CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY SSY281 - MODEL PREDICTIVE CONTROL

NIKOLCE MURGOVSKI

Division of Systems and Control Department of Electrical Engineering Chalmers University of Technology Gothenburg, Sweden

2021-01-25

Lecture 3: Unconstrained receding horizon control

Goals for today:

- To master the formulation of linear quadratic control (LQ)
- To understand how dynamic programming can be used to solve the LQ problem
- To formulate and solve the finite-time LQ problem using the "batch approach"
- To formulate an unconstrained receding horizon control based on LQ

Lecture 3: Unconstrained receding horizon control

Goals for today:

- To master the formulation of linear quadratic control (LQ)
- To understand how dynamic programming can be used to solve the LQ problem
- To formulate and solve the finite-time LQ problem using the "batch approach"
- To formulate an unconstrained receding horizon control based on LQ

Learning objectives:

- Correctly state, in mathematical form, MPC formulations based on descriptions of control problems expressed in application terms
- Describe and construct MPC controllers based on a linear model, quadratic costs and linear constraints
- Describe basic properties of MPC controllers and analyse algorithmic details on very simple examples

The LQ problem

System:

$$S: \quad x^+ = Ax + Bu.$$

Optimisation problem:

$$P: \min_{u(0:N-1)} V_N(x(0), u(0:N-1))$$

where the minimization is with respect to the sequence of control inputs

 $u(0:N-1) = \{u(0), u(1), \dots, u(N-1)\}\$

and subject to the system model (14).

(14)

The LQ problem

System:

$$S: \quad x^+ = Ax + Bu.$$

Optimisation problem:

 $P: \min_{u(0:N-1)} V_N(x(0), u(0:N-1))$

where the minimization is with respect to the sequence of control inputs

$$u(0:N-1) = \{u(0), u(1), \dots, u(N-1)\}\$$

and subject to the system model (14). The *objective* or *criterion* or *cost function* V_N is given by

$$V_N(x(0), u(0:N-1)) = x^{\top}(N)P_f x(N) + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} (x^{\top}(i)Qx(i) + u^{\top}(i)Ru(i))$$
$$= l_f(x(N)) + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} l(x(i), u(i)).$$

(15)

Batch solution

Repeated use of the system equation (14) gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} x(1) \\ x(2) \\ \vdots \\ x(N) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A \\ A^2 \\ \vdots \\ A^N \end{bmatrix} x(0) + \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ AB & B & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A^{N-1}B & A^{N-2}B & \cdots & B \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u(0) \\ u(1) \\ \vdots \\ u(N-1) \end{bmatrix}$$
(16)

or, with a more compact notation,

$$\boldsymbol{x} = \Omega \boldsymbol{x}(0) + \Gamma \boldsymbol{u}. \tag{17}$$

Batch solution

Repeated use of the system equation (14) gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} x(1) \\ x(2) \\ \vdots \\ x(N) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A \\ A^2 \\ \vdots \\ A^N \end{bmatrix} x(0) + \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ AB & B & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A^{N-1}B & A^{N-2}B & \cdots & B \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u(0) \\ u(1) \\ \vdots \\ u(N-1) \end{bmatrix}$$
(16)

or, with a more compact notation,

$$\boldsymbol{x} = \Omega \boldsymbol{x}(0) + \Gamma \boldsymbol{u}. \tag{17}$$

The LQ criterion (15) can now be written

$$V_N(x(0), \boldsymbol{u}) = x^{\top}(0)Qx(0) + \boldsymbol{x}^{\top}\bar{Q}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{u}^{\top}\bar{R}\boldsymbol{u}$$

where
$$\bar{Q} = \operatorname{diag}(Q, \ldots, Q, P_f)$$
 and $\bar{R} = \operatorname{diag}(R, \ldots, R)$

(18)

Batch solution

Repeated use of the system equation (14) gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} x(1) \\ x(2) \\ \vdots \\ x(N) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A \\ A^2 \\ \vdots \\ A^N \end{bmatrix} x(0) + \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ AB & B & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A^{N-1}B & A^{N-2}B & \cdots & B \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u(0) \\ u(1) \\ \vdots \\ u(N-1) \end{bmatrix}$$
(16)

or, with a more compact notation,

$$\boldsymbol{x} = \Omega \boldsymbol{x}(0) + \Gamma \boldsymbol{u}. \tag{17}$$

The LQ criterion (15) can now be written

$$V_N(x(0), \boldsymbol{u}) = x^{\top}(0)Qx(0) + \boldsymbol{x}^{\top}\bar{Q}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{u}^{\top}\bar{R}\boldsymbol{u}$$

= $x^{\top}(0)Qx(0) + (\Omega x(0) + \Gamma \boldsymbol{u})^{\top}\bar{Q}(\Omega x(0) + \Gamma \boldsymbol{u}) + \boldsymbol{u}^{\top}\bar{R}\boldsymbol{u}$

where $\bar{Q} = \operatorname{diag}(Q, \ldots, Q, P_f)$ and $\bar{R} = \operatorname{diag}(R, \ldots, R)$.

