SENSOR FUSION WITH KALMAN FILTER AND SUPPORT VECTOR MACHINE FOR FAULT DETECTION IN AUTOMATED GUIDED VEHICLE

MARVIN DARES

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

SENSOR FUSION WITH KALMAN FILTER AND SUPPORT VECTOR MACHINE FOR FAULT DETECTION IN AUTOMATED GUIDED VEHICLE

MARVIN DARES

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Philosophy

> Faculty of Electrical Engineering Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

> > JANUARY 2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In preparing this thesis, I was in contact with many people, researchers, academicians, and practitioners. They have contributed towards broadening my understanding and thoughts. First and foremost, I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Yeong Che Fai, for his guidance. His continued support and interest made this thesis possible.

I am grateful to the Collaborative Research in Engineering, Science and Technology (CREST) centre for funding my Msc. study. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) deserve special thanks for their assistance in supplying the relevant literatures. My appreciation to CAIRO lab for providing me a place to conduct my research and for organizing insightful talks. Special thanks also to DF Automation Sdn. Bhd for the opportunity for collaboration.

To my fellow postgraduate students, colleagues and friends, your sincere support is highly appreciated. I am grateful to all my family members. Their encouragement and support which motivates me immensely throughout the making of this thesis.

ABSTRACT

Industries are moving towards automation and the usage of machines such as Automated Guided Vehicle (AGV) is increasing. Thus, demands for the reliability of AGVs are increasing as they have various complex tasks to carry out. Unfortunately, AGVs are still susceptible to faults and breakdown. Therefore, fault detection is important to provide means of self-diagnosis on AGV. However, fault detections are generally threshold based which are unsatisfying in terms of accuracy and are prone to false triggering. Extended Kalman Filter (EKF) has limitations in handling nonlinear models while Unscented Kalman Filter (UKF) seems promising. Support Vector Machine (SVM) was used as a fault detection method. Thus, this research proposes a sensor fusion enhanced with SVM for fault detection on AGV. The first objective of this research is to develop a test AGV. This AGV is a two-wheeled differential driven mobile robot with multiple sensors and able to make various types of movements to emulate an industrial AGV. Next objective is to develop an enhanced sensor fusion method using EKF and UKF for fault detection with SVM on AGV. The last objective is to evaluate the performance of the developed method. Experiments were carried out where the AGV was used as a test bed for sensor fusion and fault detection. The AGV was tested in different experiment setups such as different track layout, different wheel condition, and different castor conditions. Result shows that UKF handles changes and non-linearity better than EKF. The average residual generated during the test for UKF is 0.0083 meter while for EKF is 0.0129 meter. With sensor fusion, deviations in odometry data can be compensated with the usage of a LiDAR sensor as reference. Using UKF parameters to detect fault, the accuracy achieved with SVM is 64.2% compared to 37.9% without SVM. Fault detection accuracy using EKF parameters with SVM is 82.5% while without SVM is 41.0%. As a conclusion, the results show SVM improves fault detection accuracy regardless of using UKF or EKF.

