



Heriot-Watt University
Research Gateway

Semi-autonomous surface-tracking tasks using omnidirectional mobile manipulators

Citation for published version:

Suárez Zapico, C, Petillot, Y & Erden, MS 2024, Semi-autonomous surface-tracking tasks using omnidirectional mobile manipulators. in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA2024)*. Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, IEEE, pp. 2176-2182, 2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, Yokohama, Japan, 13/05/24. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icra57147.2024.10611518>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1109/icra57147.2024.10611518](https://doi.org/10.1109/icra57147.2024.10611518)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Heriot-Watt Research Portal](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA2024)

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via Heriot-Watt Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

Heriot-Watt University has made every reasonable effort to ensure that the content in Heriot-Watt Research Portal complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact open.access@hw.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Semi-autonomous surface-tracking tasks using omnidirectional mobile manipulators

Carlos Suarez Zapico^{1,2}, Yvan Petillot^{1,2} and Mustafa Suphi Erden^{1,2}

Abstract—Despite the potential of mobile manipulators and applications where robots require a force-controlled physical interaction with the environment, the majority of robot automation nowadays is still based on fixed manipulators for free-motion tasks (e.g. welding, pick and place, or painting). In this work, we propose a control solution for omnidirectional mobile manipulators in force-tracking tasks, interacting with unknown surface geometries and with a human teleoperator in the control loop. Keeping a teleoperator in the loop makes the system widely applicable to unstructured environments. A human can take care, with little effort, of the mobile base navigation, self-collisions, and collisions with the environment, as well as selecting the area of the asset surface to process. The teleoperator interfaces with the robot platform by commanding motion in the mobile base in order to increase the workspace and maneuverability of the arm. The operator can also command the movement of the end-effector, sliding on the surface geometry to process a specific area. Alternatively, he can let the controller execute a parametric trajectory (spiral or raster) for an autonomous area coverage and meanwhile telecommand the base in order to keep the arm in configurations with good dexterity. The autonomous controller, on the other hand, takes responsibility for following the unknown contour on the manipulated surface by only taking observations from a force/torque sensor attached to the arm’s wrist, exerting a prescribed force, and handling the motion control in the base and the arm so that both can follow their respective task requests. Overall, we have developed a user-friendly control scheme, where an operator with little training and using a joystick, can guide the robot system to perform a physically interactive task on the surface of an asset.

I. INTRODUCTION

Mobile manipulators have the capability to provide flexibility in the manufacturing process and the automatization of tasks, yet they are not in widespread use, with most applications focusing on simplistic pick-and-place tasks. Controlling the interaction forces between the robot arm and the environment opens new potential applications for mobile robot automation such as polishing, grinding sanding, and Non-Destructive Evaluation (NDE). In applications such as sanding or polishing, by partially automating these tasks, the human operator would benefit from preventing health issues associated with holding vibrational tools regularly, inhaling dust particles generated in the process, or non-ergonomic postures.

Keeping a human operator in the loop with a semi-autonomous robot, on the other hand, provides supervision

¹Heriot-Watt University, Institute of Sensors, Signals, and Systems, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

²Edinburgh Centre for Robotics, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
{cs377, y.r.petillot, m.s.erden}@hw.ac.uk

This research was funded by EPSRC, United Kingdom, through the ORCA Hub project with the Grant Reference EP/R026173/1




Fig. 1. Testbed used to validate the proposed control architecture. RbKairos omnidirectional mobile manipulator with an UR5e arm polishing a PVC pipe with a spinning tool. The UR5e has a force/torque sensor embedded in the end-effector used in the force control and contour following.

that can relax the need for complex navigation involved in deploying the mobile robot in unstructured, cluttered, and dynamic environments. For instance, a human teleoperator can easily determine which area needs to be processed and how to move the base to maximize the arm operational envelope whilst avoiding obstacles in the scene. The human-robot symbiosis as presented here can also increase productivity, as teleoperating the robot is less tiring and possibly more precise and faster than holding and using tools, such as a rotatory sander.