Batch solution

Repeated use of the system equation (14) gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} x(1) \\ x(2) \\ \vdots \\ x(N) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A \\ A^2 \\ \vdots \\ A^N \end{bmatrix} x(0) + \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ AB & B & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A^{N-1}B & A^{N-2}B & \cdots & B \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u(0) \\ u(1) \\ \vdots \\ u(N-1) \end{bmatrix}$$
(16)

or, with a more compact notation,

$$\boldsymbol{x} = \Omega \boldsymbol{x}(0) + \Gamma \boldsymbol{u}. \tag{17}$$

The LQ criterion (15) can now be written

$$V_{N}(x(0), \boldsymbol{u}) = \boldsymbol{x}^{\top}(0)Q\boldsymbol{x}(0) + \boldsymbol{x}^{\top}\bar{Q}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{u}^{\top}\bar{R}\boldsymbol{u}$$

$$= \boldsymbol{x}^{\top}(0)Q\boldsymbol{x}(0) + (\Omega\boldsymbol{x}(0) + \Gamma\boldsymbol{u})^{\top}\bar{Q}(\Omega\boldsymbol{x}(0) + \Gamma\boldsymbol{u}) + \boldsymbol{u}^{\top}\bar{R}\boldsymbol{u}$$

$$= \boldsymbol{u}^{\top}(\Gamma^{\top}\bar{Q}\Gamma + \bar{R})\boldsymbol{u} + 2\boldsymbol{x}^{\top}(0)\Omega^{\top}\bar{Q}\Gamma\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{x}^{\top}(0)(Q + \Omega^{\top}\bar{Q}\Omega)\boldsymbol{x}(0)$$
(18)
where $\bar{Q} = \operatorname{diag}(Q, \dots, Q, P_{f})$ and $\bar{R} = \operatorname{diag}(R, \dots, R).$

Since $V_N(x(0), u)$ is quadratic in u, we can solve for the optimal control vector (either by differentiation or by completing the squares):

 $\boldsymbol{u}^* = -(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{Q}} \boldsymbol{\Gamma} + \bar{\boldsymbol{R}})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{Q}} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \, \boldsymbol{x}(0)$

and the optimal cost-to-go, or value function, is

$$V_N^*(x(0), \boldsymbol{u}) = x^\top(0) \left(Q + \Omega^\top \bar{Q} \Omega - \Omega^\top \bar{Q} \Gamma (\Gamma^\top \bar{Q} \Gamma + \bar{R})^{-1} \Gamma^\top \bar{Q} \Omega \right) x(0).$$

Note that u^* is linear in x(0) and V_N^* is quadratic in x(0)!

47 of 180

Dynamic programming solution

Let us inspect the cost function V_N in the same way by spelling out the stage costs:

$$V_N = l(x(0), u(0)) + \ldots + l(x(N-2), u(N-2)) + \overbrace{l(x(N-1), u(N-1)) + l_f(x(N))}^{u(N-1)}.$$
(19)

In the expression above, an important property of the problem has been indicated: each control input affects only a corresponding *tail* of the sum; the later the control input is, the shorter the tail. Starting at the very end, only the last two terms of (19) depend on the last control input u(N-1);

47 of 180

Dynamic programming solution

Let us inspect the cost function V_N in the same way by spelling out the stage costs:

$$\underbrace{u(N-2)}_{u(N-1)}$$

$$V_N = l(x(0), u(0)) + \ldots + l(x(N-2), u(N-2)) + \overbrace{l(x(N-1), u(N-1)) + l_f(x(N))}^{u(N-1)}.$$
(19)

In the expression above, an important property of the problem has been indicated: each control input affects only a corresponding *tail* of the sum; the later the control input is, the shorter the tail. Starting at the very end, only the last two terms of (19) depend on the last control input u(N-1); we can therefore rewrite the minimization problem as

$$\min_{u(0:N-1)} V_N(x(0), u(0:N-1)) = \\
\min_{u(0:N-2)} \left\{ V_{N-1}(x(0), u(0:N-2)) + \min_{u(N-1)} \left[l(x(N-1), u(N-1)) + l_f(x(N)) \right] \right\}.$$

This allows us to start unfolding the solution to the LQ problem by applying *backwards dynamic programming*.

