

Smart Energy-Aware Sensors for Event-Based Control (with appendix)

Nicolas Cardoso de Castro, Daniel E. Quevedo, Federica Garin, Carlos
Canudas de Wit

► **To cite this version:**

Nicolas Cardoso de Castro, Daniel E. Quevedo, Federica Garin, Carlos Canudas de Wit. Smart Energy-Aware Sensors for Event-Based Control (with appendix). 51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC 2012), Dec 2012, Maui, Hawaii, United States. pp.7224-7229, 10.1109/CDC.2012.6426482 . hal-00677174v2

HAL Id: hal-00677174

<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-00677174v2>

Submitted on 8 Mar 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Complementary notes on Smart Energy-Aware Sensors for Event-Based Control

Nicolas Cardoso de Castro, Daniel E. Quevedo, Federica Garin and Carlos Canudas de Wit

Abstract—This document completes the paper “Smart Energy-Aware Sensors for Event-Based Control” submitted to the 51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control by the same authors. It is not intended to be self contained; it only gives the proof of Lemma 2.

I. APPENDIX

We recall from [25] the following elements.

The closed loop system (the system (5) with the policy (18) and the initial conditions (z_0, m_0)), that we note $z_k(z_0, m_0)$, evolves as follows:

$$\begin{cases} z_{k+1}(z_0, m_0) = f_{v_k^*}(z_k(z_0, m_0), u_k^*) \\ m_{k+1} = v_k^* = \eta(z_k, m_k) \\ u_k^* = \mu(z_k, m_k). \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

Definition 1 The closed loop system (19) is said to be Input-to-State practically Stable (ISpS) if there exist a \mathcal{KL} -function γ , and a constant $c \geq 0$, such that, for all $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$ and for all $m_0 \in \mathbb{M}$:

$$\|z_k(z_0, m_0)\| \leq \gamma(\|z_0\|, k) + c, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}. \quad (20)$$

Definition 2 $V : \mathbb{R}^{n_z} \times \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called a ISpS-Lyapunov function for the closed loop system (19) if:

- there exist a pair of \mathcal{K}_{∞} -functions α_1 , α_2 , and a constant $c_1 \geq 0$ such that, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$ and for all $m \in \mathbb{M}$:

$$\alpha_1(\|z\|) \leq V(z, m) \leq \alpha_2(\|z\|) + c_1, \quad (21)$$

- there exist a suitable \mathcal{K}_{∞} -function α_3 and a constant $c_2 \geq 0$ such that, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$ and for all $m \in \mathbb{M}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta V(z, m) &\triangleq V(f_{v^*}(z, u^*), v^*) - V(z, m) \\ &\leq -\alpha_3(\|z\|) + c_2. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Lemma 2 If the closed loop system (19) admits an ISpS-Lyapunov function, then it is ISpS.

Proof: This proof is based on the proofs of ISS and ISpS from [15], [22].

Nicolas Cardoso de Castro and Federica Garin are with INRIA Rhône-Alpes, NeCS Team, Grenoble, FRANCE, emails: {nicolas.cardosodecastro, federica.garin}@inria.fr, Daniel E. Quevedo is with School of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science, The University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia, email: dquevedo@ieee.org, and Carlos Canudas de Wit is with Department of Automatic Control GIPSA-Lab, CNRS, NeCS Team Grenoble, FRANCE, email: carlos.canudas-de-wit@gipsa-lab.grenoble-inp.fr.

We assume that Eq.s (21)-(22) hold, *i.e.* that the closed loop system (19) admits an ISpS-Lyapunov function, denoted $V(z, m)$ hereafter. Let’s prove that the closed loop system is ISpS, *i.e.* that Eq. (20) holds.

Step 1: First, we prove that the closed loop system (19) admits an invariant set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_z} \times \mathbb{M}$, *i.e.*, for all $(z, m) \in \Omega$, $f_{v^*}(z, u^*) \in \Omega$.

We define $\bar{\alpha}_2(s) \triangleq \alpha_2(s) + s$, then, noting that $c_1 \geq 0$ and $\|z\| \geq 0$, (21) implies:

$$\begin{aligned} V(z, m) &\leq \alpha_2(\|z\| + c_1) + \|z\| + c_1 \\ &= \bar{\alpha}_2(\|z\| + c_1) \\ \Rightarrow \bar{\alpha}_2^{-1}(V(z, m)) &\leq \|z\| + c_1. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Let $\xi(s)$ be any \mathcal{K}_{∞} -function, for example $\xi(s) = s$.

