

Reconfigurable cooperative control for extremum seeking

Arthur Kahn (ONERA), <u>Julien Marzat</u> (ONERA), Hélène Piet Lahanier (ONERA), Michel Kieffer (L2S) *Aerial Robotics Workshop, ENSAM Paris, December 8 2015*





Problem statement

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Context

Source location and surveillance missions

- Forest fire source location
- Chemical or gas leaks
- Surveillance of large areas or search and rescue



Interest for multi-vehicle systems (MVS)

- Mission repartition
- Robustness to faults or agent loss



Global Approach

Field maximization with a MVS

Goal

 \rightarrow Find the global maximum of an initially unknown spatial field

Means

- \rightarrow Multi-vehicle system (MVS)
- \rightarrow Each vehicle measures the field value at its position

Constraints

- \rightarrow Accurately locate field maximum
- \rightarrow Take into account vehicle dynamics
- \rightarrow Avoid collisions between vehicles
- \rightarrow Limit the number of measurements



Outline



Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Problem statement

Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Assumptions

Consider some unknown, continuous, and time-invariant scalar field

$$\phi: \mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 o \phi(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}$$

to be maximized using N identical mobile agents with dynamics

 $M\ddot{\mathbf{x}}_i + C(\mathbf{x}_i, \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i)\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i = \mathbf{u}_i,$

and measurement equation at \mathbf{x}_i

$$y(\mathbf{x}_i) = \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) + w_i(\eta_i),$$

 w_i measurement noise and η_i the *i*-th sensor state

- $\eta_i = 0$ nominal sensor
- $\eta_i = 1$ faulty sensor (bias or modified variance)



Local approach

Global Approach

Problem statement

- N identical vehicles with lossless synchronized communication
- Communication radius R defines agent i neighbourhood

$$\mathscr{N}_i(t) = \{j \mid \|\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_j(t)\| \leq R\}.$$

Available information at time t_k for agent i

$$\mathscr{S}_i(t_k) = \bigcup_{\ell=0}^k \left\{ \left[y_j(t_\ell), \mathbf{x}_j(t_\ell) \right] \mid j \in \mathscr{N}_i(t_\ell) \cap \mathscr{M}(t_\ell) \right\}.$$

Define a strategy to find efficiently (time, measurements)

$$\mathbf{x}_M = rg\max_{\mathbf{x}\in D} \ \{\phi(\mathbf{x})\}$$



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Topics addressed





Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Proposed solutions

1 Define iteratively vehicle sampling positions

2 Model computation from measurements



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Proposed solutions

1 Define iteratively vehicle sampling positions

2 Model computation from measurements



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Proposed solutions

1 Define iteratively vehicle sampling positions

2 Model computation from measurements



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Proposed solutions

Local approach

1 Define iteratively vehicle sampling positions

Optimal sensor placement

2 Model computation from measurements



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Proposed solutions

Local approach

1 Define iteratively vehicle sampling positions

Optimal sensor placement

2 Model computation from measurements

Local linear model



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Proposed solutions

Local approach

1 Define iteratively vehicle sampling positions

Optimal sensor placement

2 Model computation from measurements

3 Move vehicles with collision avoidance

Local linear model

Formation control



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Proposed solutions

Global approach

1 Define iteratively vehicle sampling positions

Constrained sampling criterion

2 Model computation from measurements



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Proposed solutions

Global approach

1 Define iteratively vehicle sampling positions

Constrained sampling criterion

2 Model computation from measurements

Kriging model of the field



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Proposed solutions

Global approach

1 Define iteratively vehicle sampling positions

Constrained sampling criterion

2 Model computation from measurements

3 Move vehicles with collision avoidance

Kriging model of the field

Spread the vehicles in the area

Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Section 2

Local approach

Global Approach

Local approach

"Gradient climbing" algorithm (Ögren 2004, Cortes 2009)

- 1. Vehicles are kept in a close formation
- 2. Vehicles measure the field value at their positions and broadcast
- 3. Cooperative gradient estimation from measurements
- 4. Computation of formation motion along gradient direction

Contributions

- Cooperative weighted least-square estimation with local model
- Outlier detection: adaptive threshold related to cooperative estimation model
- Optimal sensor placement with faulty sensors (Fisher information matrix)
- Fleet control: vehicle formation motion and reconfiguration



Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Field modeling

Locally, spatial field ϕ can be written

$$\phi_i(\mathbf{x}) = \phi\left(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\right) + \left(\mathbf{x} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\right)^{\mathsf{T}} \nabla \phi\left(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{x} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\right)^{\mathsf{T}} \nabla^2 \phi(\boldsymbol{\chi}_i) \left(\mathbf{x} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k\right).$$

Parameter vector
$$\alpha_i^k = \begin{pmatrix} \phi(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k) \\ \nabla \phi(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k) \end{pmatrix}$$
 to be estimated

Local linear model

$$\overline{\phi}_{i}(\mathbf{x}) = \phi\left(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{k}\right) + \left(\mathbf{x} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{k}\right)^{\mathsf{T}} \nabla \phi\left(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{k}\right),$$

with modeling error $e_i(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_i(\mathbf{x}) - \overline{\phi}_i(\mathbf{x})$



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

UNERA

THE FRENCH AEROSPACE LA

Weighted least-squares

Measurement of vehicle *j*

$$y_j(t_k) = \left(1 \quad \left(\mathbf{x}_j(t_k) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i^k \right)^\mathsf{T} \right) \alpha_i^k + e_i(\mathbf{x}_j(t_k)) + n_j(t_k).$$

Vehicle *i* collects all measurements from $\mathcal{N}_i(t_k)$

$$\mathbf{y}_{i,k} = \overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k} \alpha_i^k + \mathbf{n}_{i,k} + \mathbf{e}_{i,k}$$

Weight matrix
$$\mathbf{W}_{i,k} =$$

diag $\left(\sigma_{\eta_{1}(t_{k})}^{-2} \exp\left(\frac{-||\mathbf{x}_{1}(t_{k})-\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{k}||_{2}^{2}}{k_{w}}\right), \ldots, \sigma_{\eta_{N}(t_{k})}^{-2} \exp\left(\frac{-||\mathbf{x}_{N}(t_{k})-\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{k}||_{2}^{2}}{k_{w}}\right)\right)$
 $\widehat{\alpha}_{i}^{k} = \left(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{W}_{i,k} \overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k}\right)^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{W}_{i,k} \mathbf{y}_{i,k}$

Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Model-based fault detection scheme



Problem characteristics

- Local model shared by vehicles
- Spatially-varying modeling error



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Fault detection

Faulty sensor of vehicle
$$i: y_i = \phi(\mathbf{x}_i) + w_i(\eta_i) + d$$

Detection residual $r_i = \hat{\phi}_i(\mathbf{x}_i) - y_i$

Adaptive threshold for residual analysis

$$|r_i| < k_{\text{FDI}} \sqrt{\sigma_0^2 \left(1 + \mathbf{h}_i \mathbf{h}_i^T - 2\mathbf{h}_i[i]\right) + \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{U}_i \mathbf{h}_i}$$

Takes into account measurement noise, sensor locations and modeling error

For fault isolation:

- For each vehicle, bank of N residuals r_{ij} excluding the j-th measurement
- Consensus between vehicles to identify the faulty sensors



Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Fault detection results





Global Approach

Optimal sensor placement

Find sensor locations (and associated formation shapes) that

- minimise estimate variance and modeling error influence
- take into account different sensor variances (faults)

Minimise a function of estimation error covariance matrix

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\alpha_{i}^{k+1}} = \left(\overline{\boldsymbol{\mathsf{R}}}_{i,k+1}^{\mathsf{T}} \boldsymbol{\mathsf{W}}_{i,k+1} \overline{\boldsymbol{\mathsf{R}}}_{i,k+1}\right)^{-1}$$

under collision avoidance constraint $\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|_2^2 \ge R_{\text{safety}}^2, \ \forall \{i, j\}, j > i$

Several optimal design criteria (Walter & Pronzato 1987)



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Optimal sensor placement

T-optimal solution

$$(\mathbf{x}_{1}(t_{k+1})...\mathbf{x}_{N}(t_{k+1})) = \arg \max_{(\mathbf{x}_{1},...,\mathbf{x}_{N})} \operatorname{tr} \left(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k+1}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{W}_{i,k+1} \overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k+1}\right)$$

s.t. $\|\mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{x}_{j}\|_{2}^{2} \ge R_{\operatorname{safety}}^{2}, \forall \{i,j\}, j > i.$