In order to obtain the best process quality, the controller has to meet the following criteria. Once the tool establishes contact, it has to keep the tool perpendicular to the surface while exerting a specific force. To obtain homogeneous results across the processed surface, apart from maintaining a constant force and the same angle of attack between the tool and the surface, the tool should always keep a constant tangential velocity. Therefore having a good contour following is paramount for the quality obtained after the operation is finished. Another important feature to obtain good results is to have a task-space path generator that ensures good surface coverage and that the tool has worked uniformly (removing the same amount of material).

If the mobile robot operates on a flat and smooth ground, as typical industrial plantation floors, choosing an omnidirectional base greatly simplifies motion planning as we would not need to deal with nonholonomic constraints. In addition, we gain one more actuated DOF that we can exploit to our benefit for secondary tasks such as providing configurations with dexterity for the arm, avoiding self-collisions, or prioritizing movement of the arm over the base to benefit from its superior motion accuracy.

A. Related Work

A common approach when controlling mobile manipulators is to use redundancy resolution to manage the joint motion in the base and arm while executing various tasks with different priorities. While the primary task is normally associated with the task space movement in the end-effector, secondary tasks can be used to prevent self-collisions, joint limits, or to maintain good dexterity. In [1], a motion planning control is proposed for mobile redundant manipulators in surface mechanization. By exploiting the redundancy to provide the maximum stiffness and center of gravity stability, they improve the process quality. Similarly in [4], the null space is exploited to enhance the force exertion by maximizing the force manipulability for an admittance control that helps with mobility assistance for disabled people. In [2] and [3], the redundancy resolution is used as a dual trajectory controller for non-holonomic mobile manipulators. The framework is modified so that the base and arm can follow independent trajectories, prioritizing the arm when both trajectories can not be executed simultaneously. The redundancy resolution can also be extended for dynamics modeling, and this is what is implemented in [5] and [6] to obtain a whole-body cartesian impedance control.

Another approach in motion control for mobile manipulators is to use trajectory optimization instead of redundancy resolution to optimize secondary tasks. In [14], the mobile manipulation interaction is done in a Model Predictive Control framework. The optimization not only accounts for vehicle dynamics and collision avoidance but also includes the force controller as a dynamic constraint to handle the interaction at the end-effector. Trajectory optimization can also be used to handle nonholonomic constraints [17], [18]. In [17], it is also used to avoid collisions with surrounding static and dynamic obstacles.

One of the challenges when it comes to interaction with an unknown surface geometry is following the contour to keep the tool in contact and perpendicular to the surface. To estimate the surface normal, most solutions involve perception through point clouds, laser scans, position displacement, and force/torque [7] readings. In tasks such as polishing or brushing, the spinning tool provides feedback on how the tool is aligned with the surface normal, which helps reduce the perpendicularity error [16].

In our previous work [11], we put to test various interaction controllers with the goal of maintaining contact with a prescribed force at the end-effector of a manipulator. During the test, we introduce motion disturbances at its base by replaying recorded odometry from an underwater vehicle. In [12] we use a hybrid force-position control where a novel trajectory following algorithm is developed to follow a specific trajectory projected in an unknown surface geometry. Finally, in [9] and [10], we used particle swarm optimization to find optimal locations for a mobile base and provide the attached arm with the best working conditions.

B. Contributions

In this work, we offer a new semi-autonomous robotic application for force-tracking tasks with mobile manipulators, where the human-robot symbiosis has the potential to outperform a human worker in terms of productivity and prevention of health hazards in the long term. We present a new control architecture composed of subsystems which, on their own, are quite popular in the field, but novel in the way we combine and configure them specifically for this application. This results in a system that is intuitive and easy to control by a human teleoperator to execute force-tracking tasks.