- If $c_1 \leq \|z\|$:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \leq \|z\| &\Leftrightarrow \frac{\|z\| + c_1}{2} \leq \|z\| \\ \Rightarrow \alpha_3\left(\frac{\|z\| + c_1}{2}\right) &\leq \alpha_3(\|z\|) \leq \alpha_3(\|z\|) + \xi(c_1). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

- If $c_1 > \|z\|$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z\| < c_1 &\Leftrightarrow \frac{\|z\| + c_1}{2} < c_1 \\ \Rightarrow \xi\left(\frac{\|z\| + c_1}{2}\right) &\leq \xi(c_1) \leq \alpha_3(\|z\|) + \xi(c_1). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Let’s define $\underline{\alpha}_3(s) \triangleq \min\{\xi(\frac{s}{2}), \alpha_3(\frac{s}{2})\}$. Eq.s (27),(28) yield:

$$\underline{\alpha}_3(\|z\| + c_1) \leq \alpha_3(\|z\|) + \xi(c_1) \quad (29)$$

We notice that $\underline{\alpha}_3 \in \mathcal{K}_{\infty}$, in particular $\underline{\alpha}_3$ is strictly increasing, which implies (with (26),(29)):

$$\underline{\alpha}_3(\bar{\alpha}_2^{-1}(V(z, m))) \leq \alpha_3(\|z\| + c_1) \leq \alpha_3(\|z\|) + \xi(c_1).$$

Let’s define $\alpha_4 \triangleq \underline{\alpha}_3 \circ \bar{\alpha}_2^{-1}$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_4(V(z, m)) &\leq \alpha_3(\|z\|) + \xi(c_1) \\ (22) \Rightarrow \Delta V(z, m) &\leq -\alpha_3(\|z\|) + c_2 - \xi(c_1) + \xi(c_1) \\ &\leq -\alpha_4(V(z, m)) + c_2 + \xi(c_1). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Let ρ be a \mathcal{K}_{∞} -function such that $(id - \rho)$ is also a \mathcal{K}_{∞} -function. $\rho(s) = \frac{s}{2}$ is an example. We define $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_z} \times \mathbb{M}$:

$$\Omega = \{(z, m) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z} \times \mathbb{M} : V(z, m) \leq \omega(c_3)\}, \quad (31)$$

where $\omega \triangleq \alpha_4^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1}$ and $c_3 \triangleq c_2 + \xi(c_1)$.

We assume that $(id - \alpha_4)$ is a \mathcal{K}_∞ -function. Lemma B.1 in [15] proves that if $(id - \alpha_4)$ is not a \mathcal{K}_∞ -function, there exists a \mathcal{K}_∞ -function $\hat{\alpha}_4$ such that $\hat{\alpha}_4(s) \leq \alpha_4(s)$ and $(id - \hat{\alpha}_4)$ is a \mathcal{K}_∞ -function that can be used hereafter to lead to the same result.

Let's now assume that $(z, m) \in \Omega$:

$$\begin{aligned} (30) \Rightarrow V(f_{v^*}(z, u^*), v^*) - V(z, m) &\leq -\alpha_4(V(z, m)) + c_3 \\ \Rightarrow V(f_{v^*}(z, u^*), v^*) &\leq (id - \alpha_4)(V(z, m)) + c_3 \\ &\leq (id - \alpha_4)(\omega(c_3)) + c_3 \\ &= \omega(c_3) - \alpha_4(\omega(c_3)) + c_3 \\ &= \omega(c_3) - \alpha_4(\omega(c_3)) + \rho \circ \alpha_4(\omega(c_3)) \\ &= \omega(c_3) - (id - \rho)(\alpha_4(\omega(c_3))), \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where we have used the fact that $\rho \circ \alpha_4(\omega(s)) = s$. Since $(id - \rho)(s) \geq 0$ (being a \mathcal{K}_∞ -function), (32) yields:

$$V(f_{v^*}(z, u^*), v^*) \leq \omega(c_3),$$

thus proving that Ω is an invariant set for the closed loop system (19).

Step 2: Let's now prove that the invariant set Ω is an attractive set, *i.e.* that for any $(z_0, m_0) \notin \Omega$, there exists a finite \bar{k} such that $(z_{\bar{k}}, m_{\bar{k}}) \in \Omega$. Let \bar{k} be the first time index where the system enters Ω , for the initial condition (z_0, m_0) :

$$\bar{k} \triangleq \min \{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} : (z_k, m_k) \in \Omega\} \leq \infty, \quad (33)$$

where \bar{k} is infinite when the trajectories never enter Ω . To prove that Ω is attractive, we need to prove that \bar{k} is finite. We start by noticing that if $(z, m) \notin \Omega$, then:

$$V(z, m) > \omega(c_3) = \alpha_4^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1}(c_3) \quad (34)$$

$$\Rightarrow \rho \circ \alpha_4(V(z, m)) > c_3$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \rho \circ \alpha_4(V(z, m)) - c_3 > 0. \quad (35)$$

Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} (30) \Rightarrow \Delta V(z, m) &\leq -\alpha_4(V(z, m)) + c_3 \\ &= -(id - \rho) \circ \alpha_4(V(z, m)) - \rho \circ \alpha_4(V(z, m)) + c_3 \end{aligned}$$

$$(35) \Rightarrow \Delta V(z, m) \leq -(id - \rho) \circ \alpha_4(V(z, m)). \quad (36)$$