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Optimal sensor placement

T-optimal solution

$$(\mathbf{x}_{1}(t_{k+1})...\mathbf{x}_{N}(t_{k+1})) = \arg \max_{(\mathbf{x}_{1},...,\mathbf{x}_{N})} \operatorname{tr} \left(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k+1}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{W}_{i,k+1} \overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k+1}\right)$$

s.t. $\|\mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{x}_{j}\|_{2}^{2} \ge R_{\operatorname{safety}}^{2}, \forall \{i,j\}, j > i.$

Lagrangian
$$\mathscr{L} = \operatorname{tr}\left(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k+1}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{W}_{i,k+1}\overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k+1}\right) + \sum_{j>i} \mu_{ij}\left(\|\mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{x}_{j}\|_{2}^{2} - R_{\operatorname{safety}}^{2}\right)$$

Two solutions for $\mu_{ij} = 0$ (inactive constraints),

$$\mathbf{x}_{i}(t_{k+1}) = \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{k+1}$$
 $\|\mathbf{x}_{i}(t_{k+1}) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{k+1}\|_{2}^{2} = k_{w} - 1$



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Optimal sensor placement

D-optimal solution

$$(\mathbf{x}_{1}(t_{k+1})...\mathbf{x}_{N}(t_{k+1})) = \arg \max_{(\mathbf{x}_{1},...,\mathbf{x}_{N})} \det \left(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k+1}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{W}_{i,k+1} \overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k+1}\right)$$

s.t. $\|\mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{x}_{j}\|_{2}^{2} \ge R_{\mathrm{safety}}^{2}, \forall \{i,j\}, j > i.$

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Optimal sensor placement

D-optimal solution

$$(\mathbf{x}_{1}(t_{k+1})...\mathbf{x}_{N}(t_{k+1})) = \arg \max_{(\mathbf{x}_{1},...,\mathbf{x}_{N})} \det \left(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k+1}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{W}_{i,k+1}\overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k+1}\right)$$

s.t. $\|\mathbf{x}_{i} - \mathbf{x}_{j}\|_{2}^{2} \ge R_{\mathrm{safety}}^{2}, \forall \{i,j\}, j > i.$

Lagrangian
$$\mathscr{L} = \det \left(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k+1}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{W}_{i,k+1} \overline{\mathbf{R}}_{i,k+1} \right) + \sum_{j>i} \mu_{ij} \left(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|_2^2 - R_{\text{safety}}^2 \right)$$

Two solutions for $\mu_{ij} = 0$ (inactive constraints),

$$\mathbf{x}_{i}(t_{k+1}) = \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{k+1}$$
 $\left\| \mathbf{x}_{i}(t_{k+1}) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{k+1} \right\|_{2}^{2} = \frac{2k_{w}}{3}$



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

THE EXTREME AT ADDRESS LAD

Numerical solutions





Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Numerical solutions

N = 5 agents, D-optimal placement





Global Approach

Numerical solutions

Conclusion on T-optimal and D-optimal sensor placement

- All vehicles should be located on a circle with inactive constraints
- A faulty agent is placed further from the fleet, due to estimation weight

Sensor placement to minimize modeling error

Be as close as possible to estimation position

Formation characteristics

- T-optimal \rightarrow concentric circles
- ► D-optimal → compact formation around estimation position with active constraints

A. Kahn, J. Marzat, H. Piet-Lahanier, M. Kieffer, Cooperative estimation with outlier detection and fleet reconfiguration for multi-agent systems, IFAC Workshop on Multi-Vehicule Systems 2015



Local approach

Global Approach

Cooperative guidance law

- Manage vehicle motions to respect sensor placement
- Locate field maximum

A virtual point $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^k$ is used in a two-layer control law

- High-level control
 - Move the virtual point to track the field maximum
- Low-level control
 - Keep the agents in formation around the virtual point
 - Avoid collisions between vehicles