ABSTRAK

Industri sedang menuju ke arah automasi dan penggunaan mesin seperti kenderaan panduan automatik (AGV) semakin meningkat. Oleh itu, permintaan untuk AGV yang boleh diharap semakin meningkat kerana adanya pelbagai tugas kompleks untuk dijalankan. Malangnya, AGV masih tidak bebas daripada masalah dan kerosakan. Oleh itu, AGV harus mempunyai kemampuan untuk menjalankan pemeriksaan kendiri untuk masalah dan kerosakan. Walaubagaimanapun, kaedah pengesanan kerosakan secara amnya adalah berdasarkan nilai ambang yang tidak memuaskan dari segi ketepatan. Penapis Kalman Berlanjutan (EKF) mempunyai cabaran mengendali model tidak linear sedangkan Penapis Kalman Tidak Berbau (UKF) menunjukkan potensi. Mesin Sokongan Vektor (SVM) telah digunakan untuk kaedah pengesanan kerosakan. Justeru, kajian ini mencadangkan kaedah pelakuran penderia yang dipertingkatkan dengan SVM untuk pengesanan kerosakan pada AGV. Tujuan pertama kajian ini adalah untuk membangunkan sebuah AGV. AGV ini adalah robot pacuan berbeza dua roda dengan pelbagai penderia yang boleh buat pelbagai gerakan untuk menyerupai AGV industri. Tujuan seterusnya adalah untuk menghasilkan kaedah pelakuran penderia yang diperbaiki dengan EKF dan UKF untuk pengesanan kerosakan dengan SVM pada AGV. Tujuan terakhir adalah menguji prestasi kaedah yang telah dihasilkan. AGV telah digunakan dalam kajian untuk menguji pelakuran penderia dan pengesanan kerosakan. AGV tersebut telah diuji dengan keadaan yang berbeza seperti susunan atur trek, keadaan roda dan keadaan kastor yang berlainan. Hasil kajian menunjukan bahawa UKF mengendali perubahan dan model tidak linear lebih baik daripada EKF. Nilai perbezaan antara anggaran dan sebenar yang dijanakan semasa ujian untuk UKF ialah 0.0083 meter dan untuk EKF ialah 0.0129 meter. Penyelewengan dalam data odometri boleh diperbaiki dengan penggunaan peranti pengesanan cahaya dan penjarakan sebagai rujukan. Ketepatan pengesanan kerosakan dengan penggunaan nilai UKF ialah 64.2% dengan SVM dan 37.9% tanpa SVM. Ketepatan pengesanan kerosakan dengan penggunaan nilai EKF ialah 82.5% dengan SVM dan 41.0% tanpa SVM. Kesimpulannya, hasil kajian menunjukan bahawa SVM memperbaiki ketepatan pengesanan kerosakan tanpa mengira samada menggunakan UKF atau EKF.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | TITLE | PAGE | | | |
|--------|-------------|--|------|--|--|--|
| | DECLARATION | | | | | |
| | DEDICATION | | | | | |
| | ACK | NOWLEDGEMENT | v | | | |
| | ABS | ГКАСТ | vi | | | |
| | ABS | ГКАК | vii | | | |
| | TAB | LE OF CONTENTS | viii | | | |
| | LIST | OF TABLES | X | | | |
| | LIST | OF FIGURES | xi | | | |
| | LIST | OF ABBREVIATIONS | XV | | | |
| | LIST | OF SYMBOLS | xvii | | | |
| | LIST | OF APPENDICES | XX | | | |
| СНАРТЕ | R 1 | INTRODUCTION | 1 | | | |
| | 1.1 | Introduction | 1 | | | |
| | 1.2 | Problem Statement | 2 | | | |
| | 1.3 | Objectives of Research | 3 | | | |
| | 1.4 | Scope of Research | 3 | | | |
| | 1.5 | Report Outline | 4 | | | |
| СНАРТЕ | R 2 | LITERATURE REVIEW | 5 | | | |
| | 2.1 | Introduction | 5 | | | |
| | 2.2 | Automated Guided Vehicle and Sensors | 5 | | | |
| | 2.3 | Sensor Fusion | 10 | | | |
| | 2.4 | Fault Detection | 18 | | | |
| | 2.5 | Sensor Fusion and Fault Detection on Automated | | | | |
| | | Guided Vehicle | 19 | | | |
| | 2.6 | Summary | 21 | | | |

| CHAPTER 3 | RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | 23 | | | |
|----------------------|--|----|--|--|--|
| 3.1 | Introduction | 23 | | | |
| 3.2 | Project Planning | 23 | | | |
| 3.3 | 3.3 Hardware Design | | | | |
| 3.4 | Designing Kalman Filter and SVM Model for Proposed Test AGV | 30 | | | |
| 3.5 | Encoder Test | 46 | | | |
| 3.6 | Current Sensor Test | 48 | | | |
| 3.7 | Experiment Setups | 50 | | | |
| 3.8 | Summary | 55 | | | |
| CHAPTER 4 | RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS | 57 | | | |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 57 | | | |
| 4.2 | Trajectory Test | 57 | | | |
| 4.3 | Fault Detection with Kalman Filter and Residual Measurement | 59 | | | |
| 4.4 | EKF and UKF on Track | 60 | | | |
| 4.5 | Fault Detection with SVM | 64 | | | |
| 4.6 | Summary | 78 | | | |
| CHAPTER 5 | CONCLUSION | 79 | | | |
| 5.1 | Summary | 79 | | | |
| 5.2 | Future works | 81 | | | |
| REFERENCES | | 83 | | | |
| LIST OF PUBLICATIONS | | | | | |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|-----------|--|------|
| Table 2.1 | Guidance system comparison table. | 8 |
| Table 2.2 | Type of sensors. | 9 |
| Table 2.3 | Advantages and disadvantages of various fusion methods. | 16 |
| Table 2.4 | Advantages and disadvantages of sensor fusion for fault detection methods. | |
| | | |
| Table 3.1 | Predict class for wheel conditions. | 43 |
| Table 3.2 | Predict class for castor conditions. | 43 |
| Table 3.3 | Encoder Test Data. | 47 |
| Table 3.1 | Output of DMM and Current Sensor. | 49 |
| Table G.1 | 130 samples of sensor fusion algorithm parameter data during a run on a square loop track for experiment which includes estimated odometry values and residual values. | 112 |
| | - | 112 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| FIGURE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|-------------|---|----------|
| Figure 2.1 | Timeline and recent advancement in AGV development. | 6 |
| Figure 2.2 | Configurations of mobile robots. | 6 |
| Figure 2.3 | Configuration of a differential two wheeled mobile robot. An AGV with configuration features two drive wheels that can run at different speeds separately. The different turning speeds between these two drive wheels allow the AGV to turn. | 7 |
| Figure 2.4 | Steps in Kalman filter. | , 11 |
| Figure 2.5 | Odometry plotting of measured and estimated path generated with EKF. | 12 |
| Figure 2.6 | Actual, linearized (EKF) and unscented transformation. | 13 |
| Figure 2.7 | Block diagram of UKF sensor fusion algorithm. | 13 |
| Figure 2.8 | Platform with infrared sensor and ultrasonic sensor. | 14 |
| Figure 2.9 | (a) Root mean square (RMS) values between consecutive frames exceeding threshold when the space within ultrasonic range is occupied. (b) Image as perceived by infrared sensor showing an activity of a person falling. | 15 |
| Figure 2.10 | Classification of FDI techniques. | 13 |
| Figure 2.11 | Residual generation using observer Kalman filter. | 19 |
| Figure 2.12 | Mobile robot utilizing EKF with multiple positioning module as described. | 20 |
| Figure 2.13 | Residual value evaluation during encoder fault simulation. | 21 |
| Figure 3.1 | Flow of research methodology. | 24 |
| Figure 3.2 | 3D CAD model of the AGV's chassis with motors and wheels attached. | 76 |
| Figure 3.3 | Assembly of AGV chassis. | 20 26 |