 $l(x(N-1), u(N-1)) + \overline{l_f(x(N))}$

$$l(x(N-1), u(N-1)) + l_f(x(N))$$

= $x^{\top}(N-1)Qx(N-1) + u^{\top}(N-1)Ru(N-1)$
+ $(Ax(N-1) + Bu(N-1))^{\top}P_f(Ax(N-1) + Bu(N-1))$

$$\begin{split} l(x(N-1), u(N-1)) + l_f(x(N)) \\ &= x^\top (N-1)Qx(N-1) + u^\top (N-1)Ru(N-1) \\ &+ (Ax(N-1) + Bu(N-1))^\top P_f(Ax(N-1) + Bu(N-1))) \\ &= x^\top (Q + A^\top P_f A)x + u^\top (R + B^\top P_f B)u + 2x^\top A^\top P_f Bu \end{split}$$

where we have dropped the time arguments for x(N-1) and u(N-1) in the second step

$$\begin{split} l(x(N-1), u(N-1)) + l_f(x(N)) \\ &= x^{\top}(N-1)Qx(N-1) + u^{\top}(N-1)Ru(N-1) \\ &+ (Ax(N-1) + Bu(N-1))^{\top}P_f(Ax(N-1) + Bu(N-1))) \\ &= x^{\top}(Q + A^{\top}P_fA)x + u^{\top}(R + B^{\top}P_fB)u + 2x^{\top}A^{\top}P_fBu \\ &= (u + (R + B^{\top}P_fB)^{-1}B^{\top}P_fAx)^{\top}(R + B^{\top}P_fB)(u + (R + B^{\top}P_fB)^{-1}B^{\top}P_fAx) \\ &+ x^{\top}(Q + A^{\top}P_fA - A^{\top}P_fB(R + B^{\top}P_fB)^{-1}B^{\top}P_fA)x \end{split}$$

where we have dropped the time arguments for x(N-1) and u(N-1) in the second step, and the last step has been obtained by completing the squares.

$$\begin{split} l(x(N-1), u(N-1)) + l_f(x(N)) \\ &= x^{\top}(N-1)Qx(N-1) + u^{\top}(N-1)Ru(N-1) \\ &+ (Ax(N-1) + Bu(N-1))^{\top}P_f(Ax(N-1) + Bu(N-1))) \\ &= x^{\top}(Q + A^{\top}P_fA)x + u^{\top}(R + B^{\top}P_fB)u + 2x^{\top}A^{\top}P_fBu \\ &= (u + (R + B^{\top}P_fB)^{-1}B^{\top}P_fAx)^{\top}(R + B^{\top}P_fB)(u + (R + B^{\top}P_fB)^{-1}B^{\top}P_fAx) \\ &+ x^{\top}(Q + A^{\top}P_fA - A^{\top}P_fB(R + B^{\top}P_fB)^{-1}B^{\top}P_fA)x \end{split}$$

where we have dropped the time arguments for x(N-1) and u(N-1) in the second step, and the last step has been obtained by completing the squares. The latter makes it possible to simply read off the minimizing control

$$u^{*}(N-1) = u^{*}(N-1;x) = \underbrace{-(R+B^{\top}P_{f}B)^{-1}B^{\top}P_{f}A}_{K(N-1)} x \equiv K(N-1)x$$

$$\begin{split} l(x(N-1), u(N-1)) + l_f(x(N)) \\ &= x^{\top}(N-1)Qx(N-1) + u^{\top}(N-1)Ru(N-1) \\ &+ (Ax(N-1) + Bu(N-1))^{\top}P_f(Ax(N-1) + Bu(N-1))) \\ &= x^{\top}(Q + A^{\top}P_fA)x + u^{\top}(R + B^{\top}P_fB)u + 2x^{\top}A^{\top}P_fBu \\ &= (u + (R + B^{\top}P_fB)^{-1}B^{\top}P_fAx)^{\top}(R + B^{\top}P_fB)(u + (R + B^{\top}P_fB)^{-1}B^{\top}P_fAx) \\ &+ x^{\top}(Q + A^{\top}P_fA - A^{\top}P_fB(R + B^{\top}P_fB)^{-1}B^{\top}P_fA)x \end{split}$$