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

High-level control

Gradient climbing of estimation position $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^k$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{k+1} = \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^k + \lambda^k \widehat{\nabla \phi} \left(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^k \right) / \left\| \widehat{\nabla \phi} \left(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^k \right) \right\|_2.$$

 $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^k$ can be proven to converge to maximum for concave fields

Decentralized computation of estimation position is possible with incomplete communication graph



J. Marzat, A. Kahn, H. Piet-Lahanier Cooperative guidance of Lego Mindstorms NXT mobile robots, 11th International Conference on Informatics in Control, Automation and Robotics, Vienne Autriche, 2014

Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Experiment



20/34 Reconfigurable cooperative control for extremum seeking



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

ONERA

THE FRENCH AEROSPACE LAB

Low-level control

Vehicle dynamics

$$M\ddot{\mathbf{x}}_i(t) + C(\mathbf{x}_i(t), \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i(t))\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i(t) = \mathbf{u}_i(t)$$

Proposed control law (similar to Cheah, 2009)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_{i}(t) = M\ddot{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}_{i}(t) + C(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t), \dot{\mathbf{x}}_{i}(t))\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{i}(t) - k_{1}\left(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{i}(t) - \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}_{i}(t)\right) \\ + 2k_{2}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{j}(t)\right)\exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{j}(t))^{T}(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{j}(t))}{q}\right) \\ - k_{3}^{i}(\eta_{i}, t)(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_{i}(t)), \end{aligned}$$

Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Control stability

Candidate Lyapunov function $V(\mathbf{X}(t))$

$$V(\mathbf{X}(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{i}(t) - \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}(t))^{T} M(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{i}(t) - \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}(t)) + (\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}(t))^{T} k_{3}^{i}(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) + k_{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{j}(t))^{T} (\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{j}(t))}{q}\right) \right]$$



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Control stability

Candidate Lyapunov function $V(\mathbf{X}(t))$

$$V(\mathbf{X}(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{i}(t) - \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}(t))^{T} M(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{i}(t) - \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}(t)) + (\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}(t))^{T} k_{3}^{i}(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) + k_{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{j}(t))^{T} (\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{j}(t))}{q}\right) \right]$$

Speed control term



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Control stability

Candidate Lyapunov function $V(\mathbf{X}(t))$

$$V(\mathbf{X}(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{i}(t) - \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}(t))^{T} M(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{i}(t) - \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}(t)) + (\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t))^{T} k_{3}^{i}(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) + k_{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{j}(t))^{T} (\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{j}(t))}{q}\right) \right]$$

Position control term



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Control stability

Candidate Lyapunov function $V(\mathbf{X}(t))$

$$V(\mathbf{X}(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i(t) - \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}(t))^T M(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i(t) - \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}(t)) + (\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}(t))^T k_3^i(\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) + k_2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_j(t))^T (\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_j(t))}{q}\right) \right]$$

Collision avoidance term



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Control stability

Candidate Lyapunov function $V(\mathbf{X}(t))$

$$V(\mathbf{X}(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{i}(t) - \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}(t))^{T} M(\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{i}(t) - \dot{\widehat{\mathbf{x}}}(t)) + (\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}(t))^{T} k_{3}^{i}(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) + k_{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{j}(t))^{T} (\mathbf{x}_{i}(t) - \mathbf{x}_{j}(t))}{q}\right) \right]$$

Control law can be proven to be Lyapunov stable

A. Kahn, J. Marzat, H. Piet-Lahanier, M. Kieffer, Cooperative estimation with outlier detection and fleet reconfiguration for multi-agent systems, IFAC Workshop on Multi-Vehicule Systems, Gênes Italie, 2015



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Reconfiguration

Optimal sensor placement \rightarrow desired formation shape



Faulty agent $i \rightarrow \text{modified control law}$

$$k_{3}^{i}(\eta_{i}=0) > k_{3}^{i}(\eta_{i}=1)$$

Faulty agents are "pushed" far from the formation center



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Reconfiguration





Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Local approach: complete loop simulation



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Local approach: complete loop simulation





Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Section 3

Global Approach

Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Kriging

Unknown field $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ modeled as

$$Y(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x})^{\mathsf{T}}\beta + Z(\mathbf{x})$$

- \blacktriangleright **r**(**x**) regression vector
- β parameter vector
- Z(x) zero-mean Gaussian process with covariance
 C(Z(x₁), Z(x₂))

Kriging provides a Gaussian distribution for each **x** with

- ► a mean value $\mu(\mathbf{x})$
- ► a prediction variance $\sigma^2(\mathbf{x})$

How to choose sampling points?