| Figure 3.4 | Kinetic model of AGV. | 27 |
|-------------|---|----|
| Figure 3.5 | AGV internal where the electronics, motors and wheels are located. | 28 |
| Figure 3.6 | AGV used with added 9-DOF IMU and LiDAR. | 29 |
| Figure 3.7 | System architecture of the AGV. | 30 |
| Figure 3.8 | Flow of UKF algorithm. | 37 |
| Figure 3.9 | Flow of EKF algorithm. | 41 |
| Figure 3.10 | Flow of SVM train and predict. | 46 |
| Figure 3.11 | Setup for encoder test on AGV. | 47 |
| Figure 3.12 | Setup for current sensor test. | 49 |
| Figure 3.13 | AGV running on track. | 51 |
| Figure 3.14 | A square loop track as test track, track A. | 51 |
| Figure 3.15 | An irregular loop track as test track, track B. | 52 |
| Figure 3.16 | A figure 8 track as test track, track C. | 52 |
| Figure 3.17 | Flow of data on AGV. | 52 |
| Figure 3.18 | a) Good wheel with treads, round and 126mm (5-inch) diameter. b) Damaged wheel, not round, damaged portion less by 4mm. Bumpy. c) Worn-out wheel without tread, round and 122mm diameter. d) Reduced traction. Measured with vernier caliper. | 54 |
| Figure 3.19 | a) Clean castor with nuts tighten to hold castor at correct height alignment with the other castors. b) Clean castor with nuts loosen causing castor to have uneven height alignment with the other castors and swivelling difficulties. c) PTFE (plumbing) tape wound around axle and foam tape with glue on the wheel of the castor to emulate dirt and problematic wheel turn. | 54 |
| Figure 3.20 | Block diagram of proposed fault detection for experiment. | 55 |
| Figure 4.21 | Reference trajectory for experiment. | 58 |
| Figure 4.22 | Trajectory of the AGV during experiment. | 58 |
| Figure 4.23 | Current values during normal operation test. | 59 |

| Figure 4.4 | Current values during fault test. | 60 |
|-------------|--|----|
| Figure 4.5 | AGV estimated trajectory with LiDAR and IMU for track A. | 61 |
| Figure 4.6 | AGV estimated trajectory with LiDAR and IMU for track B. | 61 |
| Figure 4.7 | AGV estimated trajectory with LiDAR and IMU for track C. | 62 |
| Figure 4.8 | Residual of Kalman filter with LiDAR and IMU comparison for track A. | 63 |
| Figure 4.9 | Residual of Kalman filter with LiDAR and IMU comparison for track B. | 63 |
| Figure 4.10 | Residual of Kalman filter with LiDAR and IMU comparison for track C. | 64 |
| Figure 4.11 | Residual and threshold (without SVM). | 65 |
| Figure 4.12 | Residual generated over three test runs for EKF estimation when the AGV is operating with normal wheel condition. | 66 |
| Figure 4.13 | Residual generated over three test runs for UKF estimation when the AGV is operating with normal wheel condition. | 66 |
| Figure 4.14 | Residual generated over three test runs for EKF estimation when the AGV is operating with damaged wheel. | 67 |
| Figure 4.15 | Residual generated over three test runs for UKF estimation when the AGV is operating with damaged wheel. | 67 |
| Figure 4.16 | Residual generated over three test runs for EKF estimation when the AGV is operating with worn out wheel. | 67 |
| Figure 4.17 | Residual generated over three test runs for UKF estimation when the AGV is operating with worn out wheel. | 60 |
| Figure 4.18 | Mean and standard deviation of generated residual for all six cases based on their Kalman filter type and wheel | 08 |
| | conditions. | 69 |

