Robust Multi-Objective Control for Linear Systems Elements of theory and RoMulOC toolbox



Denis Arzelier & <u>Dimitri Peaucelle</u> LAAS-CNRS, Toulouse, FRANCE

LAAS-CNRS

also with Alberto Bortott, Guilherme Chevarria, Yoshio Ebihara, Maud Sevin, Philippe Spiesser...

www.laas.fr/OLOCEP/romuloc/downloads.html

Introduction

Robust control theory

- Robustness properties of the feedback loop
- Aim for guaranteed properties (stability and performances)
- Uncertain modeling of systems: tradeoff between complexity of systems & simplicity of models

Optimization based tools

- Linear Matrix Inequalities (LMI) framework [1990's]
- Efficient fast solvers and nice parser for Matlab [2000's]
- Possibility of a tool gathering established results : RoMulOC



Ecole des JD-MACS Juin 2011, Marseille

• Uncertain LTI systems and performances

Control objectives: stability, transient response, perturbation rejection...

Structured parametric uncertainties: extremal values, bounded sets...

2 LMIs and convex polynomial-time optimization

Semi-Definite Programming and LMIs

SDP solvers and parsers

6 Conservative LMI results

Methods: Lyapunov, S-procedure, Finsler lemma, Topologic Separation...

The ROMULOC toolbox



Linear Time-Invariant State-Space Multi-Input Multi-Output models

$$\begin{split} \vartheta[x](t) &= Ax(t) + B_u u(t) & \vartheta[\eta](t) = K_A \eta(t) + K_B y(t) \\ y(t) &= C_y x(t) + D_{yu} u(t) & u(t) = K_C \eta(t) + K_D y(t) \\ & x \in \mathsf{C}^n \quad u \in \mathsf{C}^{q_u} \quad y \in \mathsf{C}^{p_y} \quad \eta \in \mathsf{C}^{n_K} \end{split}$$

Continuous ($\vartheta[x](t) = \dot{x}(t)$) and discrete-time ($\vartheta[x](t) = x(t+T)$)

analysis problem: For given (K_A, K_B, K_C, K_D) prove closed-loop properties of

$$\vartheta \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \eta \end{bmatrix} (t) = A(\mathbf{K}) \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} (t)$$

Design problem: Find (K_A, K_B, K_C, K_D) providing closed loop properties

• For $n_k = 0$: Static output-feedback (SOF)

$$igcap$$
 For $n_k=0$ and $y=x$: State feedback problem

• For $n_k = n$: full order output-feedback problem

Control objectives

Stability of $\vartheta[x](t) = A(K)x(t)$

A For continuous-time: poles are all in left-hand half of complex plane

A For discrete-time: poles are all in unit circle of complex plane

•
$$D_R$$
-Stability of $\vartheta[x](t) = A(K)x(t)$:

A Poles are in region defined by

$$D_R = \{ s \in \mathsf{C} : r_{11} + sr_{12} + s^*r_{12} + s^*r_{22} \le 0 \} , \quad R = (r_{ij})$$

Such regions are half-planes and discs

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} R = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} R = \begin{bmatrix} -2\alpha \cos\psi & \cos\psi - i\sin\psi \\ \cos\psi + i\sin\psi & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$



Input/output objectives

$$\vartheta[x](t) = A(K)x(t) + B_w(K)w(t) : w \in \mathsf{C}^{q_w} \\ z(t) = C_z(K)x(t) + D_{zw}(K)w(t) : z \in \mathsf{C}^{p_z}$$

Induced L_2 gain: $||z|| \leq \gamma_{\infty} ||w||$, $(||w||^2 = \int_0^\infty w^* w dt)$ Also known as: H_∞ performance (max singular value $H(j\omega)$, $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$), Robustness to unmodeled dynamics $w = \Delta z$, $||\Delta|| \leq 1/\gamma_\infty$ (bounded-real lemma)

```
Impulse-to-norm performance: ||z|| \leq \gamma_2 if w(t) = \delta(t)1
Also known as: H_2 performance (mean value H(j\omega), \omega \in \mathbb{R}),
Energy of output in response to Gaussian white noise
Norm-to-peak performance (max |z| \leq \gamma_2 ||w||, z \in \mathbb{R})
```

Impulse-to-peak performance: max $|z| \leq \gamma_{i2p}$ if $w(t) = \delta(t)\alpha$, $||\alpha|| \leq 1$.
Also known as: Invariant ellipsoids
Non saturating initial conditions



Robust Multi-Objective Control

 \mathbf{O} Δ : errors in modeling, operating conditions, mass-production...

 \frown Δ : parametric uncertainty, assumed constant, belongs to a set Δ .

$$\vartheta[x](t) = A(\Delta, K)x(t) + B_w(\Delta, K)w(t)$$
$$z(t) = C_z(\Delta, K)x(t) + D_{zw}(\Delta, K)w(t)$$

Design: Find a controller K that fulfills all robust specifications $\Pi_{p=1...\bar{p}}$ defined for models $\Sigma_p(\Delta_p)$ subject to uncertainties $\Delta_p \in \Delta_p$.