Hence, for all $k < \bar{k}$, $\Delta V(z_k, m_k) \leq -\alpha_5(V(z_k, m_k))$, where $\alpha_5(s) \triangleq (id - \rho) \circ \alpha_4(s)$ is a \mathcal{K}_∞ -function, and thus is in particular a \mathcal{K} -function. According to [24, Lemma 4.3], this implies that there exists a \mathcal{KL} -function $\hat{\gamma}(s, k)$ such that:

$$V(z_k, m_k) \leq \hat{\gamma}(V(z_0, m_0), k), \quad \forall k < \bar{k}. \quad (37)$$

The function $\hat{\gamma}(s, k)$ is decreasing in k and goes to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, then there exists a finite \tilde{k} such that:

$$\hat{\gamma}(V(z_0, m_0), \tilde{k}) < \omega(c_3) \quad (38)$$

This implies that $\tilde{k} \geq \bar{k}$. Indeed, if \tilde{k} was $\tilde{k} < \bar{k}$, then Eq.s (34),(37) would hold, but Eq.s (37),(38) would imply that $V(z_k, m_k) < \omega(c_3)$, in contradiction with (34).

This ends the proof that Ω is attractive since $\bar{k} \leq \tilde{k} < \infty$.

Step 3: Finally, we want to prove that Eq. (20) holds. We collect the results from the previous steps, $\forall (z_0, m_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z} \times \mathbb{M}$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$:

- if $(z_k, m_k) \in \Omega$, then $V(z_k, m_k) \leq \omega(c_3)$,
- if $(z_k, m_k) \notin \Omega$, then $V(z_k, m_k) \leq \hat{\gamma}(V(z_0, m_0), k)$.

Eq. (21) implies that $\|z_k\| \leq \alpha^{-1}(V(z_k, m_k))$, we thus obtain:

- if $(z_k, m_k) \in \Omega$, then $\|z_k\| \leq \alpha^{-1}(\omega(c_3))$,
- if $(z_k, m_k) \notin \Omega$, then $\|z_k\| \leq \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(V(z_0, m_0), k))$.

In any case, we have:

$$\|z_k\| \leq \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(V(z_0, m_0), k)) + \alpha^{-1}(\omega(c_3)).$$

Eq. (21) implies that $V(z_0, m_0) \leq \alpha_2(\|z_0\|) + c_1$, which implies:

$$\|z_k\| \leq \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(\alpha_2(\|z_0\|) + c_1, k)) + \alpha^{-1}(\omega(c_3)). \quad (39)$$

Then, we notice that, for any function $\alpha(s)$ of class \mathcal{K}_∞ , $\forall (s_1, s_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(s_1 + s_2) &\leq \begin{cases} \alpha(2s_1), & \text{if } s_1 \geq s_2 \\ \alpha(2s_2), & \text{if } s_1 \leq s_2 \end{cases} \\ \Rightarrow \alpha(s_1 + s_2) &\leq \alpha(2s_1) + \alpha(2s_2). \end{aligned}$$

Since, for a given k , $\alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(s, k))$ is a function of class \mathcal{K}_∞ w.r.t. s , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(\alpha_2(\|z_0\|) + c_1, k)) &\leq \\ \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2\alpha_2(\|z_0\|), k)) &+ \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2c_1, k)). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

As the function $k \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2c_1, k))$ is decreasing w.r.t. k , it attains its maximum for $k = 0$:

$$\alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2c_1, k)) \leq \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2c_1, 0)), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}. \quad (41)$$

Notice that $\alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2\alpha_2(s), k))$ is a \mathcal{KL} -function. Eq.s (39)-(41) imply:

$$\begin{aligned} \|z(z_0, m_0, k)\| &\leq \gamma(\|z_0\|, k) + c \\ \text{with } \gamma(s, k) &= \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2\alpha_2(s), k)) \\ c &= \alpha^{-1}(\omega(c_3)) + \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2c_1, 0)). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3 *The choice of the \mathcal{K}_∞ -functions $\xi(s)$, $\rho(s)$ influence how $\gamma(s, k)$ give a more or less conservative bound.*

REFERENCES

- [15] Z.-P. Jiang and Y. Wang. Input-to-state stability for discrete-time nonlinear systems. *Automatica*, 37(6):857 – 869, 2001.
- [22] D. M. Raimondo, D. Limón, M. Lazar, L. Magni, and E. Camacho. Min-max Model Predictive Control of Nonlinear Systems: A Unifying Overview on Stability. *European Journal of Control*, 15(1):5–21, January 2009.
- [24] Zhong-Ping Jiang and Yuan Wang. A converse Lyapunov theorem for discrete-time systems with disturbances. *Systems & Control Letters*, 45(1):49–58, January 2002.
- [25] N. Cardoso de Castro, D. E. Quevedo, F. Garin, and C. Canudas de Wit. Smart energy-aware sensors for event-based control. In *51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (under revision)*, 2012.