where we have dropped the time arguments for x(N-1) and u(N-1) in the second step, and the last step has been obtained by completing the squares. The latter makes it possible to simply read off the minimizing control

$$u^{*}(N-1) = u^{*}(N-1;x) = \underbrace{-(R+B^{\top}P_{f}B)^{-1}B^{\top}P_{f}A}_{K(N-1)} x \equiv K(N-1)x$$

and the resulting optimal cost-to-go from state x at time N-1 to the final time N is

$$V_{N-1\to N}^{*}(x) = x^{\top} \underbrace{(Q + A^{\top} P_{f} A - A^{\top} P_{f} B (R + B^{\top} P_{f} B)^{-1} B^{\top} P_{f} A)}_{P(N-1)} x \equiv x^{\top} P(N-1) x.$$
(20)

 $l(x(N-2), u(N-2)) + V_{N-1 \to N}^*(x(N-1))$

$$l(x(N-2), u(N-2)) + V_{N-1 \to N}^*(x(N-1))$$

= $x^{\top}(N-2)Qx(N-2) + u^{\top}(N-2)Ru(N-2)$
+ $(Ax(N-2) + Bu(N-2))^{\top}P(N-1)(Ax(N-2) + Bu(N-2)).$

$$l(x(N-2), u(N-2)) + V_{N-1 \to N}^*(x(N-1))$$

= $x^{\top}(N-2)Qx(N-2) + u^{\top}(N-2)Ru(N-2)$
+ $(Ax(N-2) + Bu(N-2))^{\top}P(N-1)(Ax(N-2) + Bu(N-2)).$

By carrying out calculations, completely analogous to the ones in step 1 (P_f is replaced by P(N-1)), we get the optimal control

$$u^*(N-2) = u^*(N-2;x) = -(R+B^\top P(N-1)B)^{-1}B^\top P(N-1)Ax = K(N-2)x,$$

where x is now short for x(N-2)

$$\begin{aligned} l(x(N-2), u(N-2)) + V_{N-1 \to N}^*(x(N-1)) \\ &= x^\top (N-2)Qx(N-2) + u^\top (N-2)Ru(N-2) \\ &+ (Ax(N-2) + Bu(N-2))^\top P(N-1)(Ax(N-2) + Bu(N-2)). \end{aligned}$$

By carrying out calculations, completely analogous to the ones in step 1 (P_f is replaced by P(N-1)), we get the optimal control

$$u^*(N-2) = u^*(N-2;x) = -(R+B^\top P(N-1)B)^{-1}B^\top P(N-1)Ax = K(N-2)x,$$

where x is now short for x(N-2), and the optimal cost-to-go from state x at time N-2 to the final time N is

$$V_{N-2 \to N}^*(x) = x^{\top} P(N-2)x,$$
(21)

and P(N-2) is given by the **Riccati equation**

 $P(N-2) = Q + A^{\top} P(N-1)A - A^{\top} P(N-1)B(R+B^{\top} P(N-1)B)^{-1}B^{\top} P(N-1)A.$

50 of 180

DP solution to the LQ problem

The sequence of optimal control laws (control policy) is computed as:

$$u^{*}(k;x) = K(k)x(k), \quad k = 0, \dots, N-1$$
$$K(k) = -(R+B^{\top}P(k+1)B)^{-1}B^{\top}P(k+1)A$$

where the Riccati equation is

$$P(k-1) = Q + A^{\top} P(k) A - A^{\top} P(k) B (R + B^{\top} P(k) B)^{-1} B^{\top} P(k) A, \quad P(N) = P_f$$
(22)

or equivalently

$$P(k-1) = Q + A^{\top} P(k) A + A^{\top} P(k) B K(k-1), \quad P(N) = P_f.$$
(23)

The **optimal cost-to-go** (from time k to time N) is

 $V_{k \to N}^*(x) = x^\top(k)P(k)x(k).$

51 of 180

Example: batch solution of a simple integrator system

Consider the simple integrator system

$$x^+ = x + u.$$

We will study the finite-time optimal control problem with $x_0 = 1$, N = 3 and $Q = R = P_f = 1$. Using the batch approach, the optimal control sequence can be found as

$$\boldsymbol{u}^{*} = -\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} x_{0} = -\begin{bmatrix} 0.615 \\ 0.231 \\ 0.077 \end{bmatrix} x_{0}$$
$$\boldsymbol{x}^{*} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.385 & 0.154 & 0.077 \end{bmatrix}^{\top}.$$

DP solution to the integrator system

We may also solve the problem with DP. The solution can be obtained as $u^*(k) = K(k)x(k)$, where the optimal control gain can be found via backward recursion,

K(0:2) = (-0.615, -0.6, -0.5).