Analysis: For given K prove for each $\Sigma_{p=1...ar{p}}(\Delta_p)$

that the specification Π_p holds for all uncertainties $\Delta_p \in \Delta_p$.

Uncertain LTI systems: Affine with scalar parametric uncertainty



Convex hull of $\bar{\upsilon}$ vertices

$$A(\Delta) = \sum_{v=1}^{\bar{v}} \xi_v A^{[v]} , \ B_w(\Delta) = \sum_{v=1}^{\bar{v}} \xi_v B_w^{[v]} \dots : \ \xi_v \ge 0 , \ \sum_{v=1}^{\bar{v}} \xi_v = 1$$

Example: Linear combination of linear models identified on different operating points.

- \land The ξ_v parameters may not have physical meaning
- $ightarrow ar{v}$ vertices can define a volume in $ar{v}-1$ space of parameters

(possible to divide space in polytopes with low number of vertices)



Uncertain LTI systems: Affine with scalar parametric uncertainty



AAS-CNRS

Uncertain LTI systems: Affine with scalar parametric uncertainty



9

- All coefficients independent
- A Change of basis does not preserve the structure

Polytopic models can also be written as

$$A(\Delta) = A + \left[\begin{array}{ccc} B_{\Delta}^{[1]} & \dots & B_{\Delta}^{[\bar{v}]} \end{array}\right] \underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{ccc} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{1} \mathbf{1}_{q_{1}} & & \mathbf{0} \\ & \ddots & \\ & \mathbf{0} & & \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\bar{v}} \mathbf{1}_{q_{\bar{v}}} \end{array}\right] \underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{ccc} C_{\Delta}^{[1]} \\ \vdots \\ C_{\Delta}^{[\bar{v}]} \end{array}\right]}_{\Delta} \\ \mathbf{\Delta} & \mathbf{C}_{\Delta} \end{array}\right]$$

where for each vertex $A^{[v]} = A + B^{[v]}_{\Delta} C^{[v]}_{\Delta}$ with $B^{[v]}_{\Delta} \in \mathsf{C}^{n \times q_v}$.

Parallelotopic models can also be written as

$$A(\Delta) = \underbrace{A^{|0|}}_{A} + \underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{ccc} B^{|1|}_{\Delta} & \dots & B^{|\bar{\varsigma}|}_{\Delta} \end{array}\right]}_{B_{\Delta}}_{B_{\Delta}} = \underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{ccc} \delta_{1} 1_{p_{1}} & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & \delta_{\bar{\varsigma}} 1_{p_{\bar{\varsigma}}} \end{array}\right]}_{\Delta} \underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{ccc} C^{|1|}_{\Delta} \\ \vdots \\ C^{|\bar{\varsigma}|}_{\Delta} \end{array}\right]}_{C_{\Delta}}$$

where for each axis $A^{|\varsigma|} = B_{\Delta}^{|\varsigma|} C_{\Delta}^{|\varsigma|}$ with $B_{\Delta}^{|\varsigma|} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times p_{\varsigma}}$.

A Factorisation as $A(\Delta) = A + B_{\Delta} \Delta C_{\Delta}$ is not unique.



Uncertain LTI systems: Linear Fractional Representation (LFR)



$$\begin{split} \vartheta[x](t) &= Ax(t) + B_{\Delta} w_{\Delta}(t) + B_{w} w(t) + B_{u} u(t) \\ z_{\Delta}(t) &= C_{\Delta} x(t) + D_{\Delta \Delta} w_{\Delta}(t) + D_{\Delta w} w(t) + D_{\Delta u} u(t) \\ z(t) &= C_{z} x(t) + D_{z\Delta} w_{\Delta}(t) + D_{zw} w(t) + D_{zu} u(t) \\ y(t) &= C_{y} x(t) + D_{y\Delta} w_{\Delta}(t) + D_{yw} w(t) + D_{yu} u(t) \end{split} : \begin{aligned} & w_{\Delta} \in \mathsf{C}^{q_{\Delta}} \\ z_{\Delta} \in \mathsf{C}^{p_{\Delta}} \end{aligned}$$

Linear - Fractional Transformation (LFT):

$$A(\Delta) = A + B_{\Delta}\Delta(1 - D_{\Delta\Delta}\Delta)^{-1}C_{\Delta} = A + B_{\Delta}(1 - \Delta D_{\Delta\Delta})^{-1}\Delta C_{\Delta},$$

$$B_w(\Delta) = B_w + B_{\Delta}\Delta(1 - D_{\Delta\Delta}\Delta)^{-1}D_{\Delta w} \dots$$



Uncertain LTI systems: Linear Fractional Representation (LFR)



$$A(\Delta) = A + B_{\Delta} \Delta (1 - D_{\Delta\Delta} \Delta)^{-1} C_{\Delta} = A + B_{\Delta} (1 - \Delta D_{\Delta\Delta})^{-1} \Delta C_{\Delta} \quad \dots$$

