony. Passivity-based trajectory tracking and formation control of nonholonomic wheeled robots without velocity measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(12):7951–7957, 2023.
- [23] A. Loria. Observers are unnecessary for output-feedback control of Lagrangian systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(4):905–920, 2016.
- [24] A. Loria and E. Panteley. Force/motion control of constrained manipulators without velocity measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 44(7):1407–1412, 1999.
- [25] M. Lu, L. Liu, and G. Feng. Adaptive tracking control of uncertain Euler–Lagrange systems subject to external disturbances. *Automatica*, 104:207–219, 2019.
- [26] F. Mazenc, L. Praly, and W. P. Dayawansa. Global stabilization by output feedback: Examples and counterexamples. *Systems & Control Letters*, 23(2):119–125, 1994.
- [27] R. M. Murray, Z. Li, and S. S. Sastry. *A Mathematical Introduction to Robotic Manipulation*. CRC press, 1994.
- [28] R. Ortega, A. Loria, R. Kelly, and L. Praly. On passivity-based output feedback global stabilization of Euler–Lagrange systems. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 5(4):313–323, 1995.
- [29] A. Serrani, A. Isidori, and L. Marconi. Semi-global nonlinear output regulation with adaptive internal model. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 46(8):1178–1194, 2001.

- [30] M. Tomizuka. Dealing with periodic disturbances in controls of mechanical systems. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 32(2):193–199, 2008.
- [31] S. Wang, H. Zhang, S. Baldi, and R. Zhong. Leaderless consensus of heterogeneous multiple Euler–Lagrange systems with unknown disturbance. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(4):2399–2406, 2023.
- [32] H. Wu, B. Jayawardhana, H. G. De Marina, and D. Xu. Distributed formation control of manipulators’ end-effector with internal model-based disturbance rejection. In *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 5568–5575. IEEE, 2021.
- [33] H. Wu, B. Jayawardhana, and D. Xu. Task-space tracking of robot manipulators via internal model principle approach. *Automatica*, 174:112104, 2025.
- [34] H. Wu, D. Xu, and B. Jayawardhana. On self-learning mechanism for the output regulation of second-order affine nonlinear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(11):5964–5979, 2022.
- [35] Q. Yang, H. Fang, J. Chen, Z. P. Jiang, and M. Cao. Distributed global output-feedback control for a class of Euler-Lagrange systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(9):4855–4861, 2017.
- [36] G. Zarikian and A. Serrani. Harmonic disturbance rejection in tracking control of Euler-Lagrange systems: An external model approach. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 15(1):118–129, 2007.