The optimal control sequence can now be obtained by simulating the system forward in time,

$$oldsymbol{u}^* = egin{bmatrix} -0.615 \cdot 1 \ -0.6 \cdot 0.385 \ -0.5 \cdot 0.154 \end{bmatrix} = -egin{bmatrix} 0.615 \ 0.231 \ 0.077 \end{bmatrix} \ oldsymbol{x}^* = egin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.385 & 0.154 & 0.077 \end{bmatrix}^ open.$$

Clearly, and as expected, the solutions by the batch and DP approach are identical.

Batch vs. DP solution under additive process disturbance



igure 6: Receding horizon control of an uncertain system with an additive process disturbance w.

Example: optimality does not guarantee stability

Consider the system

$$x^{+} = Ax + Bu = \begin{bmatrix} 4/3 & -2/3 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u$$
$$y = Cx = \begin{bmatrix} -2/3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} x$$

and design an LQ controller for $Q = P_f = C^{\top}C + \delta I$ with $\delta = 0.001$ and R = 0.001. The time horizon is N = 5. To compute the solution, the Riccati equation (22) is iterated 4 times with $P(5) = P_f$, and the controller gain is obtained as

$$K(0) = -(R + B^{\top} P(1)B)^{-1} B^{\top} P(1)A = \begin{bmatrix} -0.026 & 0.665 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues of the closed-loop matrix A + BK(0) are $\{1.307, 0.001\}$, i.e. the closed-loop system is unstable.

(27)

Infinite horizon LQ control

The system
_____S: x

$$: \quad x^+ = Ax + Bu \tag{24}$$

with optimisation criterion

$$V_{\infty}(x(0), u(0:\infty)) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (x^{\top}(i)Qx(i) + u^{\top}(i)Ru(i))$$
(25)

and with pair (A, B) controllable, and $Q, R \succ 0$, is an infinite horizon LQ control problem whose solution gives a stable closed-loop system

$$x^+ = Ax + BKx$$

with a time invariant feedback gain K, given by

$$K = -(B^{\top}PB + R)^{-1}B^{\top}PA$$
⁽²⁶⁾

$$P = Q + A^{\top} P A - A^{\top} P B (B^{\top} P B + R)^{-1} B^{\top} P A.$$

The latter equation is called the algebraic Riccati equation. The optimal cost is given by

$$V_{\infty}^{*}(x(0)) = x^{\top}(0)Px(0).$$

Example: optimality does not guarantee stability, cont'd

Consider again the LQ design for the system in the previous example. If the time horizon is increased and chosen as N = 7, i.e. the Riccati equation is iterated two more times, then the eigenvalues of the closed-loop matrix become $\{0.989, 0.001\}$, i.e. the closed-loop system is now just stable. Continuing to iterate the Riccati equation, the solution converges to the solution of the algebraic Riccati equation, giving the infinite horizon closed-loop eigenvalues

 $eig(A + BK) = \{0.664, 0.001\}$

i.e. the closed-loop system is stable as predicted.

Example: unstable and stable optimal control



Figure 7: State evolution from the two optimal controllers, one with horizon of N = 5 and the other with an infinite horizon.

References

- J.B. Rawlings, D.Q. Mayne, and M.M. Diehl. *Model Predictive Control: Theory, Computation, and Design, 2nd edition.* Nob Hill Publishing 2017.
 Available online at https://sites.engineering.ucsb.edu/~jbraw/mpc
- [2] G. Goodwin, M.M. Seron, and J.A. De Don. *Constrained Control and Estimation.* Springer 2004. Available online via Chalmers Library.
- [3] F Borrelli, A. Bemporad, and M. Morari. *Predictive Control for Linear and Hybrid Systems*. Available online at http://www.mpc.berkeley.edu/mpc-course-material
- [4] J. Maciejowski. Predictive Control with Constraints. Prentice Hall 2002.
- [5] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex optimisation*. Cambridge University Press 2004.
- [6] Diehl, M. *Real-Time Optimization for Large Scale Nonlinear Processes.* PhD thesis, University of Heidelberg, 2001.



CHALMERS