

**Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive**  
**DSpace Repository**

---

Faculty and Researchers

Faculty and Researchers' Publications

---

2020-02

# Consistent numerical methods for state and control constrained trajectory optimisation with parameter dependency

Walton, Claire; Kaminer, Isaac; Gong, Qi

Taylor & Francis

---

Claire Walton, Isaac Kaminer & Qi Gong (2020): Consistent numerical methods for state and control constrained trajectory optimisation with parameter dependency, *International Journal of Control*  
<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/65667>

---

This publication is a work of the U.S. Government as defined in Title 17, United States Code, Section 101. Copyright protection is not available for this work in the United States.

*Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun*



Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

**Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School**  
**411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle**  
**Monterey, California USA 93943**

<http://www.nps.edu/library>



# Consistent numerical methods for state and control constrained trajectory optimisation with parameter dependency

Claire Walton <sup>a</sup>, Isaac Kaminer<sup>a</sup> and Qi Gong<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, USA; <sup>b</sup>Department of Applied Mathematics, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA, USA

## ABSTRACT

This paper describes and proves the consistency of a flexible numerical method for producing solutions to state and control constrained control problems with parameter dependencies. This method allows for the use of a variety of underlying discretisation schemes, which can be catered to differing numerical challenges of specific problems, such as rapid convergence or large parameter spaces. The paper first provides a broad formulation for optimal control problems with parameter dependencies which includes multiple types of state, control, and end time constraints to enable a wide scope of application. For this formulation, the consistency of these methods for state and control constrained problems is then proved. Finally, a numerical example of an optimal search problem with constraints is demonstrated.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 16 May 2019  
Accepted 11 January 2020

## KEYWORDS

Optimal control; nonlinear control; numerical methods; parameter dependency; parameter uncertainty; distributed-parameter systems; ensemble control; optimal search

## 1. Introduction

Instances of optimal control problems with parameter dependency have arisen in multiple recent control applications. In these applications, the performance is optimised over a set of parameters which impact cost and possibly system dynamics given access to the system only through a parameter independent control. For instance, the ensemble control problem deals with the control of a family or continuum of systems  $x(t, \theta)$  whose dynamics

$$\frac{\partial x}{\partial t} = f(x(t, \theta), u(t), \theta)$$

depend continuously on parameter  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta}$  and are driven by parameter independent control  $u(t)$ . Optimising the behaviour of the ‘ensemble’ of systems over all parameter values creates control problems which must track the behaviour over a range of parameter values and incorporate this range of performances in its cost metric. Ensemble control problems arise in quantum applications, such as medical imaging or quantum experiments, where an external application of electromagnetic pulses is applied to a system with environmental inhomogeneity (Brockett & Khaneja, 2000; Li & Khaneja, 2007; Ruths & Li, 2012). Parameter dependency can also present itself in spatially distributed problems with no spatial feedback control. For example, the optimal search problem (Foraker, 2011; Phelps, Gong, Royset, Walton, & Kaminer, 2014), which aims to optimise the search for uncertain targets over a search region. When uncertain target location is modelled as a deterministic quantity conditionally dependent on a set of unknown parameter values, such as initial location, then expected probability of success becomes dependent on the parameter set. This creates a cost

function in the form of an integral over parameter space:

$$J[x, u] = \int_{\Theta} \left[ F(x(T, \theta), \theta) + \int_0^T r(x(t, \theta), u(t), t, \theta) dt \right] d\theta$$

where  $\int_{\Theta}$  represents the possibly multi-dimensional integral over parameter space. Additional examples include robotics, where manufacturing error can create parameter uncertainty in regards to vehicle part sizes and subsequent dynamics (Becker, 2012) and in chemical engineering, where the model of parameter dependency has been utilised for the optimisation of batch processes under uncertainty (Ruppen, Benthack, & Bonvin, 1995; Terwiesch, Ravemark, Schenker, & Rippin, 1998).

A key issue in addressing optimal control problems with parameter dependencies, which tend to be analytically intractable, has been the development of numerical algorithms. Recently, there has been much progress in this area. For instance, for nonlinear finite-dimensional optimisation problems with parameter uncertainty, Robust Optimisation (RO) frameworks have been developed to address the minimisation of mean performance given constraints on variance or other risk metrics, such as in Darlington, Pantelides, Rustem, and Tanyi (2000). In continuous time optimal control, the method of polynomial chaos has been applied to a variety of problems with amenable problem structures, such as quadratic costs or linear dynamics (Fisher & Bhattacharya, 2011; Hover & Triantafyllou, 2006).

As an approach to general nonlinear control problems, there have been many variations on forms of direct discretisation put forth. This can be summarised informally as first choosing a set of nodes  $\{\theta_i^M\}_{i=1}^M$  from the parameter domain  $\Theta$  and an associated set of integration weights  $\{\alpha_i^M\}_{i=1}^M$ . States, if

**Table 1.** Overview for direct discretisation.

Approach	Multi-dimensional pseudospectral	Monte Carlo sampling	Riemann–Stieltjes	Unscented transform	Collocation with convergent quadrature		
					(v)	(vi)	This paper
Reference	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)	This paper
<b>Constraints:</b>							
Control	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
State-control	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
End time state	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Distributional							
State-control	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Distributional							
End time state	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Uncertain							
Dynamics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Consistency							
Proof	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Reference</b>							
(i)	Ruths and Li (2012)						
(ii)	Phelps et al. (2016)						
(iii)	Ross et al. (2015)						
(iv)	Ross et al. (2016)						
(v)	Phelps et al. (2014)						
(vi)	Walton et al. (2016)						

parameter dependent, are then propagated at these nodes:

$$\frac{dx_i^M}{dt}(t) = f(x_i^M(t), u(t), \theta_i^M), \quad i = 1, \dots, M$$

and the cost function is estimated as a weighted sum:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Theta} \left[ F(x(T, \theta), \theta) + \int_0^T r(x(t, \theta), u(t), t, \theta) dt \right] d\theta \\ & \approx \sum_{i=1}^M \alpha_i^M \left[ F(x_i^M(T), \theta_i^M) + \int_0^T r(x_i^M(t), u(t), t, \theta_i^M) dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This creates an approximate problem – a standard control problem which can be solved using other established methods. There are many approaches to node selection, with distinct tradeoffs. Monte Carlo sampling, for instance, provides slow converge but is a way to circumvent the dimensional growth problem of a high dimension parameter space (Phelps, Royset, & Gong, 2016). Conversely, the multi-dimensional pseudospectral approach can provide rapid convergence but node selection grows exponentially with dimension (Ruths & Li, 2012). Other options include Riemann–Stieltjes integration (Ross, Proulx, Karpenko, & Gong, 2015) and using the sigma points from the unscented transform (Ross, Karpenko, & Proulx, 2016). A more generic approach is that of Phelps et al. (2014) and Walton, Phelps, Gong, and Kaminer (2016), which considers all node and weight schemes which provide convergent quadrature for continuous functions.

The variety of node generation approaches in the literature has been applied to diverse formulations of this problem. Differences include whether state dynamics are influenced by the uncertain parameter, whether control and/or state constraints are incorporated, and whether any convergence results are proven. Table 1 provides an overview of results for direct discretisation methods applied to finite horizon problems with uncertain parameters. The goal of this paper is to provide a method which addresses the full variety of constraint needs

and to provide the subsequent proof of consistency (that convergent numerical solutions of approximate problems converge to optimal solutions of the original problem) of the numerical method. An additional goal is to provide this for a broad family of numerical methods, by building on the convergent quadrature approach. This method is inclusive of both multi-dimensional pseudospectral and Riemann–Stieltjes, as well as methods that can mitigate the dimensional growth problems of quadrature, such as sparse grid methods.

We address the variety of parameter dependency forms and constraint needs through the following class of optimal control problems:

**Problem P.** Determine the state and control pair,  $(x, u)$ , that minimises the cost function:

$$J[x, u] = \int_{\Theta} \left[ F(x(T, \theta), \theta) + \int_0^T r(x(t, \theta), u(t), t, \theta) dt \right] d\theta \quad (1)$$

subject to:

$$\frac{\partial x}{\partial t}(t, \theta) = f(x(t, \theta), u(t), \theta), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad \theta \in \Theta, \quad (2)$$

$$x(0, \theta) = x_0(\theta), \quad \theta \in \Theta, \quad (3)$$

$$g(u(t)) \leq 0, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (4)$$

$$e(x(T, \theta), \theta) \leq 0, \quad \theta \in \Theta, \quad (5)$$

$$h(x(t, \theta), \theta) \leq 0, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad \theta \in \Theta, \quad (6)$$

$$\Psi_e \left( \int_{\Theta} e_I(x(T, \theta), \theta) d\theta \right) \leq 0, \quad (7)$$

$$\Psi_h \left( \int_{\Theta} h_I(x(t, \theta), \theta) d\theta \right) \leq 0, \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (8)$$

Component functions have dimensions:  $x : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ ,  $u : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ ,  $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ ,  $r : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ ,  $x_0 : \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ ,  $e : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n_e}$ ,  $g : \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n_g}$ ,  $h : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n_h}$ ,  $e_I : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\Psi_e : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ ,  $h_I :$

$\mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\Psi_h : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ . Additional conditions imposed on the state and control space and component functions for the numerical method are specified in Section 2.

In Problem **P**, the set  $\Theta$  is the domain of the parameters  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta}$ . The format of the cost function  $J$  is that of the integral over  $\Theta$  of a Mayer–Bolza type cost dependent on the uncertain parameters. In regards to state constraints, the nature of the problem, in which a single control input is applied over multiple values of parameters  $\theta$ , creates a variety of possible boundary conditions and constraints which can arise in applications. In this formulation, constraints over all parameter values, in the form of Li and Khaneja (2006, 2007, 2009), Ross, Proulx, and Karpenko (2014b) are included with conditions (5) and (6), as are the control constraints found in Phelps et al. (2014) and Walton et al. (2016) with condition (4). State constraints bounded over all parameter values, however, are rather strict, and guaranteed feasibility of a problems with such constraints has not been established with great generality for control systems with parameter uncertainty. Due to these limitations and also the strictness of conditions which constrain all parameter values in cases where low probability parameter values may not be as critical to restrict, applications may also consider constraints on aggregate performance, as suggested in Ross, Proulx, and Karpenko (2014a). The constraints on the aggregate performance found in Ross et al. (2014a) are generalised here to conditions (7) and (8). These conditions allow for limits to be set on quantities such as the expectation or variance of states over a distribution of parameter values.

As with all control formulations, the feasibility of individual problems is a difficult issue and not necessarily guaranteed. However, there are plenty of available examples which demonstrate the feasibility of parameter uncertainty problems under diverse constraints. For example, the constraint  $e(x(T, \theta), \theta) \leq 0$  with

$$e(x(T, \theta), \theta) = \begin{bmatrix} x(T, \theta) - \gamma(\theta) - \epsilon \\ \gamma(\theta) - x(T, \theta) - \epsilon \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

limits the end time states  $x(T, \theta)$  to be within  $[-\epsilon, \epsilon]$  of an end time goal curve  $\gamma(\theta)$ . In Li and Khaneja (2006, 2007, 2009), feasibility results for a class of linear parameter uncertainty systems are derived, in the sense that for all  $\epsilon$  there exists a final time  $T$  such that the systems can be driven to within an  $\epsilon$ -ball of a goal curve  $\gamma(\theta)$ . (The case of nonlinear systems with parameter uncertainty, however, is an open question, and in fact it is easy to construct systems which will be unable to satisfy such a constraint. For instance, Becker (2012) provides a scaled non-holonomic unicycle system which is provably unable to satisfy an end constraint on orientation over all parameters.) A path constraint example can be found in Ross et al. (2016), which uses such a constraint of type (6) to avoid singular gimbal trajectories for an agile spacecraft. The spatially distributed application of optimal search (Pursiheimo, 1976) also provides many intuitive instances of feasible constrained problems – attainable search performance constraints, for instance. We provide such an example in Section 4.