| Figure 4.19 | Residual generated over three test runs for EKF estimation when the AGV is operating with normal | |
|-------------|--|----|
| | castor condition. | 70 |
| Figure 4.20 | Residual generated over three test runs for UKF estimation when the AGV is operating with normal castor condition. | 70 |
| Figure 4.21 | Residual generated over three test runs for EKF estimation when the AGV is operating with loose castor condition. | 71 |
| Figure 4.22 | Residual generated over three test runs for UKF estimation when the AGV is operating with loose castor condition. | 71 |
| Figure 4.23 | Residual generated over three test runs for EKF estimation when the AGV is operating with dirty castor condition. | 72 |
| Figure 4.24 | Residual generated over three test runs for UKF estimation when the AGV is operating with dirty castor condition. | 72 |
| Figure 4.25 | Mean and standard deviation of generated residual for all six cases based on their Kalman filter type and castor faults. | 73 |
| Figure 4.26 | Learning curve of uneven wheel model (MSE: 0.1905, Accuracy: 0.9167). | 74 |
| Figure 4.27 | Correlation plot for uneven wheel model. | 74 |
| Figure 4.28 | Learning curve of uneven castor model (MSE: 0.0765, Accuracy: 0.9388). | 75 |
| Figure 4.29 | Correlation plot for uneven castor model. | 75 |
| Figure 4.30 | SVM vs threshold (accuracy). | 76 |
| Figure 4.31 | SVM model performance (accuracy). | 77 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| 3D CAD | - | 3-dimensional computer aided design |
|--------|---|--|
| 4Ds | - | Too Dangerous, too Dull, too Dirty and too Difficult |
| 9-DOF | - | 9-degrees of freedom |
| ADC | - | Analogue to digital conversion |
| AGV | - | Automated guide vehicle |
| CCD | - | Charge-coupled device |
| CMOS | - | Complementary metal-oxide semiconductor |
| DC | - | Direct current |
| DMM | - | Digital multimeter |
| DST | - | Dempster-Shafer theory |
| EKF | - | Extended Kalman filter |
| FDI | - | Fault detection and isolation |
| GPS | - | Global positioning system |
| IMU | - | Inertial measurement unit |
| ІоТ | - | Internet of Things |
| LiDAR | - | Light detection and ranging |
| LiPo | - | Lithium polymer |
| MEMS | - | Microelectromechanical system |
| MM | - | Multi-model |
| MSE | - | Mean square error |
| RFID | - | Radio frequency identification |
| RMS | - | Root mean square |
| PC | - | Personal computer |
| PF | - | Particle filter |
| SBC | - | Single board computer |
| SVM | - | Support vector machine |
| UART | - | Universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter |
| UAV | - | Unmanned aerial vehicle |
| UKF | - | Unscented Kalman filter |
| USB | - | Universal serial bus |

QEI - Quadrature encoder interface

LIST OF SYMBOLS

| d | - | Axial distance between wheels |
|----------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| k | - | Iteration |
| n | - | Number of pulses |
| ϕ | - | Heading angle |
| π | - | Pi constant (3.142) |
| r | - | Radius of wheel |
| t | - | Time |
| v | - | Velocity of AGV |
| ω | - | Angular velocity of AGV |
| Ν | - | Number of pulses per rotation |
| Т | - | Sampling time |
| x_k^f | - | State prediction |
| P_k^f | - | Covariance |
| K_k | - | Kalman gain |
| x_k^a | - | Updated state |
| P_k^a | - | Update covariance |
| \overline{X} | - | Predicted state |
| X | - | Updated state |
| A | - | State transition matrix |
| В | - | Coefficient matrix |
| u | - | Input matrix |
| \overline{P} | - | Predicted state |
| Р | - | Updated state |
| Н | - | Measurement matrix |
| Q | - | Process noise |
| R | - | Measurement noise |
| Ζ | - | Measurement |
| у | - | Residual |
| v_e | - | Velocity output based on encoder data |

| ω_e | - | Steering angle output based on encoder data |
|-----------------|---|--|
| r_R | - | Radius of right wheel |
| r_L | - | Radius of left wheel |
| ω_R | - | Angular velocity of right wheel |
| ω_L | - | Angular velocity of left wheel |
| x _e | - | x-position of AGV based on encoder data |
| y_e | - | y-position of AGV based on encoder data |
| ϕ_e | - | Heading angle of AGV based on encoder data |
| u _e | - | Input matrix based on encoder data |
| a_x | - | Accelerometer output in x-axis |
| m_x | - | Magnetometer output in x-axis |
| m_y | - | Magnetometer output in y-axis |
| x _i | - | x-position of AGV based on IMU data |
| y_i | - | y-position of AGV based on IMU data |
| ϕ_i | - | Heading angle of AGV based on IMU data |
| u _i | - | Input matrix based on IMU data |
| v_i | - | Velocity based on IMU output |
| Δx_l | - | Displacement in x-axis based on LiDAR data |
| Δx_l | - | Displacement in x-axis based on LiDAR data |
| $\Delta \phi_l$ | - | Heading angle difference based on LiDAR data |
| x_l | - | x-position of AGV based on LiDAR data |
| y_l | - | y-position of AGV based on LiDAR data |
| ϕ_l | - | Heading angle of AGV based on LiDAR data |
| x | - | x-position of AGV |
| у | - | y-position of AGV |
| <i>x</i> | - | Sigma points |
| ý | - | Transformed sigma points |
| ω^m | - | Weight of mean |
| ω^{c} | - | Weight of covariance |
| Ζ | - | Measurement-transformed sigma points |
| μ_z | - | Mean of measurement space |
| P_z | - | Covariance of measurement space |
| Y | - | Residual |

| P_{xz} | - | Cross-covariance between state and measurement |
|----------|---|--|
| F | - | Jacobian of state model |
| Н | - | Jacobian of measurement model |
| Ι | - | Identity matrix |
| | | |