C. Control Architecture Overview

The control architecture is composed of various subsystems that work simultaneously to handle the whole body motion control while responding to the primary and secondary tasks, keeping the tool perpendicular to the surface, and exerting a desired force. Figure 2 schematizes the dimensions of the task space, $[x, y, z, \phi_x, \phi_y, \phi_z]$ and the mobile base $[x_b, y_b, \phi_b]$. The primary task corresponds to the motion at the arm's end-effector whereas the secondary task contains the motion commands for the mobile base. We offer two separate operating modes for the motion at the task space, the teleoperated, and the automatic mode. The human operator can switch between these two modes. The difference is that in the teleoperated mode, the operator guides the motion of the end-effector along the surface, whereas in the automatic mode, a parametric trajectory (raster, spiral) is executed along the surface. The operator uses a joystick (Fig 2) to interface with the system. In the autonomous mode, he commands motion in $[x_b, y_b, \phi_b]$, while in the teleoperated mode he commands motion in $[x, y, x_b, y_b, \phi_b]$. So in both modes, the operator guides the mobile base.

As opposed to mobile manipulators operating in underwater, aerial, or outer-space scenarios, the base on a flat ground is not significantly disturbed by interactions with the environment, by the coupling dynamics between the base and the arm, or even by the weight of the tools that are used, as typically in this application. For that reason, the motion control of the entire robot is done through a whole-body kinematic model. For the force-tracking application, the control architecture is complemented with an admittance controller acting on the end-effector with a force/torque sensor closing the loop and located in the wrist of the arm.

In the following sections, we explain the details of our proposed controller, starting with the whole-body differential inverse kinematics with redundancy resolution. The third and fourth sections describe the interaction control acting in the task space of the end-effector, and the base motion control, respectively. In Section V we show the results from an experiment that illustrates how the controller performs on a rbKairos mobile platform (Figure 1).

II. REDUNDANCY RESOLUTION

Movement in the end-effector is fully determined with the 6 DOFs of the task space. The omnidirectional base provides

control in the 3 DOFs of the floor and in addition to the joints of the arm (6 DOFs in the case of the rbKairos robot), it results in a system with redundancy that can be exploited with a redundancy resolution scheme.

The motion of the robot is achieved through differential inverse kinematics by using the robot Jacobian, J , which results from the concatenation of the arm and the base Jacobians (J_a and J_v , respectively). Given the current arm configuration q_a we can map the task space velocities to the joint space \dot{q} with the Jacobian:

$$\dot{r} = \begin{bmatrix} J_v & J_a(q_a) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{q}_v \\ \dot{q}_a \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \dot{r} = J(q)\dot{q} \quad (1)$$

In redundant systems, there is a null space of joint velocities that have no effect on the task space motion. We can exploit this null space by using the null space projector ($I_n - J^+J$). We can include this and extend 1 as:

$$\dot{q} = J^+\dot{r} + (I_n - J^+J)\dot{s} \quad (2)$$

where J^+ is the Moore-Penrose inverse Jacobian and \dot{s} is an arbitrary joint speed normally used to optimize secondary tasks while following the primary one \dot{r} .

The differential inverse kinematics breaks down when we reach a singularity or try to go beyond the arm's workspace, resulting in high speeds and unstable motions. We can handle these situations by embedding the Damped Least Square (DLS) method into the expression resulting in:

$$\dot{q} = (J^TJ + \lambda^2I)^{-1}J^T\dot{r} + (I_n - (J^TJ + \lambda^2I)^{-1}J^TJ)\dot{s} \quad (3)$$

where the damping term λ from the DLS method is defined as an adaptive law that acts when the Jacobian gets near to the singularities.

$$\lambda^2 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{when } \sigma_{lower} \geq \varepsilon \\ \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_{lower}}{\varepsilon}\right)^2 \lambda_{max}^2 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

As the motion accuracy of the base is much worse than the arm, we want to penalize the error in movement on the base DOFs. We use Weighted-Least Norm (WLN) to integrate this feature into our formulation. Expression (4) is now transformed into:

$$\dot{q} = W^{-1}J^T(JW^{-1}J^T + \lambda^2I)^{-1}\dot{r} - \alpha(I - W^{-1}J^T(JW^{-1}J^T + \lambda^2I)^{-1}J)\dot{s} \quad (5)$$

where W is a diagonal square matrix that allows us to penalize each DOF independently by associating a null or very high value w_i .

$$W_q = \begin{bmatrix} w_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & w_2 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & w_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & w_{n+1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

With this mathematical scheme, joint limits can also be easily handled by assigning a penalizing value when a joint is approaching its own limits [21]. In our case, the primary

task velocity \dot{r} is given in the mobile axis, so we have to provide the mobile axis Jacobian in 5.