For any model where $A(\Delta), \ldots$ are rational functions of δ_j the LFT exists Δ can always be taken as a bloc-diagonal matrix with repeated blocs

$$\Delta = \left[egin{array}{cccc} 1_{r_1}\otimes \Delta_1 & & 0 \ & \ddots & \ & 0 & & \ddots & \ & 0 & & 1_{r_{ar{j}}}\otimes \Delta_{ar{j}} \end{array}
ight]$$

igta For scalar uncertainties $1_{r_j}\otimes \delta_j=\delta_j 1_{r_j}$

🔺 LFR are not unique



Sets of uncertainties in LFRs

• $\{X, Y, Z\}$ -dissipative uncertain matices

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \Delta_j & : & X+Y\Delta_j+\Delta_j^*Y^*+\Delta_j^*Z\Delta_j\leq 0 \end{array} \right., \hspace{0.1cm} X\leq 0 \hspace{0.1cm}, \hspace{0.1cm} Z\geq 0 \end{array} \right\}$$

▲ Norm-bounded : $\|\Delta_j\| \le \rho 1$ (gain limited operators) $\Rightarrow \{-\rho^2 1, 0, 1\}$ -dissipative ▲ Positive real : $\Delta_j + \Delta_j^* \ge 0$ (passive operators) $\Rightarrow \{0, -1, 0\}$ -dissipative



Sets of uncertainties in LFRs

• $\{X, Y, Z\}$ -dissipative uncertain matices

 $\left\{ \Delta_j : X + Y\Delta_j + \Delta_j^*Y^* + \Delta_j^*Z\Delta_j \le 0 , X \le 0 , Z \ge 0 \right\}$

▲ Norm-bounded : $\|\Delta_j\| \le \rho 1$ (gain limited operators) $\Rightarrow \{-\rho^2 1, 0, 1\}$ -dissipative ▲ Positive real : $\Delta_j + \Delta_j^* \ge 0$ (passive operators) $\Rightarrow \{0, -1, 0\}$ -dissipative

Polytopic uncertainties

$$\left\{ \Delta_j = \sum \xi_{j,v} \Delta_j^{[v]} : \xi_{j,v} \ge 0 , \sum \xi_{j,v} = 1 \right\}$$

Parallelotopic uncertainties

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \Delta_{j} = \Delta_{j}^{|0|} + \sum \delta_{j,i} \Delta_{j}^{|i|} & : \ |\delta_{j,i}| \leq 1 \end{array}
ight\}$$

Interval uncertainties

$$\left\{ \Delta_j \preceq \Delta_j \preceq \overline{\Delta}_j \right\}$$



Example

15

 $ightarrow z_{\Delta 3} = z_{\Delta 2}$ added to have Δ diagonal

 $\land \delta_1$ repeated twice

 $\Delta \delta_1, \delta_2$ if independent can be defined in two intervals, or as norm-bounded

 $igstarrow \delta_1, \delta_2$ if dependent can be defined in polytope

16



"Helicopter" example

System defined at maximal value of parameters



17

System defined at maximal value of parameters

```
>> sysmax = ssmodel( 'Helicopter' );
>> sysmax.A = [0 1 0 ;0 0 1;0 -2.8 -0.14];
>> sysmax.Bw = [0;0;-14];
>> sysmax.Bu = [0;0;8];
>> sysmax.Dzu = 1;
```

System defined at minimal value of parameters



Uncertain system defined as interval of max and min

Interval model converted to polytopic model



Declare a state-feedback design problem

```
>> quiz = ctrpb( 'state-feedback', 'Lyap-unique' )
control problem: STATE-FEEDBACK design
Lyapunov function: UNIQUE (quadratic stability)
No specified performance
```

Add an H_∞ performance objective

>> quiz = quiz + hinfty(usys, 4);

Add a pole location performance objective

```
>> r = region( 'plane', -0.1 )
Half-plane such that: Re(z)<-0.1
>> quiz = quiz + dstability( usys, r )
```

Add an impulse-to-peak performance minimization objective

```
>> quiz = quiz + i2p( usys )
control problem: STATE-FEEDBACK design
Lyapunov function: UNIQUE (quadratic stability)
Specified performances / systems:
# Hinfty < 4 / Helicopter
# D-stability / Helicopter
# minimize I2P / Helicopter</pre>
```



• Uncertain LTI systems and performances

- Control objectives: stability, transient response, perturbation rejection...
- Structured parametric uncertainties: extremal values, bounded sets...