For this general Problem **P**, we provide a discretisation-based numerical algorithm, and proofs of its feasibility (that it generates solutions which are feasible for Problem **P**) and consistency

(that convergent numerical solutions converge to optimal solutions of Problem **P**). These results build on the work of Phelps et al. (2014) and Walton et al. (2016) to extend to the broader problem formulation presented here. The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 provides the additional regularity conditions imposed on Problem **P**. Section 3 presents a numerical method for generating solutions and a proof of the consistency of this method. Finally, Section 4 provides an example with the numerical solution.

## 2. Regularity assumptions

In order to address Problem **P** numerically and analytically in the next sections, we impose the following regularity assumptions:

**Assumption 2.1:** *The functions  $f$ ,  $r$ ,  $F$ ,  $e$ ,  $h$ ,  $e_I$ ,  $h_I$ ,  $\Psi_e$ , and  $\Psi_h$  are  $C^1$ , and  $x_0 : \Theta \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$  is continuous.*

Due to their compact domains, the  $C^1$  functions thus satisfy Lipschitz conditions.

**Assumption 2.2:** *Control solutions  $u$  are  $C^0$  on  $[0, T]$ .*

From Assumption 2.1, this implies state solutions are  $C^1$  on  $\Theta \times [0, T]$ .

**Assumption 2.3:** *The function  $g$  is continuous and the set  $U = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u} | g(v) \leq 0\}$  is compact.*

**Assumption 2.4:** *The set  $\Theta$  is compact, and there exists a compact set  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$  such that for all  $u(t) \in U$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $x(t, \theta) \in X$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , where  $x(t, \theta) = x_0 + \int_0^t f(x(s, \theta), u(s), \theta) ds$ .*

This assumption essentially requires for all bounded controls that there is no  $\theta \in \Theta$  for which the state has a finite escape time. A large class of nonlinear systems satisfy this assumption, for example, input-to-state stable systems and systems for which  $f$  is globally Lipschitz or satisfies a linear growth condition.

## 3. Numerical approximation scheme

We introduce an approximation of Problem **P**, referred to as Problem **P<sup>M</sup>**. Problem **P<sup>M</sup>** is created by approximating the parameter space,  $\Theta$ , with a numerical integration scheme which is defined in terms of a finite set of  $M$  nodes  $\{\theta_i^M\}_{i=1}^M$  and an associated set of  $M$  weights  $\{\alpha_i^M\}_{i=1}^M \subset \mathbb{R}$ . Throughout the paper,  $M$  is used to denote the number of nodes used in this approximation of parameter space. The only requirement on the numerical integration scheme is that it satisfies the following assumptions:

**Assumption 3.1:** *For each  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ , the integration scheme is defined by a set of nodes  $\{\theta_i^M\}_{i=1}^M \subset \Theta$  and an associated set of weights  $\{\alpha_i^M\}_{i=1}^M \subset \mathbb{R}$  such that for any continuous function  $f : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$\int_{\Theta} f(\theta) d\theta = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^M f(\theta_i^M) \alpha_i^M.$$

**Remark 3.1:** For a series of functions  $\{f_M\}$ , note that if  $f_M : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous for all  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\{f_M\}$  converges uniformly to  $f$  on  $\Theta$  with respect to the Euclidean norm, then the following also holds as a result of Assumption 3.1:

$$\int_{\Theta} f(\theta) d\theta = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^M f_M(\theta_i^M) \alpha_i^M.$$

This property is used later.

**Remark 3.2:** For a given function  $h : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $h \in C^1$  and given integration scheme satisfying Assumption 3.1, there exists a constant  $K \in \mathbb{R}$  and function  $\epsilon(M) : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon(M) = 0$  and the numerical integration error is bounded by:

$$\left| \int_{\Theta} f(\theta) d\theta - \sum_{i=1}^M f(\theta_i^M) \alpha_i^M \right| \leq K \epsilon(M). \quad (10)$$

We note that  $\Theta$  has been defined as a compact domain. Many numerical integration methods satisfy the convergence requirement of Assumption 3.1 on compact domain, for instance Gaussian quadrature, composite-Simpson, and Clenshaw–Curtis. Remark 3.2 will be used to quantify slack bounds for the integral constraints of Problem **P** given by Equations (7) and (8), whose integrated functions  $h_I$  and  $e_I$  have been defined as satisfying the  $C^1$  requirement of Remark 3.2. Although numerical integration errors are often given in terms of higher-order derivatives, bounds satisfying Remark 3.2 can be provided given the compact domain and subsequently bounded first derivative of the function. In Trefethen (2008), for instance, such bounds are given for Gaussian quadrature and Clenshaw–Curtis in terms of the bounded first derivative of the function. Davis and Rabinowitz (2007) provides such bounds for quadrature schemes which are exact for polynomials of some degree. Alternate discretisation methods with lower-dimensional growth rates or the computation of problems with high parameter space dimension, in which the full tensor product required by multi-dimensional collocation may be intractable, may also be chosen, for instance, Smolyak sparse grid methods satisfy both assumptions (Gerstner & Griebel, 1998).