LIST OF APPENDICES

| APPENDIX | TITLE | PAGE |
|------------|--|------|
| Appendix A | Reference Specification of Industrial Mobile Robot | 91 |
| Appendix B | Datasheet of Cytron LSA08 Line Follower | 92 |
| Appendix C | Datasheet of Xsens MTI-670 | 94 |
| Appendix D | Module Datasheet of Hokuyo URG-04LX-UG01 | 97 |
| Appendix E | Circuit Design and Schematics | 99 |
| Appendix F | Source Code | 101 |
| Appendix G | Sample Data Collected | 112 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

In this era of Industry 4.0, more solutions are moving towards automation and such automated solutions are automated guided vehicle (AGV). According to the International Federation of Robotics, the population of service mobile robot were 4 million and is increasing to about 31 million in 2014 till 2017 [1]. AGV is a type of self-propelled, mobile robot and is capable of carrying out task. AGVs are deployed in industrial environment to automate industrial operation and to cut down operation cost [2]. In a warehouse, operation cost can be costly with manual labour due to employee salary. The operation is less efficient due to the limitation of human workers where human workers can feel exhausted and are prone to health problems. AGV as machines, work tirelessly and continuously to ensure high productivity. AGV as robot seems suitable for any task which are too Dangerous, too Dull, too Dirty and too Difficult (4Ds) to be done by humans [3]. Modern AGVs are equipped with more different sensors, allowing them to complete complex tasks. Sensors play a vital role on AGVs to acquire information from the environment so AGVs may operate properly in its working environment [4]. By using sensor fusion, the combination of data from more than one sensor enables better robot perception. Uncertainties in sensors can be reduced and the accuracy and reliability of AGVs can be increased with better perception. However, machines can break down and cause business losses and potential harm to the workers. Thus, there is an increase in demands regarding the reliability and maintenance [5]. With fault detection, anomalies in performance of AGV can be detected which could help improve reliability of AGV. Thus, this research aims to design and develop an enhanced sensor fusion algorithm for fault detection in AGV with better accuracy. Hence,

sensor fusion method with better estimation accuracy could contribute to better fault detection accuracy.

1.2 Problem Statement

Modern AGVs are equipped with more sensors to collect information on the AGV itself and its surrounding. Data generated from sensors enable AGV functions such as detecting obstacles and performance and status monitoring. Information on the AGV can be utilized to optimize maintenance work on AGV. Efficient maintenance can save time and cost which is beneficial.

The weakness of currently utilized AGV systems are the cost for installation, efficiency of the system, flexibility of the system and the safety of the system [5]. The challenges in fault detection includes robustness, multiple fault diagnosis and real time diagnosis [6]. Failure in mobile robot system may cause robot to be off navigation which will be hazardous to human and degrades service performance [7]. Hence, the AGV should be capable of fault detection with multiple sensors for fault diagnosis and the sensors installed should be reliable so the AGV and its fault detection is robust while dealing with uncertainties in practical operation. The importance of fault detection is that it would bring more advantages not only to the mobile robot itself but also to maintenance planning and safety [8].

Residual generation is vital for most case in fault detection. Model based methods are preferred as data driven based methods are computationally costly. Most previous sensor fusion for fault detection work uses extended Kalman filter (EKF) which has limitation in handling nonlinear model [9]. This limitation causes low accuracy of the generated estimated value. Limited accuracy of the generated estimated value. Limited accuracy of the generated estimated value using EKF causes the fault detection to be unsatisfying in terms of accuracy. There are other sensor fusion methods claimed to have better estimation accuracy than EKF when used on other applications such as unscented Kalman filter (UKF). As for fault detection algorithm, previous work mostly relies on thresholding

of residual values generated which can be falsely triggered due to inaccuracies of EKF. Classification methods such as support vector machine (SVM) can be used to identify abnormalities in AGV performances.

1.3 Objective of Research

The purpose of this research is to design and develop enhanced sensor fusion for fault detection on AGV. The objectives of this research are:

- i. To design and develop an AGV as a test bed for fault detection. Sensors such as current sensor and encoder will be implemented on the test AGV.
- ii. To design an enhanced sensor fusion and fault detection method on AGV. Multiple sensor data generated on test AGV will be fused using EKF and UKF. SVM will be used for fault detection.
- iii. To evaluate the performance of methods on AGV and compare performance for fault detection on AGV. The performance of methods is measured in terms of estimation accuracy of sensor fusion method and the fault detection accuracy.