- 2 LMIs and convex polynomial-time optimization
 - Semi-Definite Programming and LMIs
 - SDP solvers and parsers

Onservative LMI results

- Methods: Lyapunov, S-procedure, Finsler lemma, Topologic Separation...
- The ROMULOC toolbox



Semi-Definite Programming and LMIs

Extension of LP to semi-definite matrices

min
$$cx$$
 : $Ax = b$, $x_i \ge 0 (LP) \mid mat(x) \ge 0 (SDP)$

Convexity, duality, polynomial-time algorithms ($\mathcal{O}(n^{6.5}\log(1/\epsilon))$).

$$\max b^T y \quad : \quad A^T y - c^T = z \quad , \quad \max(z) \ge 0$$

1st developments and 1st results : LMI formalism & Control Theory

$$\min \sum g_i y_i \quad : \quad F_0 + \sum F_i y_i \ge 0$$

 \blacktriangle The H_{∞} norm computation example for $G(s) \sim (A, B, C, D)$:

$$\|G(s)\|_{\infty}^{2} = \min \gamma : P > 0 , \begin{bmatrix} A^{T}P + PA + C_{z}^{T}C_{z} & B_{w}P + C_{z}^{T}D_{zw} \\ PB_{w}^{T} + D_{zw}^{T}C_{z} & -\gamma 1 + D_{zw}^{T}D_{zw} \end{bmatrix} \leq 0$$



SDP solvers and parsers

LMI Control Toolbox ⇒ Control Toolbox

1st solver, dedicated to LMIs issued from Control Theory, Matlab, owner.

SDP solvers: SP, SeDuMi, SDPT3, CSDP, DSDP, SDPA...

Active field, mathematical programing, C/C++, free.

Parsers: tklmitool, sdpsol, SeDuMiInterface, YALMIP

Convert LMIs to SDP solver format, Matlab (Scilab), free.



Any SDP representable problem is "solved" (numerical problems due to size and structure)
 Find "SDP-ables" problems

(linear systems, performances, robustness, LPV, saturations, delays, singular systems...)

- \land Equivalent SDP formulations \Rightarrow distinguish which are numerically efficient
- A New SDP solvers: faster, precise, robust (need for benchmark examples)



Any SDP representable problem is "solved" (numerical problems due to size and structure)
 Find "SDP-ables" problems

(linear systems, performances, robustness, LPV, saturations, delays, singular systems...)

- \land Equivalent SDP formulations \Rightarrow distinguish which are numerically efficient
- A New SDP solvers: faster, precise, robust (need for benchmark examples)
- Any "SDP-able" problem has a dual interpretation
- A New theoretical results (worst case)
- New proofs (Lyapunov functions = Lagrange multipliers; related to SOS)
- ▲ SDP formulas numerically stable (KYP-lemma)



Any SDP representable problem is "solved" (numerical problems due to size and structure)
 Find "SDP-ables" problems

(linear systems, performances, robustness, LPV, saturations, delays, singular systems...)

- \land Equivalent SDP formulations \Rightarrow distinguish which are numerically efficient
- A New SDP solvers: faster, precise, robust (need for benchmark examples)
- Any "SDP-able" problem has a dual interpretation
- A New theoretical results (worst case)
- New proofs (Lyapunov functions = Lagrange multipliers; related to SOS)
- ▲ SDP formulas numerically stable (KYP-lemma)
- Non "SDP-able" : Robustesse & Multi-objective & Relaxation of NP-hard problems
- A Optimistic / Pessimistic (conservative) results
- \land Reduce the gap (upper/lower bounds) while handling numerical complexity growth.



Any SDP representable problem is "solved" (numerical problems due to size and structure)
 Find "SDP-ables" problems

(linear systems, performances, robustness, LPV, saturations, delays, singular systems...)

- \land Equivalent SDP formulations \Rightarrow distinguish which are numerically efficient
- A New SDP solvers: faster, precise, robust (need for benchmark examples)
- Any "SDP-able" problem has a dual interpretation
- A New theoretical results (worst case)
- \land New proofs (Lyapunov functions = Lagrange multipliers; related to SOS)
- ▲ SDP formulas numerically stable (KYP-lemma)
- Non "SDP-able" : Robustesse & Multi-objective & Relaxation of NP-hard problems
- A Optimistic / Pessimistic (conservative) results
- A Reduce the gap (upper/lower bounds) while handling numerical complexity growth.
- O Develop software for "industrial" application / adapted to the application field

⇒ ROMULOC toolbox





"Helicopter" example

The quiz object

```
>> quiz
control problem: STATE-FEEDBACK design
Lyapunov function: UNIQUE (quadratic stability)
Specified performances / systems:
# Hinfty < 4 / Helicopter</pre>
# D-stability / Helicopter
# minimize I2P / Helicopter
```

Contains decision variables

>> quiz.vars

3x3 sdpva	ar] 'L	yapunov	matri	x′
1x3 sdpva	ar] 'S	=-K*P′		
lx1 sdpva	ar] 'S	-procedu	ire sc	aling'

[1x1 sdpvar] 'q > $(I2P cost)^2$ '





Constrained by LMIs

>> quiz.	.lmi						
+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++							
ID	Constraint	-	Гуре	Tag			
+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++							
#1	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	3x3	Lyap >0			
#2	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	4x4	Var Lyap <0			
#3	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	4x4	Var Lyap <0			
#4	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	4x4	Var Lyap <0			
#5	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	4x4	Var Lyap <0			
#6	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	3x3	Var Lyap <0			
#7	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	3x3	Var Lyap <0			
#8	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	3x3	Var Lyap <0			
#9	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	3x3	Var Lyap <0			
#10	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	3x3	Constraint 1			
#11	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	4x4	Constraint 2			
#12	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	3x3	Constraint 3			
#13	Numeric value	Element-wise	1x1	Constraint 4			
#14	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	3x3	Constraint 1			
#15	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	4x4	Constraint 2			
#16	Numeric value	Matrix inequality	3x3	Constraint 3			
#17	Numeric value	Element-wise	1x1	Constraint 4			