Due to the inaccuracies in the motion of the base to follow the reference velocity signal or in scenarios where the platform climbs up or down a slope, in order to compensate for the occurring open-loop errors at the end-effector, we can feed them back into the primary task for compensation. As an example, (2) can be modified to compensate for a tracking error e_p with a proportional control as follows:

$$\dot{q} = J^+(\dot{r} + K_p e_p) + (I_n - J^+J)\dot{s} \quad (7)$$

Force-tracking only requires motion definition over five of the six dimensions in the task space. This gives us one more DOF that we can exploit to our benefit. However, with this mathematical scheme, we cannot directly exploit this DOF. A higher-level planner working on top of this formulation could exploit this task space DOF.




Fig. 2. Controlled dimensions in the task space $[x, y, z, \phi_x, \phi_y, \phi_z]$ and the mobile base $[x_b, y_b, \phi_b]$. A joystick is used as an interface to send motion commands in velocity for $[x, y, x_b, y_b, \phi_b]$

III. TASK SPACE VELOCITY: HYBRID FORCE-POSITION CONTROL

When the robot end-effector establishes contact and starts the force-tracking operation, we divide the dimensions of the task space into position or force control. Fig. 2 shows the six dimensions of the task space $[x, y, z, \phi_x, \phi_y, \phi_z]$ and the notation that we use to refer to them. x and y are position-controlled, used for covering a specific area of the surface that we are interacting with. ϕ_z does not require motion definition, it can be set arbitrarily or exploited for secondary tasks. ϕ_x and ϕ_y are used to keep the tool perpendicularly to the surface and z is where we control the exerting force.

During the interaction, if the tool is misaligned with the surface normal, the torque increases in ϕ_x and ϕ_y . The tool orientation controller relies on this principle and works by minimizing these torques. This is achieved by using a simple

proportional gain on the torque readings.

$$\dot{\phi}_x = K\tau_x \quad \dot{\phi}_y = K\tau_y \quad (8)$$

where τ_x and τ_y are the torque readings at the interaction point frame, obtained after computing the wrench conversion from the F/T sensor. K is a proportional gain and $\dot{\phi}_x$ and $\dot{\phi}_y$ are the output angular velocity to modify the orientation of the tool. With a higher gain, the robot can adapt faster when moving through high curvatures, performing a better contour following, but when the velocity is low, or there is little curvature, this can lead to an undesired wiggle behavior in the orientation control of the tool. For better performance, an adaptive law for the gain K can be set so that it increases when the velocity is higher and high curvature is encountered and vice-versa. In the experiments presented in this paper, we apply a varying K gain, proportional to the tangential velocities of the end-effector, \dot{x} and \dot{y} . This provides a simple solution to improve surface tracking and reduce the undesired wiggle effect compared to a fixed gain.

Finally, the direction z is where we run a mass-damping admittance controller to handle the impact and force control. The control in this axis is the most decisive for the success of the interaction in terms of safety, avoiding contact losses, and maintaining stable contact. As shown in [22] the mass-damping admittance system naturally evolves to the desired force F_d .

$$M_d\ddot{z} + B_d\dot{z} = \Delta F \quad (9)$$

where M_d and B_d are the virtual mass and damping respectively, and ΔF is the force error between the measured and desired force.