For a given set of nodes  $\{\theta_i^M\}_{i=1}^M$  and quadrature weights  $\{\alpha_i^M\}_{i=1}^M \subset \mathbb{R}$ , the approximate problem is defined as follows:

**Problem  $\mathbf{P}^M$ .** Determine the control function  $u$  that minimises

$$J^M[X^M, u] = \sum_{i=1}^M \left[ F(x_i^M(T), \theta_i^M) + \int_0^T r(x_i^M(t), u(t), t, \theta_i^M) dt \right] \alpha_i^M \quad (11)$$

subject to:

$$\frac{dx_i^M}{dt}(t) = f(x_i^M(t), u(t), \theta_i^M), \quad t \in [0, T], \quad i = 1, \dots, M, \quad (12)$$

$$x_i^M(0) = x_0(\theta_i^M), \quad i = 1, \dots, M, \quad (13)$$

$$g(u(t)) \leq 0, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (14)$$

$$e(x_i^M(T), \theta_i^M) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, M, \quad (15)$$

$$h(x_i^M(t), \theta_i^M) \leq 0, \quad t \in [0, T], i = 1, \dots, M, \quad (16)$$

$$\Psi_e \left( \sum_{i=1}^M e_I(x_i^M(T), \theta_i^M) \alpha_i^M \right) \leq K_e \epsilon_e(M), \quad (17)$$

$$\Psi_h \left( \sum_{i=1}^M h_I(x_i^M(t), \theta_i^M) \alpha_i^M \right) \leq K_h \epsilon_h(M), \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (18)$$

This approximate problem is a result of the enforcement of the state dynamics and conditions (3)–(8) at the collocation nodes  $\{\theta_i^M\}_{i=1}^M$  and the enforcement at these nodes of an approximation of the integral constraints (7) and (8) through quadrature. Due to the discretisation of parameter space, the state space for Problem  $\mathbf{P}^M$  is of a different dimension than that of Problem **P**. The state variables  $x_i^M$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, M$  specified by the ODEs in (12) are functions of time rather than time and parameter space, and the dimension of the entire state space,  $X^M(t) = [x_1^M(t), \dots, x_M^M(t)]$ , has dimension  $n_x \times M$ , where  $n_x$  is the dimension of the original state space. The dimension of the control space, however, remains the same.

We take a moment to discuss the slack constraints of Equations (17) and (18) versus the exact constraints which precede them. In contrast to direct discretisation methods in the time domain which must introduce slack constraints into all state constraints, such as the pseudospectral method for standard control, Problem  $\mathbf{P}^M$  is only approximating the additional parameter space. Constraints which are defined pointwise with respect to this parameter space, such as the dynamics, can be enforced exactly. This does not mean that the original problem, Problem **P**, is necessarily feasible without its own slack constraints. Recall that Equation (9) in Section 1 for instance, provides an example of an end time constraint which is only provably feasible within an  $\epsilon$ -ball. This ‘slack’ constraint of the original problem is first defined in terms of its own  $\epsilon$ -slacks, which are in turn enforced strictly via Equation (15). Equations (17) and (18) in contrast are made approximate from the approximation of integration. The constants  $K_e$  and  $K_h$  come from Remark 3.2 combined with the Lipschitz constants of  $\Psi_e$  and  $\Psi_h$  respectively. For Equation (18), the constant from Remark 3.2 must be determined using the max over the time interval  $[0, T]$ .

The resulting Problem  $\mathbf{P}^M$  is a standard optimal control problem, no longer distinguished by an additional parameter domain, for which there are many available methods of solution. The following theorem establishes the property of consistency for solutions of Problem  $\mathbf{P}^M$  in regards to Problem **P**. Consistency is not a proof of the feasibility of the original Problem **P** – that is a design task. Rather, this proof addresses the reliability of the numerical solutions for a feasible problem. The proof thus assumes Problem **P** is feasible. From that it follows that Problem  $\mathbf{P}^M$  is feasible, since any discretisation of Problem **P** at the nodes will generate a feasible solution to Problem  $\mathbf{P}^M$ . The question the proof then addresses, consistency, is the property that if optimal controls to Problem  $\mathbf{P}^M$  converge as the number of nodes  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , they converge to feasible, optimal controls of Problem **P**. Convergence is referred to in the following sense:

**Definition 3.2 (Uniform accumulation point):** A function  $f$  is called a uniform accumulation point of the sequence of functions  $\{f_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  if  $\exists$  a subsequence of  $\{f_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  that uniformly converges to  $f$ . Similarly, a vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^M$  is called a uniform accumulation point of the sequence of vectors  $\{v_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  if  $\exists$  a subsequence of  $\{v_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  that converges to  $v$ .

Note that Definition 3.2 applies to limits of subsequences, not the limits of the sequence in entirety. To express this, we adopt the following notation. Let  $V$  be an infinite subset of the index set  $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ . If for a sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ , the subsequence  $\{x_n | n \in V\}$  has a limit point  $x$ , we will refer to this with the notation  $\lim_{n \in V} x_n = x$ . For uniform accumulation points of the controls of Problem  $\mathbf{P}^M$  as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , the following holds:

**Theorem 3.3 (Control Consistency):** Let  $\{u^{M*}\}_{M \in V}$  be a sequence of optimal controls for Problem  $\mathbf{P}^M$  with an accumulation point  $u^\infty$ . Given Assumptions 2.2–2.4, then  $u^\infty$  is an optimal control for Problem  $\mathbf{P}$ .

### 3.1 Theorem 3.3 proof

In the following proof, and all subsequent proofs in this paper,  $\|\cdot\|$  refers to the Euclidean norm. Let  $\{u^{M*}\}_{M \in V}$  be a set of optimal controls for the Problem  $P^M$  such that  $\lim_{M \in V} \{u^{M*}\} = u^\infty$ . Let  $x^\infty(t, \theta)$  be the solution to the dynamical system:

$$\frac{\partial x^\infty}{\partial t}(t, \theta) = f(x^\infty(t, \theta), u^\infty(t, \theta)), \quad x^\infty(0, \theta) = x_0(\theta) \quad (19)$$

and let  $\{x^{M*}(t, \theta)\}$  be the sequence of solutions to the dynamical systems:

$$\frac{\partial x^{M*}}{\partial t}(t, \theta) = f(x^{M*}(t, \theta), u^{M*}(t, \theta)), \quad x^{M*}(0, \theta) = x_0(\theta) \quad (20)$$

for  $M \in V$ . We note, first of all, that since Problem  $P$  and Problem  $P^M$  share the same feasible control set  $U$ , the solutions to Equations (19) and (20) exist, due to Assumption 2.4. We note, second of all, that these solutions are *not* necessarily feasible solutions to Problem  $P$ , as they may violate the state constraints. We will revisit this issue after the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4:** The sequence  $\{x^{M*}(t, \theta)\}$  converges pointwise to  $x^\infty(t, \theta)$  and this convergence is uniform in  $\theta$ .