28

Ecole des JD-MACS 🛒 Juin 2011, Marseille

#18	Numeric	value	Matrix	inequality	3x3	Constraint	1
#19	Numeric	value	Matrix	inequality	4x4	Constraint	2
#20	Numeric	value	Matrix	inequality	3x3	Constraint	3
#21	Numeric	value	El	lement-wise	1x1	Constraint	4
#22	Numeric	value	Matrix	inequality	3x3	Constraint	1
#23	Numeric	value	Matrix	inequality	4x4	Constraint	2
#24	Numeric	value	Matrix	inequality	3x3	Constraint	3
#25	Numeric	value	El	lement-wise	1x1	Constraint	4

29



Ecole des JD-MACS Marseille

And can be solved (SeDuMi solver by default)

```
>> K = solvesdp( quiz )
SeDuMi 1.1R3 by AdvOL, 2006 and Jos F. Sturm, 1998-2003.
Alg = 2: xz-corrector, theta = 0.250, beta = 0.500
eqs m = 11, order n = 76, dim = 250, blocks = 22
nnz(A) = 282 + 0, nnz(ADA) = 117, nnz(L) = 64
 it :
         b*y
                        delta rate t/tP* t/tD* feas cg cg prec
                    qap
                 6.96E+01 0.000
  0:
       -1.79E+02 1.85E+01 0.000 0.2657 0.9000 0.9000
  1 :
                                                       -0.09
                                                              1
                                                                 1
                                                                    5.0E+02
       -1.05E+02 5.96E+00 0.000 0.3223 0.9000 0.9000
                                                        1.55
  2 :
                                                              1
                                                                 1
                                                                    1.1E+02
                                                        1.73
  3 :
       -2.56E+01 1.38E+00 0.000 0.2312 0.9000 0.9000
                                                              1
                                                                 1
                                                                    1.9E+01
       -5.54E+00 2.62E-01 0.000 0.1902 0.9000 0.9000
  4 :
                                                        1.21
                                                              1
                                                                 1
                                                                    3.2E+00
  5 :
       -1.84E+00 8.00E-02 0.000 0.3050 0.9000 0.9000
                                                        1.29
                                                              1
                                                                 1
                                                                    8.3E-01
       -7.08E-01 2.90E-02 0.000 0.3621 0.9000 0.9000
  6 :
                                                        1.35
                                                              1
                                                                 1
                                                                    2.6E-01
       -2.95E-01 1.05E-02 0.000 0.3637 0.9000 0.9000
                                                        1.27
                                                                    8.3E-02
  7 :
                                                              1
                                                                 1
       -2.30E-01 3.57E-03 0.000 0.3393 0.9000 0.9000
                                                        1.12
                                                                    2.7E-02
  8 :
                                                              1
                                                                 1
       -1.97E-01 6.73E-04 0.000 0.1882 0.9000 0.9000
                                                        1.00
  9 :
                                                              1
                                                                 1
                                                                    5.1E-03
       -1.91E-01 2.02E-05 0.000 0.0300 0.9900 0.9900
 10 :
                                                        0.98
                                                              1
                                                                 1
                                                                    1.6E-04
       -1.91E-01 1.13E-06 0.000 0.0558 0.9900 0.9900
                                                        1.00
                                                                    8.7E-06
 11 :
                                                              1
                                                                 1
 12 :
       -1.91E-01 3.08E-07 0.000 0.2737 0.9000 0.9000
                                                        1.00
                                                                 1
                                                                    2.4E-06
                                                              1
 13 :
       -1.91E-01 1.33E-08 0.000 0.0433 0.9900 0.9900
                                                        1.00
                                                              1
                                                                    1.0E-07
                                                                 1
 14 : -1.91E-01 3.01E-09 0.000 0.2261 0.9000 0.9000
                                                        1.00
                                                              2
                                                                 2
                                                                    2.3E-08
```



Ecole des JD-MACS Marseille

15 : -1.91E-01 7.53E-10 0.000 0.2498 0.9000 0.9000 1.00 2 2 5.8E-09 16 : -1.91E-01 4.50E-11 0.087 0.0598 0.9900 0.9900 1.00 2 2 3.5E-10

Detailed timing (sec)
 Pre IPM Post
1.800E-01 4.000E-01 7.000E-02
Max-norms: ||b||=1, ||c|| = 196,
Cholesky |add|=0, |skip| = 0, ||L.L|| = 42153.4.

```
Feasibility is not strictly determined
Worst constraint residual is -2.59066e-11 < 0</pre>
```

0.436574 (=sqrt(double(CTRPB.vars{4}))) may be a guaranteed I2P norm

31

K =

0.0442 0.0091 0.0305



• Uncertain LTI systems and performances

- Control objectives: stability, transient response, perturbation rejection...
- Structured parametric uncertainties: extremal values, bounded sets...