IV. SECONDARY VELOCITY: BASE MOTION

For the motion control of the mobile base, we feed the teleoperator velocity commands through the secondary velocity, \dot{s} in the redundancy resolution (5). In the secondary task, an arbitrary whole-body joint velocity is provided. This joint velocity should be followed as best as possible after what has been left in the joint space to meet the priority task. Given the velocity commands for the base motion $V_{x_{base}}$, $V_{y_{base}}$, ω_{base} , we define \dot{s} as:

$$\dot{s} = [V_{x_{base}}, V_{y_{base}}, \omega_{base}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0] \quad (10)$$

In order to completely define the motion control given by (5), we need to provide the weight matrix W that penalizes motion in the joints. When no motion penalization is associated with a joint, a value of 1 is assigned. The opposite can be obtained by assigning a very high value. By penalization, we refer to the impact of the motion of a joint on the primary task. With a high penalization, the joint will stay stationary or blocked, even if the primary task can not be resolved with the rest of the unblocked joints. Another effect that we obtain with this configuration, is that if we define a reference velocity in the secondary task (\dot{s}), the blocked joints will follow this reference without caring about the primary task, and the unblocked joints will execute the primary task and compensate for the displacement generated in the blocked




Fig. 3. Upper graph shows a commanded motion reference with no intermediate smoothing. The lower graph shows the same test with a smoothed reference by limiting it with a predefined maximum acceleration. Reference signal and odometry are represented in blue and orange respectively.

joints. For the specifications of our application, the joints of the base are highly penalized to only follow the secondary velocity \dot{s} , and the joints of the arm are totally in charge of meeting the primary task requests. The weighting matrix to enforce this behavior in the system is then defined as:

$$W = \text{diag}\{10^8, 10^8, 10^8, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\} \quad (11)$$

The limitation of this setting is that if the teleoperator is not careful, he can command the mobile base to a position where the arm can no longer follow the primary task, and the arm ends up blocked at a near out-of-workspace configuration. However, the advantage is that the system remains very intuitive for the user as his commands are perfectly followed by the mobile base, without the redundancy resolution interfering in the DOFs of the base at any moment, not even when the primary task is violated. This configuration makes the system very easy to teleoperate and allows fast and agile motions or avoidance of collisions in cluttered spaces. We could be tempted to set an intermediate penalizing value to the joints of the base, but not to the point of totally blocking them. For instance setting the weighting matrix like:

$$W = \text{diag}\{100, 100, 100, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\} \quad (12)$$

This configuration shows very similar behavior as before, with the only difference being that the redundancy resolution will act on the mobile base DOFs if the primary task is about to be violated, taking control over the base DOFs, and leaving none to the operator. A priori this might look like a better configuration. After all the controller is preventing the operator from moving the base away and making it

unfeasible for the arm to meet the primary task request. However, this happens in a context where the arm is in a near out-of-workspace singular configuration and the controller will have to use the DOFs of the base to respond to the demands of the force controller that is acting in the task space, resulting in a very precarious scenario. With our proposed configuration (11), the arm will instead block near the singularity, but the teleoperator never loses control over the base DOFs, resulting in a safety feature of the system.

If we run this mathematical model in a simulated environment on an ideal robot that perfectly follows the motion reference in all its DOFs, we will observe that it executes the requested motions both for the primary task and for the base perfectly accurately. We could check this in a simulation that we created as a previous step to the implementation in the real robot. However, with a physical system, the major source of error comes from the base DOFs following the velocity references. This error is directly transmitted to the end-effector and needs to be compensated by the force controller. If the error is too high, the force controller will not be able to compensate for it and this can generate high-force spikes that are dangerous for the robot's integrity, jeopardize the quality of the process, or in the best of cases run into a fail-safe and stopping the robot. To prevent this, we add velocity constraints to the mobile base commanded signal in order to reduce errors in the z task space dimension. Moreover, we smooth the reference signal to a middle point where the base can easily follow while keeping the control agile and intuitive for the operator, without too much time delay.