**Proof:** From their definitions, we have:

$$\|x^{M*}(t, \theta) - x^\infty(t, \theta)\| \leq \int_0^t \|f(x^{M*}(\tau, \theta), u^{M*}(\tau, \theta)) - f(x^\infty(\tau, \theta), u^\infty(\tau, \theta))\| d\tau$$

Since  $f$  is  $C^1$  on a compact domain by Assumptions 2.3, 2.4, and 2.1, the Lipschitz condition applies, yielding:

$$\|x^{M*}(t, \theta) - x^\infty(t, \theta)\| \leq \int_0^t c \left( \|x^{M*}(\tau, \theta) - x^\infty(\tau, \theta)\| + \|u^{M*}(\tau) - u^\infty(\tau)\| \right) d\tau$$

for Lipschitz constant  $c$ . Since  $u^{M*}$  and  $u^\infty$  are in the compact

set  $U$ , they are bounded. Thus, the Dominated Convergence Theorem applies and we have:

$$\lim_{M \in V} \int_0^t \|u^{M*}(\tau) - u^\infty(\tau)\| d\tau = 0.$$

For any  $t$  and  $\delta_u$  we can therefore pick an  $N$  such that for all  $M > N, M \in V$ :

$$\int_0^t \|u^{M*}(\tau) - u^\infty(\tau)\| d\tau < \delta_u.$$

This provides us with the inequality

$$\|x^{M*}(t, \theta) - x^\infty(t, \theta)\| \leq cT\delta_u + c \int_0^t \|x^{M*}(\tau, \theta) - x^\infty(\tau, \theta)\| d\tau.$$

By Gronwall's Inequality,  $\|x^{M*}(t, \theta) - x^\infty(t, \theta)\| \leq cT\delta_u e^{cT}$ . Since for each value of  $t$  and  $\theta$ , this quantity can be made arbitrarily small,  $\{x^{M*}(t, \theta)\}$  converges pointwise to  $x^\infty(t, \theta)$ . Furthermore, since  $\delta_u$ , though it may depend on  $t$ , does not depend on the value of  $\theta$ , this convergence is uniform in  $\theta$ . ■

We now revisit feasibility. State feasibility in this context is defined as a state generated through the state dynamics by an admissible control which satisfies all boundary conditions and state constraints.

**Lemma 3.5:** State  $x^\infty(t, \theta)$  is a feasible state for Problem  $P$ .

**Proof:** By definition,  $x^\infty(t, \theta)$  satisfies Problem  $P$ 's conditions (2) and (3). It furthermore satisfies control constraints (4), as since  $U$  is compact, the set of feasible controls is trivially closed in the topology of pointwise convergence. We thus consider the satisfaction of conditions (5), (6), (7), and (8).

Condition (5): When  $\theta = \theta_i^M$ , then  $x^{M*}(t, \theta_i^M) = x_i^{M*}(t)$ , where  $x_i^{M*}$  is the optimal state for Problem  $P^M$  generated by the optimal control  $u^{M*}(t)$ . Thus from constraint (15)  $x^{M*}(t, \theta)$  satisfies constraint (5) at the collocated constraints:

$$e(x^{M*}(T, \theta_i^M), \theta_i^M) \leq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, M.$$

For an arbitrary  $\theta \in \Theta$  and an arbitrary node  $\theta_i^M$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e(x^\infty(T, \theta), \theta) - e(x^{M*}(T, \theta_i^M), \theta_i^M)\| \\ &= \|e(x^\infty(T, \theta), \theta) - e(x^{M*}(T, \theta), \theta) \\ &\quad + e(x^{M*}(T, \theta), \theta) - e(x^{M*}(T, \theta_i^M), \theta_i^M)\| \\ &\leq \|e(x^\infty(T, \theta), \theta) - e(x^{M*}(T, \theta), \theta)\| \\ &\quad + \|e(x^{M*}(T, \theta), \theta) - e(x^{M*}(T, \theta_i^M), \theta_i^M)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Due to Assumptions 2.1 and 2.4,  $e$  satisfies Lipschitz conditions with respect to each argument. Thus:

$$\|e(x^\infty(T, \theta), \theta) - e(x^{M*}(T, \theta), \theta)\| \leq c_x \|x^\infty(T, \theta) - x^{M*}(T, \theta)\|$$

for Lipschitz constant  $c_x$  with respect to the first argument of  $e$ . By the results of Lemma 3.4, for any  $\epsilon_x$  there exists an  $M'$

such that  $\forall M > M'$  this quantity is less than  $\epsilon_x$  and this  $M'$  is independent of  $\theta$ . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e(x^{M^*}(T, \theta), \theta) - e(x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M), \theta_i^M)\| \\ & \leq c_x \|x^{M^*}(T, \theta) - x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M)\| + c_\theta \|\theta - \theta_i^M\| \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_\theta$  is the Lipschitz constant with respect to the second argument of  $e$ . Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|x^{M^*}(T, \theta) - x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M)\| \\ & \leq \int_0^T \|f(x^{M^*}(\tau, \theta), u^{M^*}(\tau, \theta)) \\ & \quad - f(x^{M^*}(\tau, \theta_i^M), u^{M^*}(\tau, \theta_i^M))\| d\tau \\ & \leq \int_0^T c (\|x^{M^*}(\tau, \theta) - x^{M^*}(\tau, \theta_i^M)\| + \|\theta - \theta_i^M\|) d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