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives







Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives







Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Kriging-based existing sampling criteria

Kriging-based sampling criterion for seeking $\mathbf{x}_M = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in D} \phi(\mathbf{x})$

- For optimizing costly-to-evaluate functions
- Based on *n* measurements, choose the n+1-th

• Kushner, 1962

- Expected improvement (Jones, 1998)
- Confidence bound (Cox, 1997)

$$\mathscr{C}_{\text{Kushner}}(\mathbf{x}) = P(\mu(\mathbf{x}) > f_{\max} + \varepsilon)$$



Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Kriging-based existing sampling criteria

Kriging-based sampling criterion for seeking $\mathbf{x}_M = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in D} \phi(\mathbf{x})$

- For optimizing costly-to-evaluate functions
- \blacklozenge Based on *n* measurements, choose the *n*+1-th
- ► Kushner, 1962
- Expected improvement (Jones, 1998)

 $\mathscr{C}_{\mathrm{EI}}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f_{\max})\Psi(z) + \hat{\sigma}(\mathbf{x})\Psi(z)$

Confidence bound (Cox, 1997)

$$z = rac{\mu(\mathbf{x}) - f_{\max}}{\hat{\sigma}(\mathbf{x})}$$



Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Kriging-based existing sampling criteria

Kriging-based sampling criterion for seeking $\mathbf{x}_M = \arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in D} \phi(\mathbf{x})$

- For optimizing costly-to-evaluate functions
- \blacklozenge Based on *n* measurements, choose the *n*+1-th
- ► Kushner, 1962
- Expected improvement (Jones, 1998)
- Confidence bound (Cox, 1997)

$$\mathscr{C}_{\mathrm{lcb}}(\mathsf{x}) = \mu(\mathsf{x}) + b_{\mathrm{lcb}}\hat{\sigma}(\mathsf{x})$$



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Existing Kriging-based sampling criteria for MVS

Now looking for all vehicle positions ${\bf X}$

- Choi, 2008 • Xu & Choi, 2011 $\mathscr{C}_{\text{Choi}}(\mathbf{X}(t)) = \frac{\sum_{p=1}^{4} \lambda_{p}(t) \Xi_{p}(\mathbf{X}(t), t)}{\sum_{p=1}^{4} \lambda_{p}(t)}$
- $\Xi_1=\mu$, $\Xi_2=-\mu$, $\Xi_3=\sigma^2$, $\Xi_4=\ln(2\pi\sigma^2)$

Minimise uncertainy mean on \mathcal{J} , grid of interest points.

- More exploration criteria than global optimization criteria
- Do not take into account vehicle dynamics explicitly



Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Existing Kriging-based sampling criteria for MVS

Now looking for all vehicle positions ${\bf X}$

Choi, 2008
Xu & Choi, 2011
C_{Xu}(X(t)) = 1/| j | solution for the second second

$\Xi_1 = \mu$, $\Xi_2 = -\mu$, $\Xi_3 = \sigma^2$, $\Xi_4 = \ln(2\pi\sigma^2)$

Minimise uncertainy mean on \mathscr{J} , grid of interest points.

- More exploration criteria than global optimization criteria
- Do not take into account vehicle dynamics explicitly



Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Existing Kriging-based sampling criteria for MVS

Now looking for all vehicle positions \mathbf{X}

- ▶ Choi, 2008
- ▶ Xu & Choi, 2011

$\Xi_1 = \mu$, $\Xi_2 = -\mu$, $\Xi_3 = \sigma^2$, $\Xi_4 = \ln(2\pi\sigma^2)$

Minimise uncertainy mean on \mathscr{J} , grid of interest points.