- 2 LMIs and convex polynomial-time optimization
 - Semi-Definite Programming and LMIs
 - SDP solvers and parsers

Onservative LMI results

Methods: Lyapunov, S-procedure, Finsler lemma, Topologic Separation...

32

The ROMULOC toolbox



Ecole des JD-MACS Juin 2011, Marseille

 \Rightarrow YALMIP and all solvers

Nominal performance analysis: $V(x) = x^T P x$ Lyapunov function (P > 0) $A^T P + P A < 0 \qquad \qquad A^T P A - P < 0$ Stability $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & A^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{vmatrix} r_{11}P & r_{12}P \\ r_{12}^*P & r_{22}P \end{vmatrix} \begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ A \end{vmatrix} < 0$ $\triangleright D_R$ -Stability $\begin{bmatrix} A^T P + PA + C_z^T C_z & PB_w + C_z^T D_{zw} \\ B_w^T P + D_{zw}^T C_z & -\gamma^2 \mathbf{1} + D_{zw}^T D_{zw} \end{bmatrix} < \mathbf{0}$ H_∞ norm $A^T P + P A + C_z^T C_z < 0$ H_2 norm trace $(B_w^T P B_w) < \gamma^2$ $A^T P + P A < 0 \quad B_w^T P B_w < \gamma^2 1$ Impulse-to-peak $C_z^T C_z < \mathbf{P} \qquad D_{zw}^T D_{zw} < \gamma^2 \mathbf{1}$



Ecole des JD-MACS Marseille

Robust performance analysis: $V(x, \Delta)$ parameter-dependent Lyapunov function.

 \land Nominal analysis (LMI) \rightarrow Robust analysis (NP-hard)

 $\exists P : \mathcal{L}_{\Sigma}(P) < 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \forall \Delta \in \Delta \land, \ \exists P(\Delta) : \mathcal{L}_{\Sigma(\Delta)}(P(\Delta)) < 0$

igtleace Test over sample values $\{\Delta_{1\dots N}\}\in igtteta$ gives optimistic results

(some results exist if $\{\Delta_{1...N}\}$ is uniform distribution of Δ and large N)



Robust performance analysis: $V(x, \Delta)$ parameter-dependent Lyapunov function.

 \land Nominal analysis (LMI) \rightarrow Robust analysis (NP-hard)

 $\exists P : \mathcal{L}_{\Sigma}(P) < 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \forall \Delta \in \Delta \land, \ \exists P(\Delta) : \mathcal{L}_{\Sigma(\Delta)}(P(\Delta)) < 0$

▲ Test over sample values $\{\Delta_{1...N}\} \in \Delta$ gives optimistic results (some results exist if $\{\Delta_{1...N}\}$ is uniform distribution of Δ and large N)

lacksim Choice of $P(\Delta)$ for having a finite number of decision variables :

- → "Quadratic Stability": $P(\Delta) = P$
- → Polytopic PDLF: $P(\Delta) = \sum \zeta_i P^{[i]}$

 $\rightarrow P(\Delta)$ polynomial w.r.t. ζ_i (not coded in RoMulOC)

→ Quadratic-LFT PDLF:
$$P(\Delta) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \Delta_C^T \end{bmatrix} P \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \Delta_C \end{bmatrix}$$
 : $\Delta_C = (1 - \Delta D_{\Delta\Delta})^{-1} \Delta C_{\Delta}$

 $\rightarrow P(\Delta)$ polynomial w.r.t. Δ_C (not coded in RoMulOC)

Robust performance analysis: $V(x, \Delta)$ parameter-dependent Lyapunov function.

 \land Nominal analysis (LMI) \rightarrow Robust analysis (NP-hard)

 $\exists P : \mathcal{L}_{\Sigma}(P) < 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \forall \Delta \in \Delta \land, \ \exists P(\Delta) : \mathcal{L}_{\Sigma(\Delta)}(P(\Delta)) < 0$

▲ Test over sample values $\{\Delta_{1...N}\} \in \Delta$ gives optimistic results (some results exist if $\{\Delta_{1...N}\}$ is uniform distribution of Δ and large N)

lacksim Choice of $P(\Delta)$ for having a finite number of decision variables :

- → "Quadratic Stability": $P(\Delta) = P$
- → Polytopic PDLF: $P(\Delta) = \sum \zeta_i P^{[i]}$
- → Quadratic-LFT PDLF: $P(\Delta) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \Delta_C^T \end{bmatrix} P \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \Delta_C \end{bmatrix} : \Delta_C = (1 \Delta D_{\Delta\Delta})^{-1} \Delta C_{\Delta}$

