



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

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. Complementary notes on Smart Energy-Aware Sensors for Event-Based Control. CDC - 51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control - 2012, Dec 2012, Hawaii, United States. hal-00677174v1

HAL Id: hal-00677174

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-00677174v1>

Submitted on 7 Mar 2012 (v1), last revised 8 Mar 2012 (v2)

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 [1] the following elements.

Definition 1 The system (5) with the policy (18) 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 $\zeta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\zeta}$ and for all $m_0 \in \mathbb{M}$:

$$\|\zeta_k(\zeta_0, m_0)\| \leq \gamma(\|\zeta_0\|, k) + c, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}. \quad (20)$$

Definition 2 $V : \mathbb{R}^{n_\zeta} \times \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called a *ISpS-Lyapunov function* for the system (5) with the policy (18) if:

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

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

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

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

Lemma 2 Under assumption 2, if the closed-loop system formed by (5) and the policy (18) admits an ISpS-Lyapunov function, then it is ISpS.

Proof: This proof is based on the proofs of ISS and ISpS from [2], [3].

We assume that Eq.s (21)-(22) hold, i.e. that the system (5) with the policy (18) admits an ISpS-Lyapunov function, denoted $V(\zeta, m)$. Let's prove that the closed-loop system is ISpS.

Definition 3 A set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_\zeta} \times \mathbb{M}$ is called an *invariant set* for system (5) if there exists a policy (μ, η) such that, for all $(\zeta, m) \in \Omega$, $g_{\eta(\zeta, m)}(\zeta, \mu(\zeta, m)) \in \Omega$.

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.

1) *Step 1:* First, we prove that the closed-loop system (5),(18) admits an invariant set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_\zeta} \times \mathbb{M}$.

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

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

Let $\xi(s)$ be a \mathcal{K}_∞ -function.

- If $c_1 \leq \|\zeta\|$

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

- If $c_1 > \|\zeta\|$

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

Let's define $\underline{\alpha}_3(s) \triangleq \min\{\xi(\frac{s}{2}), \alpha_3(\frac{s}{2})\}$. We notice that $\underline{\alpha}_3 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, $\underline{\alpha}_3$ is then strictly increasing, which yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\alpha}_3(\|\zeta\| + c_1) &\leq \alpha_3(\|\zeta\|) + \xi(c_1) \\ (26), (27) \Rightarrow \underline{\alpha}_3(\bar{\alpha}_2^{-1}(V(\zeta, m))) &\leq \alpha_3(\|\zeta\|) + \xi(c_1) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_4(V(\zeta, m)) &\leq \alpha_3(\|\zeta\|) + \xi(c_1) \\ \Rightarrow -\alpha_3(\|\zeta\|) - \xi(c_1) &\leq -\alpha_4(V(\zeta, m)) \\ (22) \Rightarrow \Delta V(\zeta, m) &\leq -\alpha_3(\|\zeta\|) + c_2 - \xi(c_1) + \xi(c_1) \\ \Delta V(\zeta, m) &\leq -\alpha_4(V(\zeta, m)) + c_2 + \xi(c_1) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

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 $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_\zeta} \times \mathbb{M}$:

$$\Omega = \{(\zeta, m) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\zeta} \times \mathbb{M} : V(\zeta, m) \leq \omega(c_3)\} \quad (29)$$

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 [2] 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 $(\zeta, m) \in \Omega$:

$$\begin{aligned}
(28) \Rightarrow V(g_{v^*}(\zeta, u^*), v^*) - V(\zeta, m) &\leq -\alpha_4(V(\zeta, m)) + c_3 \\
\Rightarrow V(g_{v^*}(\zeta, u^*), v^*) &\leq (id - \alpha_4)(V(\zeta, m)) + c_3 \\
&\leq (id - \alpha_4)(\omega(c_3)) + c_3 \\
&= \omega(c_3) - \alpha_4(\omega(c_3)) + c_3 \\
&= \omega(c_3) - \alpha_4(\omega(c_3)) + \rho \circ \alpha_4(\omega(c_3)) \\
&= \omega(c_3) - (id - \rho)(\alpha_4(\omega(c_3)))
\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, from the definition of ω , it holds that $\rho \circ \alpha_4(\omega(s)) = s$, and since $(id - \rho)(s) \geq 0$ (being a \mathcal{K}_∞ -function), it yields:

$$V(g_{v^*}(\zeta, u^*), v^*) \leq \omega(c_3) \quad (30)$$

Eq. (30) with the assumption that ζ is in Ω implies that Ω is an invariant set for the policy (18).

2) *Step 2*: Let's now prove that the invariant set Ω is an attractive set, i.e. that for any $(\zeta_k, m_k) \notin \Omega$, there exists a finite $\bar{k} \geq k$ such that, $(\zeta_{\bar{k}}, m_{\bar{k}}) \in \Omega$.