We choose now  $\theta_i^M$  for each  $M > M'$  to be a node within  $\epsilon_\theta$  of  $\theta$ . As was done in Lemma 3.4, we can apply the Dominated Convergence Theorem to the integral of the second quantity, yielding:

$$\begin{aligned} & \|x^{M^*}(T, \theta) - x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M)\| \\ & \leq c \int_0^T \|x^{M^*}(\tau, \theta) - x^{M^*}(\tau, \theta_i^M)\| d\tau + cT\epsilon_\theta. \end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's Inequality,  $\|x^{M^*}(T, \theta) - x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M)\| \leq cT\epsilon_\theta e^{cT}$ , which through choosing  $\epsilon_\theta$  can be made smaller than any  $\bar{\epsilon}_\theta$ . Together these inequalities yield that for arbitrary  $\epsilon_x$  and  $\bar{\epsilon}_\theta$ , there exists an  $M'$ , independent of  $\theta$  such that for all  $M > M'$  there exists a node  $\theta_i^M$  within  $\epsilon_\theta$  of  $\theta$  and:

$$\|e(x^\infty(T, \theta), \theta) - e(x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M), \theta_i^M)\| \leq \epsilon_x + \bar{\epsilon}_\theta.$$

If we assume by contradiction that  $e(x^\infty(T, \theta), \theta) > 0$  for some  $\theta$  then since  $e(x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M), \theta_i^M) \leq 0$ , the difference in quantities is some constant number greater than zero. Choice of  $\epsilon_x + \bar{\epsilon}_\theta$  less than this number creates a contradiction.

Condition (6) follows from similar arguments.

Condition (7): The satisfaction of the integral constraints will be shown through similar arguments as above with the addition of the convergence property of Remark 3.1. By the uniform convergence of  $\{x^{M^*}(t, \theta)\}$  to  $x^\infty(t, \theta)$  with regard to  $\theta$  given by Lemma 3.4, and by the Lipschitz condition on  $e_I$  provided by Assumptions 2.1 and 2.4, it can be seen that the sequence of functions  $\{e_I(x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M), \theta_i^M)\}$  converges to  $e_I(x^\infty(T, \theta), \theta)$  and that this convergence is uniform in  $\theta$ . By Remark 3.1 then:

$$\lim_{M \in V} \sum_{i=1}^M e_I(x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M), \theta_i^M) \alpha_i^M = \int_{\Theta} e_I(x^\infty(T, \theta), \theta) d\theta$$

and by the continuity of  $\Psi_e$  from Assumption 2.1 we have

$$\Psi_e \left( \lim_{M \in V} \sum_{i=1}^M e_I(x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M), \theta_i^M) \alpha_i^M \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \lim_{M \in V} \Psi_e \left( \sum_{i=1}^M e_I(x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M), \theta_i^M) \alpha_i^M \right) \\ & = \Psi_e \left( \int_{\Theta} e_I(x^\infty(T, \theta), \theta) d\theta \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since the collocated constraints are satisfied:

$$\Psi_e \left( \sum_{i=1}^M e_I(x_i^M(T), \theta_i^M) \alpha_i^M \right) \leq K_e \epsilon_e(M), \quad i = 1, \dots, M$$

with  $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_e(M) = 0$ , and since Assumptions 2.1 and 2.4 also provide a Lipschitz condition for  $\Psi_e$ , the arguments of the proof of Condition (5) follow from this point on. One finds that this contradicts the possibility that  $\Psi_e(\int_{\Theta} e_I(x^\infty(T, \theta), \theta) d\theta) > 0$  thus proving satisfaction of the constraint.

Condition (8) follows from similar arguments.  $\blacksquare$

Using Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5, we now establish Theorem 3.3. By Lemma 3.5, the pair  $(x^\infty, u^\infty)$  is feasible for Problem  $P$ . The limit of the difference in cost values satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{M \in V} \|J^M[X^{M^*}, u^{M^*}] - J[x^\infty, u^\infty]\| \\ & = \lim_{M \in V} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^M \left[ F(x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M)) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \int_0^T r(x^{M^*}(t, \theta_i^M), u^{M^*}(t, t, \theta_i^M)) dt \right] \alpha_i^M \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \int_{\Theta} \left[ F(x^\infty(T, \theta)) + \int_0^T r(x^\infty(t, \theta), u^\infty(t, t, \theta)) dt \right] d\theta \right\| \\ & \leq \lim_{M \in V} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^M F(x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M)) \alpha_i^M - \int_{\Theta} F(x^\infty(T, \theta)) d\theta \right\| \\ & \quad + \lim_{M \in V} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^M \int_0^T r(x^{M^*}(t, \theta_i^M), u^{M^*}(t, t, \theta_i^M)) dt \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \int_{\Theta} \int_0^T r(x^\infty(t, \theta), u^\infty(t, t, \theta)) dt d\theta \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

We examine the quantity:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{M \in V} \left\| \int_0^T r(x^{M^*}(t, \theta), u^{M^*}(t, t, \theta)) dt \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \int_0^T r(x^\infty(t, \theta), u^\infty(t, t, \theta)) dt \right\| \\ & \leq \lim_{M \in V} \int_0^T \|r(x^{M^*}(t, \theta), u^{M^*}(t, t, \theta)) \\ & \quad - r(x^\infty(t, \theta), u^\infty(t, t, \theta))\| dt. \end{aligned}$$

From the continuity of  $r$  on a compact domain, we apply the Lipschitz condition to get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \|r(x^{M^*}(t, \theta), u^{M^*}(t, t, \theta)) - r(x^\infty(t, \theta), u^\infty(t, t, \theta))\| dt \\ & \leq \int_0^T c (\|x^{M^*}(t, \theta) - x^\infty(t, \theta)\| + \|u^{M^*}(t) - u^\infty(t)\|) dt. \end{aligned}$$