LMIs over infinite number of variables

$$\begin{array}{ll} \forall \ \Delta \in \Delta \ , \ \exists \ P(\Delta) & : \ \ \mathcal{L}_{\Sigma(\Delta)}(P(\Delta)) < 0 \\ & \Leftarrow \ \exists \ P^{[i]} & : \ \ \forall \ \Delta \in \Delta \ , \ \ \mathcal{L}_{\Sigma(\Delta)}(P(\Delta)) < 0 \end{array}$$

36



Conservative LMIs for polytopic models (Example of stability analysis)

 $\dot{x} = A(\xi)x \text{ with } A(\xi) = \sum_{v=1}^{\bar{v}} \xi_v A^{[v]} : \ \xi \in \Xi = \{\xi_v \ge 0, \ \sum_{v=1}^{\bar{v}} \xi_v = 1\}$





Conservative LMIs for polytopic models (Example of stability analysis)

 $\dot{x} = A(\boldsymbol{\xi})x \text{ with } A(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \sum_{v=1}^{\bar{v}} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{v} A^{[v]} : \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \boldsymbol{\Xi} = \{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{v} \ge 0, \sum_{v=1}^{\bar{v}} \boldsymbol{\xi}_{v} = 1\}$ • "Quadratic Stability": $P(\Delta) = P$

 $\dot{V}(x) < 0 \iff A^{T}(\Delta)P + PA(\Delta) < 0 \iff A^{[i]^{T}}P + PA^{[i]} < 0$



Ecole des JD-MACS Marseille

Conservative LMIs for polytopic models (Example of stability analysis) $\dot{x} = A(\xi)x$ with $A(\xi) = \sum_{v=1}^{v} \xi_{v} A^{[v]}$: $\xi \in \Xi = \{\xi_{v} \ge 0, \sum_{v=1}^{v} \xi_{v} = 1\}$ • "Quadratic Stability": $P(\Delta) = P$ $V(x) < 0 \iff A^{T}(\Delta)P + PA(\Delta) < 0 \iff A^{[i]^{T}}P + PA^{[i]} < 0$ Polytopic PDLF: $P(\Delta) = \sum \zeta_i P^{[i]}$ $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ \dot{x} \end{pmatrix}^{T} \begin{vmatrix} 0 & P(\Delta) \\ P(\Delta) & 0 \end{vmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \dot{x} \end{pmatrix} < 0 : \begin{bmatrix} A(\Delta) & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ \dot{x} \end{pmatrix} = 0$ ⇔ Finsler Lemma $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & P(\Delta) \\ P(\Delta) & 0 \end{bmatrix} + G(\Delta) \begin{bmatrix} A(\Delta) & -1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} A^T(\Delta) \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} G^T(\Delta) < 0$ $\leftarrow G(\Delta) = G$ & convexity $\begin{vmatrix} 0 & P^{[i]} \\ P^{[i]} & 0 \end{vmatrix} + G \begin{bmatrix} A^{[i]} & -1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{vmatrix} A^{[i]^T} \\ -1 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} G^T \\ G^T \end{vmatrix}$

LAAS-CNRS

Ecole des JD-MACS Marseille

<u>Conservative LMIs for LFT models</u> (Example of stability analysis)

 $\dot{x} = Ax + B_{\Delta}w_{\Delta}$ with $w_{\Delta} = \Delta z_{\Delta} = \Delta C_{\Delta}x + \Delta D_{\Delta\Delta}w_{\Delta}$





Conservative LMIs for LFT models (Example of stability analysis)

$$\dot{x} = Ax + B_{\Delta}w_{\Delta}$$
 with $w_{\Delta} = \Delta z_{\Delta} = \Delta C_{\Delta}x + \Delta D_{\Delta\Delta}w_{\Delta}$

• "Quadratic Stability": $P(\Delta) = P$

$$\dot{V}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ w_{\Delta} \end{pmatrix}^* \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ A & B_{\Delta} \end{bmatrix}^* \begin{bmatrix} 0 & P \\ P & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ A & B_{\Delta} \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ w_{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} < 0$$
$$: \begin{bmatrix} \Delta & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_{\Delta} & D_{\Delta\Delta} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ w_{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

$$M_{A}^{*} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & P \\ P & 0 \end{bmatrix} M_{A} < \tau M_{C}^{*} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta^{*} \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta & -1 \end{bmatrix} M_{C}$$



D. Peaucelle

Conservative LMIs for LFT models (Example of stability analysis)

$$\dot{x} = Ax + B_{\Delta}w_{\Delta}$$
 with $w_{\Delta} = \Delta z_{\Delta} = \Delta C_{\Delta}x + \Delta D_{\Delta\Delta}w_{\Delta}$

"Quadratic Stability": $P(\Delta) = P$

$$\dot{V}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ w_{\Delta} \end{pmatrix}^* \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ A & B_{\Delta} \end{bmatrix}^* \begin{bmatrix} 0 & P \\ P & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ A & B_{\Delta} \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ w_{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} < 0$$
$$: \begin{bmatrix} \Delta & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_{\Delta} & D_{\Delta\Delta} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ w_{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{ Finsler Lemma}$$

$$M_{A}^{*} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & P \\ P & 0 \end{bmatrix} M_{A} < M_{C}^{*} \Theta M_{C} \leq \tau M_{C}^{*} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta^{*} \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta & -1 \end{bmatrix} M_{C}$$

$$\text{ with } \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \Delta^{*} \end{bmatrix} \Theta \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \Delta \end{bmatrix} \leq 0$$