A. Motion constraints on the base

For safety reasons, a velocity saturation is set on the commanded reference to the actuated DOFs of the base. Another safety feature is to put extra care on the motion errors in the z dimension of the task space. This dimension is the most critical for the success of the interaction and also in terms of safety for the robot and asset, as it is perpendicular to the surface of the asset being treated, and motion errors can induce high peak forces.

For that reason, we add another motion constraint (13) built on top of the previous one, which is dependent on the current configuration of the robot as seen below:

$$\dot{r} = \begin{bmatrix} J_v & J_a(q_a) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_{xbase} \\ V_{ybase} \\ \omega_{base} \\ 0 \\ \dots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \dot{z} \leq v_{zLim} \quad (13)$$

If the commanded velocity $V_{base} = [V_{xbase}, V_{ybase}, \omega_{base}]$ does not comply with the constraint (13), we scale it down by multiplying with the ratio between the velocity limit v_{zLim} and the induced task velocity in the z dimension. The saturation for the three actuated dimensions of the base is obtained with the following expression:

$$V_{saturation-base} = (v_{zLim}/\dot{z}) * V_{base} \quad (14)$$

where \dot{z} is previously calculated in (13) given the current arm configuration q_a and the commanded velocity for the base V_{base} . This way, we not only can limit much better the motion error that the force control has to compensate for, but we also keep the motion direction intended by the operator and keep the machine interface intuitiveness.

The major source of error in the motion at the end-effector is the poor velocity-reference tracking in the base. In free motion tasks, we can compensate for this error by closing the loop with global odometry and feeding it back as in (7). But in this case, with fast interaction dynamics, it is best to execute the open loop motion as synchronized and accurately as possible. For that reason, it is paramount that the base follows the secondary velocity signal that is fed through \dot{s} in (5). To meet this criterion we apply an acceleration limitation filter to the reference signal, both for the acceleration and deceleration phases. Fig. 3 shows how the velocity tracking improves after applying the smoothing to a square signal and saturating in velocity for both directions of the x_b dimension in the base.

Equation (15) shows how the smoothing works. The smoothed reference signal s_t is obtained by bounding the maximum acceleration a_{lim} :

$$s_t = \max(\min(r_t, s_{t-1} + a_{lim}\Delta t), s_{t-1} - a_{lim}\Delta t) \quad (15)$$

where r_t is the original user-commanded motion reference, and Δt is the sampling time.

V. EXPERIMENT FOR VALIDATION: PIPE BRUSHING

In this section, we show the performance obtained after implementing the controller on the rbKairos robot platform and we validate the subsystems of the controller working all together. To demonstrate its capabilities we brush a PVC pipe with 0.5m in diameter and 3m in length. The size and high curvature of the pipe make it a challenging scenario to put the whole controller to the test. During the experiment, we brush the front area of the pipe. Part of the coverage is made with the end-effector being teleoperated, then the operator switches to an autonomous mode which executes a raster trajectory to cover the rest of the front pipe area. In both modes, the user is still in the loop to teleoperate the motion of the base.

The test shown in Fig. 4 starts in teleoperation mode, later on, the operator switches to autonomous mode to execute a predefined raster trajectory, and finally, in the last phase, the user switches back to teleoperation mode. We can see when the autonomous mode is switched on and off by looking at the raster pattern left on the trace. The desired force is set to -25N. We can observe in the exerted force graph, a noisy signal, accuracy errors, and error spikes. Reasons for these errors can be explained by the rotatory brush, the tool-perpendicularity and force controllers working simultaneously and conflicting with each other, vibrations generated from the mecanum wheels and imperfections on the ground, or modeling errors in the whole-body kinematic model. Another reason is that there is not much passive compliance




Fig. 4. Results of "brushing the front area of a PVC pipe" of Section V.B. Top graph shows the exerted force perpendicular to the surface with a desired force set to 25 N. The second graph shows the velocity of the mobile base in x_b and y_b in blue and orange respectively. The bottom graph depicts the trace followed by the tool during the brushing.

in the system, only the inherent compliance of the tool, arm, base, and pipe. Adding more compliance in the tool would reduce force spikes and slow down the contact dynamics which makes it easier for the controller to handle impacts.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