The results of Lemma 3.4, the compactness of  $X$  and  $U$ , and the assumption that  $u^\infty$  is an accumulation point of  $\{u^{M^*}\}_{M \in V}$ , enable us to apply the Dominated Convergence Theorem. Thus:

$$\lim_{M \in V} \int_0^T c(\|x^{M^*}(t, \theta) - x^\infty(t, \theta)\| + \|u^{M^*}(t) - u^\infty(t)\|) dt = 0$$

and this convergence must be uniform in  $\theta$  due to the uniform convergence of  $x^{M^*}(t, \theta)$ . We can therefore conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{M \in V} \int_0^T r(x^{M^*}(t, \theta), u^{M^*}(t), t, \theta) dt \\ &= \int_0^T r(x^\infty(t, \theta), u^\infty(t), t, \theta) dt \end{aligned}$$

and that the convergence is uniform. This enables the use of Remark 3.1, which provides:

$$\left\| \lim_{M \in V} \sum_{i=1}^M \int_0^T r(x^{M^*}(t, \theta_i^M), u^{M^*}(t), t, \theta_i^M) dt - \int_{\Theta} \int_0^T r(x^\infty(t, \theta), u^\infty(t), t, \theta) dt d\theta \right\| = 0.$$

Similar arguments show:

$$\left\| \lim_{M \in V} \sum_{i=1}^M F(x^{M^*}(T, \theta_i^M)) \alpha_i^M - \int_{\Theta} F(x^\infty(T, \theta)) d\theta \right\| = 0.$$

Thus  $\lim_{M \in V} J^M[X^{M^*}, u^{M^*}] = J[x^\infty, u^\infty]$ .

Assume that  $u^\infty$  is not an optimal control for Problem  $P$ . Then there exists some admissible control  $u$  such  $J[x, u] < J[x^\infty, u^\infty]$ , where  $x$  is a feasible state for Problem  $P$  defined by:

$$\frac{\partial x}{\partial t}(t, \theta) = f(x(t, \theta), u(t), \theta), \quad x(0, \theta) = x_0(\theta).$$

As can be seen by the definition of Problem  $P^M$ , the set of states given by  $X^M = \{x(t, \theta_i^M)\}_{i=1}^M$  is a feasible solution to Problem  $P^M$  (note that this assertion requires the slackness in constraints (17) and (18)). Furthermore,  $\lim_{M \in V} J^M[X^M, u] = J[x, u]$  through identical arguments as the convergence of the optimal cost. The optimality of  $X^{M^*}$  for Problem  $P^M$  creates the following inequalities:

$$J[x^\infty, u^\infty] = \lim_{M \in V} J^M[X^{M^*}, u^{M^*}] < \lim_{M \in V} J^M[X^M, u],$$

$$\lim_{M \in V} J^M[X^M, u] = J[x, u] < J[x^\infty, u^\infty]$$

which are in contradiction. Thus,  $u^\infty$  must in fact be an optimal solution to Problem  $P$ .

#### 4. Example: optimal search

Here, we present an example application of optimal motion planning with parameter dependency: the task of path planning for sonar search over an area. The search problem can be considered an example of a coverage path planning problem.

This challenge of covering a region can be generically defined as the task of producing a path for a vehicle which reaches all regions of interest while avoiding obstacles. The problem has been studied in robotics and reviews of approaches can be found in Choset (2001) and Galceran and Carreras (2013). Applications of covering algorithms include vacuuming, snow cleanup, lawn mowing, window cleaning, painting, and topographical mapping. Commercial products, such as the Roomba, incorporate a mix of local and global planning in their design to attain satisfactory confidence in their performance (Hess, Beinhofer, & Burgard, 2014). However, though global coverage plans have been developed which provide assurances of eventual complete or near-complete coverage, the question of optimality in performance is still largely unaddressed. One reason for this is that performance is ultimately not a feature solely of the geometry of the coverage path, the production of which has been the main focus of research (Choset, 2001; Galceran & Carreras, 2013). Rather, performance is additionally dependent on specific equipment capabilities as well as dynamic features, such as the duration of coverage and the impact of kinematics on equipment. Spatial approaches to coverage path planning which minimise path overlap for example, such as Galceran and Carreras (2012), will not necessarily produce maximal performance if a slow-acting device has not allotted enough time to a region.

In this example, we model the SeaFox (MarineLink, 2004) unmanned surface vehicle (USV), pictured in Figure 1 searching for a target on a 100 m<sup>2</sup> surface region. Parameters  $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  parameterise the two-dimensional surface region where the goal target could be located beneath, with uniform probability density function given by  $\phi(\theta)$ . The dynamics of the vehicle are represented by the horizontal location  $(x_1, x_2)$ , heading angle  $\psi$ , and velocity  $v$ , and given by:

$$\frac{dx}{dt}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_1(t) \\ \dot{x}_2(t) \\ \dot{\psi}(t) \\ \dot{v}(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} v \sin \psi(t) \\ v \cos \psi(t) \\ u_1(t) \\ u_2(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad x(0) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1.57 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The functions  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are the control inputs guiding the vehicle's motion. They are limited by constraints of the form:

$$|u_1(t)| \leq K_1, \quad |u_2(t)| \leq K_2.$$

Velocity is also constrained:

$$0 \leq v \leq K_v.$$

Coefficient values are provided in Table 2.

A range-limited sonar is modelled by an indicator function,  $I(x, \theta)$  which returns 1 if the point  $\theta$  is within range of location  $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$  and 0 if it does not. To comply with the regularity assumptions of the numerical algorithm, we further approximate this indicator function by a continuously differentiable approximation of the indicator function,  $I_{\text{smooth}}(x, \theta)$ , which we define as:

$$I_{\text{smooth}}(x, \theta) = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \operatorname{erf} \left( \frac{c_1 - c_2 x}{\sigma} \right) \right),$$

where

$$\operatorname{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-t^2} dt.$$




**Figure 1.** The Naval Postgraduate School's SeaFox USV.

**Table 2.** Scenario values for paths 1–3.

Aperture coefficients	$c_1$	20
	$c_2$	.15
	$\sigma$	10
Max detection rate	$r_0$	.5
Control constraints	$K_1$	.125
	$K_2$	1
Velocity constraint	$K_v$	12.5 m/s
Search region	$\Theta$	$[0, 100] \times [0, 100] \text{ m}^2$
Initial probability	$\phi(\theta)$	$\phi(\theta) = 1$
Final time	$T$	360 s
Switchback interval	$2\rho$	$2 \times 12.5$
Path 1 velocity	$v$	1.57 m/s