We assume that, for any time t from 0 up to time k , $(\zeta_t, m_t) \notin \Omega$. From Eq. (29), and ignoring the time index, the following holds for any time up to k :

$$\begin{aligned}
V(\zeta, m) &> \omega(c_3) = \alpha_4^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1}(c_3) \\
&\Rightarrow \rho \circ \alpha_4(V(\zeta, m)) > c_3 \\
&\Leftrightarrow \rho \circ \alpha_4(V(\zeta, m)) - c_3 > 0
\end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned}
(28) \Rightarrow \Delta V(\zeta, m) &\leq -\alpha_4(V(\zeta, m)) + c_3 \\
&= -(id - \rho) \circ \alpha_4(V(\zeta, m)) - \rho \circ \alpha_4(V(\zeta, m)) + c_3 \\
(31) \Rightarrow \Delta V(\zeta, m) &\leq -(id - \rho) \circ \alpha_4(V(\zeta, m))
\end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Let's define \bar{k} as the first time index where the system enters Ω , for the initial condition (ζ_0, m_0) :

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

Remark 1 We allow \bar{k} to be infinite, which means that the trajectories never enter Ω . To prove that Ω is attractive, we need to prove that \bar{k} is finite.

Eq. (32) holds for all (ζ_0, m_0) and for all (ζ_k, m_k) with $0 \leq k < \bar{k}$. According to [4, Lemma 4.3], there exists a \mathcal{KL} -function $\hat{\gamma}(s, k)$ such that, $\forall (\zeta_0, m_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c} \times \mathbb{M}$:

$$V(\zeta_k, m_k) \leq \hat{\gamma}(V(\zeta_0, m_0), k) \quad \forall k \in \{0, 1, \dots, \bar{k}\}$$

It holds then that, for all $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, \bar{k}\}$, the value function is decreasing and going to 0.

Assume that \bar{k} is not finite, since $\omega(c_3) > 0^1$, there exists a finite time \bar{t} such that $\hat{\gamma}(V(\zeta_0, m_0), \bar{t}) \leq \omega(c_3)$, which contradict the assumption that \bar{k} is not finite. This proves that Ω is an attractive set.

¹Note that $\omega(c_3) = \alpha_4^{-1} \circ \rho^{-1}(\xi(c_1) + c_2)$, and if $c_1 = 0, c_2 = 0$, $\xi(0) = 0, \rho^{-1}(0) = 0$ and $\alpha_4^{-1}(0) = 0$, then $\omega(c_3) = 0$, but in this situation since $c_1 = 0$ and $c_2 = 0$, we are back in the case studied in [2].

3) *Step 3*: Finally, we want to prove that Eq. (20) holds.

We collect the results from the previous steps, $\forall (\zeta_0, m_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c} \times \mathbb{M}, \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$:

- if $(\zeta_k, m_k) \in \Omega$, $V(\zeta_k, m_k) \leq \omega(c_3)$,
- if $(\zeta_k, m_k) \notin \Omega$, $V(\zeta_k, m_k) \leq \hat{\gamma}(V(\zeta_0, m_0), k)$.

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

- if $(\zeta_k, m_k) \in \Omega$, $\|\zeta_k\| \leq \alpha^{-1}(\omega(c_3))$,
- if $(\zeta_k, m_k) \notin \Omega$, $\|\zeta_k\| \leq \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(V(\zeta_0, m_0), k))$.

In any case, we have:

$$\|\zeta_k\| \leq \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(V(\zeta_0, m_0), k)) + \alpha^{-1}(\omega(c_3))$$

Eq. (21) implies that $V(\zeta_0, m_0) \leq \alpha_2(\|\zeta_0\|) + c_1$, which implies:

$$\|\zeta_k\| \leq \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(\alpha_2(\|\zeta_0\|) + c_1, k)) + \alpha^{-1}(\omega(c_3)) \quad (34)$$

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}_∞ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(\alpha_2(\|\zeta_0\|) + c_1, k)) \leq \\
&\alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2\alpha_2(\|\zeta_0\|), k)) + \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2c_1, k)).
\end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The function $\alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2c_1, k))$ is of class \mathcal{K}_∞ , and thus going to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$, which means that it attains its maximum for $k = 0$:

$$\alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2c_1, k)) \leq \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2c_1, 0)), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad (36)$$

Eq.s (34)-(36) imply:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\zeta(\zeta_0, m_0, k)\| &\leq \gamma(\|\zeta_0\|, k) + c \\
&\text{with } \gamma(s, k) = \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2\alpha_2(s), k)) \\
&c = \alpha^{-1}(\omega(c_3)) + \alpha^{-1}(\hat{\gamma}(2c_1, 0)).
\end{aligned}$$

■

REFERENCES

- [1] 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*, 2012.
- [2] Z.-P. Jiang and Y. Wang. Input-to-state stability for discrete-time nonlinear systems. *Automatica*, 37(6):857 – 869, 2001.
- [3] 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.
- [4] 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.