LAAS-CNRS

 \Leftrightarrow

D. Peaucelle

Ecole des JD-MACS [Marseille 42

<u>Conservative LMIs for LFT models</u> (Example of stability analysis)

$$\dot{x} = Ax + B_{\Delta}w_{\Delta}$$
 with $w_{\Delta} = \Delta z_{\Delta} = \Delta C_{\Delta}x + \Delta D_{\Delta\Delta}w_{\Delta}$

• "Quadratic Stability": $P(\Delta) = P$

Finsler I emma

 \Leftrightarrow

AAS-CNRS

$$\dot{V}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ w_{\Delta} \end{pmatrix}^* \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ A & B_{\Delta} \end{bmatrix}^* \begin{bmatrix} 0 & P \\ P & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ A & B_{\Delta} \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ w_{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} < 0$$
$$: \begin{bmatrix} \Delta & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_{\Delta} & D_{\Delta\Delta} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ w_{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

$$M_{A}^{*} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & P \\ P & 0 \end{bmatrix} M_{A} < M_{C}^{*} \Theta M_{C} \le \tau M_{C}^{*} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta^{*} \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta & -1 \end{bmatrix} M_{C}$$
with $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \Delta^{*} \end{bmatrix} \Theta \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \Delta \end{bmatrix} \le 0$

Quadratic-LFT PDLF - same methodology (yet needs many matrix manipulations).

Conservative LMIs for LFT models

lace LMI constraints on Quadratic Separators igodot

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \Delta^* \end{bmatrix} \Theta \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \Delta \end{bmatrix} \le 0 : \forall \Delta \in \Delta \iff \Theta \le \tau \begin{bmatrix} X & Y \\ Y^* & Z \end{bmatrix}, \tau \ge 0$$



Conservative LMIs for LFT models

lacksim LMI constraints on Quadratic Separators igodol

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \Delta^* \end{bmatrix} \Theta \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \Delta \end{bmatrix} \le 0 : \forall \Delta \in \Delta \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \Theta \le \tau \begin{bmatrix} X & Y \\ Y^* & Z \end{bmatrix}, \ \tau \ge 0$$

 $A \{X, Y, Z\} - \text{dissipative real repeated scalars } \Delta = \left\{ \Delta = \delta 1 : x + 2y\delta + z\delta^2 \le 0 \right\}$

$$\Theta \leq \left[egin{array}{cc} xD & yD+G \ yD-G & zD \end{array}
ight], egin{array}{cc} Q \geq 0 \ G = -G^* \end{array}$$

45



Conservative LMIs for LFT models

lace LMI constraints on Quadratic Separators igodot

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \Delta^* \end{bmatrix} \Theta \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \Delta \end{bmatrix} \le 0 : \forall \Delta \in \Delta \iff \Theta \le \tau \begin{bmatrix} X & Y \\ Y^* & Z \end{bmatrix}, \ \tau \ge 0$$

 $A \{X, Y, Z\} - \text{dissipative real repeated scalars } \Delta = \left\{ \Delta = \delta 1 : x + 2y\delta + z\delta^2 \le 0 \right\}$

$$\Theta \leq \left[egin{array}{cc} xD & yD+G \ yD-G & zD \end{array}
ight], egin{array}{cc} Q \geq 0 \ , \ G = -G^* \end{array}$$

A Polytopic uncertainties $\Delta = \left\{ \Delta = \sum \xi_i \Delta^{[i]} : \xi_i \ge 0 , \sum \xi_i = 1 \right\}$

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc}1 & {\Delta^{[i]}}^*\end{array}\right] \Theta \left[\begin{array}{c}1\\ {\Delta^{[i]}}\end{array}\right] \leq 0 \hspace{0.2cm}, \hspace{0.2cm} \left[\begin{array}{c}0 & 1\end{array}\right] \Theta \left[\begin{array}{c}0\\ 1\end{array}\right] \geq 0$$



Conclusions

47

RoMulOC today: www.laas.fr/OLOCEP/romuloc/downloads.html

- Large variety of uncertain models associated with multiple performances
- Several associated LMI-based theoretical results coded
- Access to efficient LMI solvers (thanks to YALMIP)
- Testing being done on applications





Design: limited to state-feedback



Ecole des JD-MACS Marseille

Conclusions

RoMulOC in the future

- Other design problems: Dynamic output-feedback (LMI) Static output-feedback (not LMI)
- Time-varying uncertainties (with bounded derivatives)
- Time-delay systems (constant or time-varying)
- Non-linearities (Saturations, dead-zone ...)





Descriptor systems: $E(\Delta)\dot{x} = A(\Delta)x \Rightarrow$ Romuald