A semi-autonomous control architecture in mobile manipulators is proposed in this paper that takes advantage of the robot and human skills to create a symbiosis with the potential to further automate and improve force-tracking tasks. The architecture is decoupled into two separate controllers, one acting on the end-effector where the force-tracking is taking place, while the second handles the base motion based on teleoperator commands. A redundancy resolution scheme is used in a novel way to harmonize motions between the arm and base. Full motion control of the base is provided to the teleoperator by blocking the direct contribution of these DOFs to the motion in the end-effector. This presents a very intuitive interface for the operator to generate very agile motions in the platform, but in case of incompatible motions between the base and arm, the arm will stop following the task space requirements and end up being stuck in a

near out-of-workspace singularity, so it is the task of the operator or a parallel supervisor process to prevent this from happening. This configuration provides safety and maintains full control in the hands of the operator. It avoids the redundancy resolution from taking over the mobile base in singular configurations to compensate for the primary task motion request.

In future work, we plan to also develop a fully automated version of our system for use cases where a human teleoperator is beneficial to be replaced with a fully autonomous controller. We can achieve this by optimizing the trajectory of the base to provide maximum maneuverability to the arm while the arm executes its assigned task in the end-effector.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bai, Q., Li, P., Tian, W. et al. "Coordinated motion planning of the mobile redundant manipulator for processing large complex components", *Int J Adv Manuf Technol* 121, 6703–6721 (2022). doi:10.1007/s00170-022-09785-x
- [2] M. Mashali, R. Alqasemi and R. Dubey, "Task priority based dual-trajectory control for redundant mobile manipulators", 2014 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO 2014), Bali, Indonesia, 2014, pp. 1457-1462, doi:10.1109/ROBIO.2014.7090539.