1.4 Scope of Research

A prototype AGV will be designed and developed as a test bed to experiment sensor fusion methods and fault detection. A two wheeled differential drive mobile robot will be used as the test AGV. Sensors are to be applied to the AGV. These sensors are vital for an AGV operations as the data outputs from these sensors can be used to measure the performance of the AGV and its fault detection capabilities. Next, the test AGV uses Arduino Mega microcontroller as controller to govern the operation of the test AGV. Some C programming as prerequisite for coding the program to drive the actuators of the test AGV and to control the sensors. The Raspberry Pi 4 is to collect and analyse data, computing the sensor fusion algorithm. The programming environment to run sensor fusion and fault detection algorithm is mostly in Python programming language.

Lastly, the performance of the fault detection will be evaluated using residual calculation and error evaluation. The generated residual will be evaluated using SVM for fault detection. Based on the residual values calculated, the accuracy of estimation of each sensor fusion method can be measured and abnormality on AGV can be detected using fault detection method.

1.5 Thesis Outline

This report is divided into five chapters with Chapter 1 being the introduction of this report where problem statement, objective and scope of research are discussed. Chapter 2 is the literature review where research and review of AGV, sensor fusion and fault detection are discussed and summarized. Chapter 3 is where the project methodology is explained in detail. Experiment setup and execution to test the AGV test bed, sensor fusion and fault detection methods are mentioned in Chapter 3. Next, Chapter 4 is the result and outcome of the experiment mentioned in Chapter 3. Finally, Chapter 5 is the conclusion and suggestion for future work of this project. This final chapter is to summarize the research based on the findings in previous chapters and to proposed possible improvements for future research work.

REFERENCES

- D. Stavrou, D. G. Eliades, C. G. Panayiotou, and M. M. Polycarpou, "Fault detection for service mobile robots using model-based method," *Autonomous Robots*, 2016, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 383-394.
- [2] T. Ganesharajah, N. G. Hall, and C. Sriskandarajah, "Design and operational issues in AGV-served manufacturing systems," *Annals of Operations Research*, 1998, vol. 76, no. 0, pp. 109-154.
- [3] E. Khalastchi and M. Kalech, "Fault Detection and Diagnosis in Multi-Robot Systems: A Survey," *Sensors (Basel)*, 2019, vol. 19, no. 18.
- [4] S. G. Anavatti, S. L. Francis, and M. Garratt, "Path-planning modules for Autonomous Vehicles: Current status and challenges," in 2015 International Conference on Advanced Mechatronics, Intelligent Manufacture, and Industrial Automation (ICAMIMIA), 2015, pp. 205-214.
- [5] L. Sabattini *et al.*, "Technological roadmap to boost the introduction of AGVs in industrial applications," in 2013 IEEE 9th International Conference on Intelligent Computer Communication and Processing (ICCP), 2013, pp. 203-208.
- [6] Z.-h. Duan, Z.-x. Cai, and J.-x. Yu, "Fault Diagnosis and Fault Tolerant Control for Wheeled Mobile Robots under Unknown Environments: A Survey," in *Proceedings of the 2005 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2005, pp. 3428-3433.
- [7] R. Hongpipatsak and M. Wongsaisuwan, "Motion interference detection and identification in mobile robots using driving motor currents," in *IECON 2017* - 43rd Annual Conference of the IEEE Industrial Electronics Society, 2017, pp. 3203-3208.

- [8] M. S, G. G, A. E. M. El, O. M, and P. A, "On fault detection and isolation applied on unicycle mobile robot sensors and actuators," in 2018 7th International Conference on Systems and Control (ICSC), 2018, pp. 148-153.
- [9] P. G. Medewar, M. Yadav, and H. G. Patel, "A Comparison between Nonlinear Estimation based Algorithms for Mobile Robot Localizations," in 2019 IEEE 1st International Conference on Energy, Systems and Information Processing (ICESIP).
- [10] R. C. Arkin and R. R. Murphy, "Autonomous navigation in a manufacturing environment," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, 1990, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 445-454.
- [11] E. A. Oyekanlu *et al.*, "A Review of Recent Advances in Automated Guided Vehicle Technologies: Integration Challenges and Research Areas for 5G-Based Smart Manufacturing Applications," *IEEE Access*, 2020, vol. 8, pp. 202312-202353.
- [12] J. F. Archila and M. Becker, "Mathematical models and design of an AGV (Automated Guided Vehicle)," in 2013 IEEE 8th Conference on Industrial Electronics and Applications (ICIEA), 2013, pp. 1857-1862.
- [13] L. A. Yekinni and A. Dan-Isa, "Fuzzy Logic Control of Goal-Seeking 2-Wheel Differential Mobile Robot Using Unicycle Approach," in 2019 IEEE International Conference on Automatic Control and Intelligent Systems (I2CACIS), 2019, pp. 300-304.
- [14] Y. Ryoo and J. Park, "Design and development of magnetic position sensor for magnetic guidance system of automated ground vehicle," in 2012 12th International Conference on Control, Automation and Systems, 2012, pp. 988-991.

