

ISDA 2004–BUDAPEST MODEL-BASED AUTONOMY



Toward Design Parameterization Support for Model Predictive Control

Jonathan Sprinkle, J. Mikael Eklund, S. Shankar Sastry

University of California, Berkeley Department of Electrical Engineering & Computer Sciences







Overview

- What is MPC?
- How does it work?
- Example : aircraft control
- Motivation for parameterization
- Room for parameterization
- Planned work
- Conclusions







Model Predictive Control

- MPC is a method for restricting/encouraging behavior
- A "fortune teller" controller
- Restricts input ranges, as well as encourages some inputs based on safety/stability concerns
- Very useful for *nonlinear* systems, due to the ability to get good optimizations with non-linear abstractions





How does it work?



- Examine the mathematical abstraction of the system (PDE)
- Determine value along N time steps into the future
- Optimize this value, according to some *a priori* specifications (to J = 0)

$$J = \phi(\mathbf{b}_{1_N..M_N}) + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} L(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{b}_{1..M}) = 0$$
$$m = M$$

$$\phi(\mathbf{b}_{1_N..M_N}) = C \sum_{m=1} \mathbf{b}_m^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B}_{0_m} \mathbf{b}_m$$

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{b}_{k_1..M}) \triangleq C \left(\mathbf{x}_k^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{X}_0 \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{u}_k^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U}_0 \mathbf{u}_k + \sum_{m=1}^{m=M} \mathbf{b}_{m_k}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B}_{0_m} \mathbf{b}_{m_k} \right)$$

Jonathan Sprinkle, UC Berkeley

Berkelev







• In the form of,

 $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$

- Obviously, very system-dependent
- Sometimes an abstraction of the *actual* system in order to speed up computation
- Accuracy of the prediction, directly tied to the abstraction
- Eventually, arrive at a snapshot N steps in the future

 $[\mathbf{x_1}, \mathbf{x_2}, \dots, \mathbf{x_N}]$





Example: Aircraft Control

 $\bigcirc^{\operatorname{End}}$



$L(\cdot) \triangleq \mathbf{x}_k^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{X}_0 \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{u}_k^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U}_0 \mathbf{u}_k + \mathbf{b}_{m_1}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B}_{0_1} \mathbf{b}_{m_1}$

27 August 2004

Jonathan Sprinkle, UC Berkeley





 \bigcirc^{End}

Example: Aircraft Control





$$L(\cdot) \triangleq \mathbf{x}_k^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{X}_0 \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{u}_k^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U}_0 \mathbf{u}_k + \mathbf{b}_{m_1}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B}_{0_1} \mathbf{b}_{m_1} \\ + \mathbf{b}_{m_2}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B}_{0_2} \mathbf{b}_{m_2}$$

27 August 2004



Boundary

$$egin{aligned} L(\cdot) &\triangleq \mathbf{x}_k^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{X}_0 \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{u}_k^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U}_0 \mathbf{u}_k &+ \mathbf{b}_{m_1}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B}_{0_1} \mathbf{b}_{m_1} \ &+ \mathbf{b}_{m_2}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B}_{0_2} \mathbf{b}_{m_2} \ &+ \mathbf{b}_{m_3}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B}_{0_3} \mathbf{b}_{m_3} \end{aligned}$$



Boundary

$$L(\cdot) \triangleq \mathbf{x}_k^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{X}_0 \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{u}_k^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{U}_0 \mathbf{u}_k + \mathbf{b}_{m_1}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B}_{0_1} \mathbf{b}_{m_1} \\ + \mathbf{b}_{m_2}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B}_{0_2} \mathbf{b}_{m_2} \\ + \mathbf{b}_{m_3}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B}_{0_3} \mathbf{b}_{m_3} \\ + \mathbf{b}_{m_2}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{B}_{0_3} \mathbf{b}_{m_3}$$





Example: Aircraft Control

- Now, what do you do?
 - Hope that you don't get caught?
 - First, fight with you left hand, and then surprise you opponent by not being left-handed
 - Encode "getting away" from your opponent into the costfunction



"I admit it, you are better than I am" "Then why are you smiling?" "Because *I* am not left-handed"



Pursuit/Evasion: $D_D e_e t_v a_i i_l ls$









The Real Problem:

- Making it work is nice, *but*
 - How in the devil did we come up with those
 - Equations
 - Individual components
 - Matrix values
 - Is there a way to derive these from the application constraints?
- Additionally
 - How hard was it to write a fast optimizer?
 - Is there a way to make this interface easily usable?





Toward a solution:

System-dependent, Behavior-dependent, Independent

System Model	CostFunction	Optimizer $(J=0)$
	Input Constraints	
	Safety Constraints	
	Application Constraints	
	x ranges	
	u ranges	
	Behaviors	





Toward a solution

- System-dependent
 - Can be derived for a particular system's mathematical definition
 - In general, quite easy to obtain
- Independent
 - Software engineering exercise
 - Once defined, will be reused
- Behavior-dependent
 - By far the hardest piece of the solution
 - Not generally derivable, but there are tricks that should be available for all future implementers, that a parameterized approach can provide





Behavior-dependent tricks

- Use the itemized pieces of the cost function to examine overall volatility under certain criteria
- Steer inputs to provide an "order of magnitude" cost function behavior
- Provide a mechanism to translate math definitions into computer code









- Currently implementing a new NMPC problem using different models and designs
- Will be developing the NMPC interface to provide the behavior for this new application, using
 - Ideas presented here
 - Suggestions received here
- Evaluate the new MATLAB MPC toolbox, to see what benefits it offers







- MPC can be used to provide interesting behaviors for linear and non-linear control systems, but not necessarily a fast development cycle
- We hope to reduce the development cycle by at least
 - Providing a cost-function independent optimizer
 - Inventing an intuitive interface to generate the cost function
 - Developing a method/tool to tune the cost function for desired behaviors
 - Experimenting with ways to reverse engineer values for the matrices, based on desired behaviors under stimuli









"Well HAL, I'm damned if I can find anything wrong with it." "Yes. It's puzzling. I don't think I've ever seen anything quite like this before." -- 2001: A Space Odyssey