- More exploration criteria than global optimization criteria
- Do not take into account vehicle dynamics explicitly





Global Approach

Proposed criterion

Goals

- Locate global maximum
- Limit exploration to areas of interest
- Take into account vehicle dynamics

 $J_i^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}_i(t_k) - \mathbf{x}\|^2 - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t_k)} \alpha \|\mathbf{x}_j(t_k) - \mathbf{x}\|^2$

$$\mathbf{x}_{i}^{d}(t_{k}) = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}\in D} \left\{ J_{i}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) \right\}$$

s.t. $\hat{\phi}_{i,k}(\mathbf{x}) + b\sigma_{\phi,i,k}(\mathbf{x}) > f_{\max}^{i}(t_{k})$



Global Approach

Proposed criterion

Goals

- Locate global maximum
- Limit exploration to areas of interest
- Take into account vehicle dynamics

$$J_i^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}_i(t_k) - \mathbf{x}\|^2 - \sum_{j \in \mathscr{N}_i(t_k)} lpha \|\mathbf{x}_j(t_k) - \mathbf{x}\|^2,$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{i}^{d}(t_{k}) = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}\in D} \left\{ J_{i}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) \right\}$$

s.t. $\hat{\phi}_{i,k}(\mathbf{x}) + b\sigma_{\phi,i,k}(\mathbf{x}) > f_{\max}^{i}(t_{k})$



Global Approach

Proposed criterion

Goals

- Locate global maximum
- Limit exploration to areas of interest
- Take into account vehicle dynamics

$$J_i^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) = \|\mathbf{x}_i(t_k) - \mathbf{x}\|^2 - \sum_{j \in \mathscr{N}_i(t_k)} lpha \|\mathbf{x}_j(t_k) - \mathbf{x}\|^2,$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{i}^{d}(t_{k}) = \arg\min_{\mathbf{x}\in D} \left\{ J_{i}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}) \right\}$$

s.t. $\hat{\phi}_{i,k}(\mathbf{x}) + b\sigma_{\phi,i,k}(\mathbf{x}) > f_{\max}^{i}(t_{k})$



Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives





Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives





Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives







Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives







Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

ONERA

THE FRENCH AEROSPACE LAB





Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives





Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Global approach : full simulation



A. Kahn, J. Marzat, H. Piet-Lahanier, M. Kieffer, Global extremum seeking by Kriging with a multi-agent system, 17th IFAC SYSID, Beijing China, 2015



 Problem statement
 Local approach
 Global Approach
 Conclusions and perspectives

 0000
 Comparison with reference method
 Conclusions and perspectives





Contribution

 Quick convergence to a small error with limited measurements

Limitations

True covariance parameters usually unknown





Local approach

Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Conclusions and perspectives

Two approaches for maximum location with a multi-vehicle system

Local approach

- Cooperative estimation with associated optimal placement
- Fault detection and identification
- Formation control with reconfiguration

Global approach

- Kriging-based criterion for global optimization to limit search area
- Perspectives
 - Fault diagnosis and reconfiguration with Kriging model
 - Incorporate communication constraints in criterion



Global Approach

Conclusions and perspectives

Publications

- Kahn, A., Marzat, J., Piet Lahanier, H. Formation flying control via elliptical virtual structure, IEEE International Conference on Networking, Sensing and Control, 158-163, Evry, France, (2013)
- Piet Lahanier, H., Kahn, A., Marzat, J. Cooperative guidance laws for maneuvering target interception, IFAC Symposium on Automatic Control in Aerospace, 296-301, Würzburg, Germany, (2013)
- Marzat, J., Piet Lahanier, H., Kahn, A. Cooperative guidance of Lego Mindstorms NXT mobile robots, 11th International Conference on Informatics in Control, Automation and Robotics, 605-610, Vienne, Austria, (2014)
- Bertrand S., Marzat J., Piet-Lahanier H., Kahn A., Rochefort Y., MPC Strategies for Cooperative Guidance of Autonomous Vehicles, Aerospace Lab Journal, 8, 1-18, (2014)
- Kahn, A., Marzat, J., Piet Lahanier, H., Kieffer, M. Cooperative estimation with outlier detection and fleet reconfiguration for multi-agent systems, IFAC Workshop on Multi-Vehicule Systems, 11-16, Genova, Italy, (2015)
- Kahn, A., Marzat, J., Piet Lahanier, H., Kieffer, M. Global extremum seeking by Kriging with a multi-agent system, 17th IFAC Symposium on System Identification, Bejing, China (2015)