- [15] T. L. Bui, P. T. Doan, H. K. Kim, and S. B. Kim, "Trajectory tracking controller design for AGV using laser sensor based positioning system," in 2013 9th Asian Control Conference (ASCC), 2013, pp. 1-5.
- [16] G. Ziwei and L. Rong, "2D Range Flow-based Odometry fusing LiDAR and IMU," in 2019 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO), 2019, pp. 2761-2765.
- [17] L. Lynch, T. Newe, J. Clifford, J. Coleman, J. Walsh, and D. Toal, "Automated Ground Vehicle (AGV) and Sensor Technologies- A Review," in 2018 12th International Conference on Sensing Technology (ICST), 2018, pp. 347-352.
- [18] S. Campbell *et al.*, "Sensor Technology in Autonomous Vehicles : A review," in 2018 29th Irish Signals and Systems Conference (ISSC), 2018, pp. 1-4.
- [19] Q. Sun, H. Liu, Q. Yang, and W. Yan, "On the design for AGVs: Modeling, path planning and localization," in 2011 IEEE International Conference on Mechatronics and Automation, 2011, pp. 1515-1520.
- [20] M. B. Alatise and G. P. Hancke, "A Review on Challenges of Autonomous Mobile Robot and Sensor Fusion Methods," *IEEE Access*, 2020, vol. 8, pp. 39830-39846.
- [21] Z. Zhao, J. Wang, J. Cao, W. Gao, and Q. Ren, "A Fault-tolerant Architecture for Mobile Robot Localization," in 2019 IEEE 15th International Conference on Control and Automation (ICCA), 2019, pp. 584-589.
- [22] S. Jusoh and S. Almajali, "A Systematic Review on Fusion Techniques and Approaches Used in Applications," *IEEE Access*, 2020, vol. 8, pp. 14424-14439.

- [23] M. J. Gilmartin, "INTRODUCTION TO AUTONOMOUS MOBILE ROBOTS, by Roland Siegwart and Illah R. Nourbakhsh, MIT Press, 2004, xiii+321 pp., ISBN 0-262-19502-X. (Hardback, £27.95)," *Robotica*, 2005, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 271-272.
- [24] B. Chandrasekaran, S. Gangadhar, and J. M. Conrad, "A survey of multisensor fusion techniques, architectures and methodologies," in *SoutheastCon 2017*, 2017, pp. 1-8.
- [25] R. C. Luo and C. Chang, "Multisensor Fusion and Integration: A Review on Approaches and Its Applications in Mechatronics," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 2012, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 49-60.
- [26] Y. Qingmei and S. Jianmin, A data fusion method applied in an autonomous robot. 2008, pp. 361-364.
- [27] H. Wang and J. Leng, "A brief review on the development of Kalman filter," in 2018 Chinese Control And Decision Conference (CCDC), 2018, pp. 694-699.
- [28] Y. Liu, Y. Zhou, C. Hu, and Q. Wu, "A Review of Multisensor Information Fusion Technology," in 2018 37th Chinese Control Conference (CCC), 2018, pp. 4455-4460.
- [29] A. Eman and H. Ramdane, "Mobile Robot Localization Using Extended Kalman Filter," in 2020 3rd International Conference on Computer Applications & Information Security (ICCAIS), 2020, pp. 1-5.
- [30] D. R. Phang, W. Lee, N. Matsuhira, and P. Michail, "Enhanced Mobile Robot Localization with Lidar and IMU Sensor," in 2019 IEEE International Meeting for Future of Electron Devices, Kansai (IMFEDK), 2019, pp. 71-72.

- [31] H. Deilamsalehy and T. C. Havens, "Sensor fused three-dimensional localization using IMU, camera and LiDAR," in 2016 IEEE SENSORS, 2016, pp. 1-3.
- [32] M. Thirumarimurugan, N. Bagyalakshmi, and P. Paarkavi, "Comparison of fault detection and isolation methods: A review," in 2016 10th International Conference on Intelligent Systems and Control (ISCO), 2016, pp. 1-6.
- [33] K. Berntorp, K.-E. Arzén, and A. Robertsson, "Sensor fusion for motion estimation of mobile robots with compensation for out-of-sequence measurements," 2011.
- [34] M. L. Anjum *et al.*, "Sensor data fusion using Unscented Kalman Filter for accurate localization of mobile robots," in *ICCAS 2010*, 2010, pp. 947-952.
- [35] Q. Xu, C. Ren, H. Yan, and J. Ji, "Laser sensor based localization of mobile robot using Unscented Kalman Filter," in 2016 IEEE International Conference on Mechatronics and Automation, 2016, pp. 1726-1731.
- [36] S. Avidan, "Support vector tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2004, vol. 26, no. 8, pp. 1064-1072, 2004.
- [37] Z. Li and Y. Ma, "A new method of multi-sensor information fusion based on SVM," in 2009 International Conference on Machine Learning and Cybernetics, 2009, vol. 2, pp. 925-929.
- [38] F. Deng, S. Guo, R. Zhou, and J. Chen, "Sensor Multifault Diagnosis With Improved Support Vector Machines," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2017, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 1053-1063, 2017.
- [39] Z. J. Chen and Y. Wang, "Infrared-ultrasonic sensor fusion for support vector machine-based fall detection," (in English), *Journal of Intelligent Material Systems and Structures*, 2018, Article vol. 29, no. 9, pp. 2027-2039.