- [3] F. Farelo, R. Alqasemi and R. Dubey, "Optimized dual-trajectory tracking control of a 9-DoF WMRA system for ADL tasks", 2010 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, Anchorage, AK, USA, 2010, pp. 1786-1791, doi:10.1109/ROBOT.2010.5509554.
- [4] Hongjun Xing, Ali Torabi, Liang Ding, Haibo Gao, Zongquan Deng, Vivian K. Mushahwar, Mahdi Tavakoli, "An admittance-controlled wheeled mobile manipulator for mobility assistance: Human-robot interaction estimation and redundancy resolution for enhanced force exertion ability", *Mechatronics*, Volume 74, 2021, 102497, ISSN 0957-4158, doi:10.1016/j.mechatronics.2021.102497.
- [5] Y. Wu, E. Lamon, F. Zhao, W. Kim and A. Ajoudani, "Unified Approach for Hybrid Motion Control of MOCA Based on Weighted Whole-Body Cartesian Impedance Formulation", in *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 3505-3512, April 2021, doi:10.1109/LRA.2021.3062316.
- [6] J. Zhao, A. Giammarino, E. Lamon, J. M. Gandarias, E. D. Momi and A. Ajoudani, "A Hybrid Learning and Optimization Framework to Achieve Physically Interactive Tasks With Mobile Manipulators", in *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 8036-8043, July 2022, doi:10.1109/LRA.2022.3187258.
- [7] Wang Z, Liu W, Cui B, He J, Li Z, Zhao Y. "Research on Robot Surface Tracking Motion Based on Force Control of Six-Axis Wrist Force Sensor", *Advances in Mechanical Engineering*. 2015;7(1). doi:10.1155/2014/249696
- [8] C. Sloth and I. Iturrate, "Simultaneous Contact Point and Surface Normal Estimation during Soft Finger Contact," 2021 20th International Conference on Advanced Robotics (ICAR), Ljubljana, Slovenia, 2021, pp. 19-25, doi:10.1109/ICAR53236.2021.9659339.
- [9] Harun Tugal, Kamil Cetin, Yvan Petillot, Matthew Dunnigan, Mustafa Suphi Erden, "Contact-based object inspection with mobile manipulators at near-optimal base locations", *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, Volume 161, 2023, 104345, ISSN 0921-8890, doi:10.1016/j.robot.2022.104345.
- [10] Tugal, H., Cetin, K., Petillot, Y. et al. "Manipulation at optimum locations for maximum force transmission with mobile robots under environmental disturbances", *Auton Robot* 46, 769–782 (2022), doi:10.1007/s10514-022-10050-z
- [11] Cetin, Kamil Zapico, Carlos Tugal, Harun Petillot, Yvan Dunnigan, Matthew Erden, Mustafa Suphi. (2021). "Application of Adaptive and Switching Control for Contact Maintenance of a Robotic Vehicle-Manipulator System for Underwater Asset Inspection", *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*. 8. doi:10.3389/frobt.2021.706558.
- [12] J. Moura, W. Mccoll, G. Taykaldiranian, T. Tomiyama and M. S. Erden, "Automation of Train Cab Front Cleaning With a Robot Manipulator", in *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 3058-3065, Oct. 2018, doi:10.1109/LRA.2018.2849591.
- [13] S. Scherzinger, A. Roennau and R. Dillmann, "Forward Dynamics Compliance Control (FDCC): A new approach to cartesian compliance for robotic manipulators", 2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), Vancouver, BC, Canada, 2017, pp. 4568-4575, doi:10.1109/IROS.2017.8206325.
- [14] J. Pankert and M. Hutter, "Perceptive Model Predictive Control for Continuous Mobile Manipulation", in *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 6177-6184, Oct. 2020, doi:10.1109/LRA.2020.3010721.
- [15] Amersdorfer, Manuel Kappey, Jens Meurer, Thomas. (2020). "Real-time freeform surface and path tracking for force controlled robotic tooling applications", *Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing*. 65. 101955. doi:10.1016/j.rcim.2020.101955.
- [16] J. Li, Y. Guan, H. Chen, B. Wang and T. Zhang, "Robotic Polishing of Unknown-Model Workpieces With Constant Normal Contact Force Control", in *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, 2022, doi:10.1109/TMECH.2022.3216314.
- [17] M. Spahn, B. Brito and J. Alonso-Mora, "Coupled Mobile Manipulation via Trajectory Optimization with Free Space Decomposition", 2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA), Xi'an, China, 2021, pp. 12759-12765, doi:10.1109/ICRA48506.2021.9561821.
- [18] M. Gifftaler, F. Farshidian, T. Sandy, L. Stadelmann and J. Buehli, "Efficient kinematic planning for mobile manipulators with non-holonomic constraints using optimal control", 2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA), Singapore, 2017, pp. 3411-3417, doi:10.1109/ICRA.2017.7989388.
- [19] Mostafa Osman, Mohamed W. Mehrez, Shiyi Yang, Soo Jeon, William Melek, "End-Effector Stabilization of a 10-DOF Mobile Manipulator using Nonlinear Model Predictive Control", *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, Volume 53, Issue 2, 2020, Pages 9772-9777, ISSN 2405-8963, doi:10.1016/j.ifacol.2020.12.2658.
- [20] Zhang, Xinglei, Binghui Fan, Chuanjiang Wang, and Xiaolin Cheng. 2021. "An Improved Weighted Gradient Projection Method for Inverse Kinematics of Redundant Surgical Manipulators", *Sensors* 21, no. 21: 7362. doi:10.3390/s21217362
- [21] Zhang, Xinglei, Binghui Fan, Chuanjiang Wang, and Xiaolin Cheng. 2021. "An Improved Weighted Gradient Projection Method for Inverse Kinematics of Redundant Surgical Manipulators", *Sensors* 21, no. 21: 7362. doi:10.3390/s21217362
- [22] Staniscic, R., Fernández, Á. (2012). "Adjusting the parameters of the mechanical impedance for velocity, impact and force control", *Robotica*, 30(4), 583-597. doi:10.1017/S0263574711000725