- [40] S. Zhang, "Mobile Robot Location Algorithm Based on Improved Particle Filtering," in 2018 IEEE 18th International Conference on Communication Technology (ICCT), 2018, pp. 1417-1421.
- [41] A. Suparyanto, R. N. Fatimah, A. Widyotriatmo, and Y. Y. Nazaruddin, "Port Container Truck Localization Using Sensor Fusion Technique," in 2018 5th International Conference on Electric Vehicular Technology (ICEVT), 2018, pp. 72-77.
- [42] E. Astuti, N. E. Saragih, N. Sribina, and R. Ramadhani, "Dempster-Shafer Method for Diagnose Diseases on Vegetable," in 2018 6th International Conference on Cyber and IT Service Management (CITSM), 2018, pp. 1-4.
- [43] L. Zhang, S. Zhang, Y. Tao, and H. Long, "Sensory Task Assignment Based on Dempster-Shafer Theory and Multi-Attribute Fusion in Mobile Sensor Networks," *IEEE Access*, 2019, vol. 7, pp. 133962-133973.
- [44] N. Nesa and I. Banerjee, "IoT-Based Sensor Data Fusion for Occupancy Sensing Using Dempster–Shafer Evidence Theory for Smart Buildings," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 2017, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 1563-1570.
- [45] R. C. Luo and C.-C. Chang, "Multisensor Fusion and Integration: A Review on Approaches and Its Applications in Mechatronics," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 2012, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 49-60.
- [46] P. S. Pratama, A. V. Gulakari, Y. D. Setiawan, D. H. Kim, H. K. Kim, and S. B. Kim, "Trajectory tracking and fault detection algorithm for automatic guided vehicle based on multiple positioning modules," *International Journal of Control, Automation and Systems*, 2016, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 400-410.
- [47] M. S, G. G, A. E. M. E, O. M, and P. A, "Detection & isolation of sensor and actuator additive faults in a 4-mecanum wheeled mobile robot (4-MWMR)," in 2019 International Conference on Control, Automation and Diagnosis (ICCAD), 2019, pp. 1-6.

- [48] P. Padrao, L. Hsu, M. Vilzmann, and K. Kondak, "A Comparative Study of Sensor Fault Detection Approaches applied to an Autonomous Solar-powered Aircraft," in 2019 19th International Conference on Advanced Robotics (ICAR), 2019, pp. 761-766.
- [49] Y. Wang and J. Qian, "Gas Flow Path Fault Diagnosis and Sensor Fault Diagnosis for Aeroengine Based on Fusion Filter Algorithm," in 2017 International Conference on Sensing, Diagnostics, Prognostics, and Control (SDPC), 2017, pp. 86-91.
- [50] C. S. Jing and D. Pebrianti, "Fault detection and identification in Quadrotor system (Quadrotor robot)," in 2016 IEEE International Conference on Automatic Control and Intelligent Systems (I2CACIS), 2016, pp. 11-16.
- [51] Z. Duan, H. Ma, and L. Yang, "Fault detection for internal sensors of mobile robots based on support vector data description," in *The 27th Chinese Control* and Decision Conference (2015 CCDC), 2015, pp. 2702-2706.
- [52] G. K. Fourlas, G. C. Karras, and K. J. Kyriakopoulos, "Sensors fault diagnosis in autonomous mobile robots using observer — Based technique," in 2015 International Conference on Control, Automation and Robotics, 2015, pp. 49-54.
- [53] P. Pratama et al., "Fault detection algorithm for automatic guided vehicle based on multiple positioning modules," Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on Advances in Computing, Communications and Informatics, ICACCI 2014, 2014, pp. 751-757.
- [54] P. Yazdjerdi and N. Meskin, "Actuator fault detection and isolation of differential drive mobile robots using multiple model algorithm," in 2017 4th International Conference on Control, Decision and Information Technologies (CoDIT), 2017, pp. 0439-0443.

[55] A. Mhatre, S. Lachell, and J. Pearlman, "Development, reliability, and piloting of a wheelchair caster failure inspection tool (C-FIT)," *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology*, 2019, vol. 15, pp. 1-10.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

Indexed Conference Proceedings

- Dares, M., Goh, K. W., Koh, Y. S., Yeong, C. F., Su, E., and Tan., P. H. (2020). Development of AGV as Test Bed for Fault Detection. In 2020 6th International Conference on Control, Automation and Robotics (ICCAR) (pp. 379-383). IEEE. doi: 10.1109/ICCAR49639.2020.9107977. (Indexed by SCOPUS)
- Dares, M., Goh, K. W., Koh, Y. S., Yeong, C. F., Su, E., and Tan., P. H. (2021). Automated Guided Vehicle Robot Localization with Sensor Fusion. In 2021 International Conference on Computational Intelligence in Machine Learning (ICCIML) (pp. 135-143). Springer Nature Singapore. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-8484-5_11. (Indexed by SCOPUS)