Coefficient values are given in Table 2. Figures 2 and 3 illustrate the smoothed indicator concept and its implementation with the values in Table 2. For an object within the vehicle's range, we assume that the vehicle acts on it with a constant probabilistic detection rate,  $r_0$ . The probability that the vehicle detects the object in time interval  $[t, t + \Delta t]$  is approximated by



**Figure 3.**  $I_{\text{smooth}}$  for the values in Table 2.

$r_0 I_{\text{smooth}}(x, \theta) \Delta t$ . The probability of *not* detecting the target at location  $\theta$  by time  $t$ , given by  $P_{\text{ND}}(t, \theta)$ , is thus given by:

$$P_{\text{ND}}(t + \Delta t, \theta) = P_{\text{ND}}(t, \theta)[1 - r_0 I_{\text{smooth}}(x, \theta) \Delta t]$$

which as  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$  creates the dynamics:

$$\frac{\partial P_{\text{ND}}}{\partial t}(t, \theta) = -r_0 I_{\text{smooth}}(x, \theta) P_{\text{ND}}(t, \theta), \quad P_{\text{ND}}(0, \theta) = \phi(\theta).$$

This is the exponential detection model, derived in Koopman (1956).


In the scenarios that follow, the initial probability at each location has been set to  $\phi(\theta) = 1$ . Together,  $x$  and  $P_{\text{ND}}$  create the state space of our control problem, referred to with the augmented state variable  $z$ :

$$z(t, \theta) = \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ P_{\text{ND}}(t, \theta) \end{bmatrix}.$$

We consider three path plans and contrast their performance. Performance is gauged by the expected final probability of missing the target after searching:

$$J = \frac{\int_{\Theta} P_{\text{ND}}(T, \theta) d\theta}{\int_{\Theta} d\theta}. \quad (21)$$

Path 1, a baseline, is a heuristic solution generated by following a lawnmower pattern at constant velocity. The vehicle



**Figure 2.** Smoothed sensor range indicator function.




Figure 4. Path 1 at final time  $T$ .




Figure 5. Path 2 at final time  $T$ .

region is over  $\Theta = [0, 100] \times [0, 100] \text{ m}^2$ . The width between paths has been chosen as  $2\rho$  where  $\rho$  is an estimate of the effective radius of the aperture, based on  $I_{\text{smooth}}$  and allowing for a small amount of overlap; its value is set as  $\rho = 12.5$ . The time interval has been chosen to allow for this lawnmower path to finish:  $T = 360$ . Control constraints on  $u_1(t)$  enforce a maximum turning rate,  $\dot{\psi}_{\text{max}}$ , for executing the lawnmower path's switchbacks, and the velocity of the vehicle is determined by  $\rho$  and this turning rate using the equation  $\rho\dot{\psi}_{\text{max}} = v = 1.57$ . Figure 4 shows the performance of the lawnmower pattern, Path 1. Path 1's average probability of failure,  $J_1$ , is 0.2982. The lowest failure probability  $P_{\text{ND}}(T, \theta)$  at point  $\theta$  it attains is 0.1195 and the highest is 1 (i.e. there are spots it completely misses, where if the target is located there, probability of failure to detect is 1).

Path 2 is generated by solving the optimal control problem to minimise the failure probability in Equation (21). This solution has been generated by discretising  $\Theta$  with  $25 \times 25$  nodes and time with 150 nodes, both domains using LGL pseudospectral nodes. We note that the choice of solution method used in the time domain is independent of the method chosen for the parameter domain. In this example, we have chosen to use matching methods. However, any method appropriate to the approximate problem established in Section 3, Problem  $\mathbf{P}^{\text{M}}$ , can be applied to the time domain. Discretised state and control constraints (14)–(18) may create an approximate problem which, due to the constraints, may benefit from a method from a time domain method which caters more specifically to constrained optimal control problems, such as the local pseudospectral method (Darby, Garg, & Rao, 2011), or the symplectic pseudospectral method (Wang, Peng, Zhang, Chen, & Zhong, 2017). This can be ascertained from the structure of Problem  $\mathbf{P}$ . In this example, which has smooth state and control solutions, we find the global pseudospectral method utilised to be sufficient.

Figure 5 shows the performance of Path 2. Path 2's average failure probability,  $J_2$ , is 0.1795, the lowest failure probability at point  $\theta$  it attains is 0.0710 and the highest is 0.9694. As one would





Figure 6. Path 3 at final time  $T$ .

Table 3. Performance values.

	Avg final $P_{\text{ND}}$	Low $P_{\text{ND}}$	High $P_{\text{ND}}$	Computation time
Path 1 (heuristic)	0.2982	0.1195	1	n/a
Path 2 (optimal avg)	0.1795	0.0710	0.9694	12.61 min
Path 3 (constrained worst case)	0.2305	0.0638	0.6917	26.67 min

expect, the optimal solution performs much better than Path 1, providing around a 40% reduction in expected failure. However, depending on one's standards, Path 2 may still not be ideal. It is notable that the highest failure probability, 0.9694, reveals spots which have been mostly skipped in order to create the best average. An alternate goal for a vehicle's searching path could be to a thoroughly search the region to within a certain risk threshold.



**Figure 7.** Convergence of maximum constraint violation as discretisation increases.

Path 3 has been generated by minimising the expected failure given by Equation (21) subject to the risk constraint:

$$P_{ND}(T, \theta) \leq \gamma, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta \quad (22)$$

with  $\gamma = 0.5$ . This problem sets a floor for the vehicle's performance. As with Path 2, Path 3 is generated by discretising  $\Theta$  with  $25 \times 25$  nodes and time with 150 nodes, both domains using LGL pseudospectral nodes. Figure 6 shows the performance of Path 3. Path 3's average final performance,  $J_3$ , is worse than Path 2's, at 0.2305. However, its maximum non-detection probabilities,  $\gamma$ , is much improved at 0.6917.

Table 3 provides a summary of the performance of all three paths. Each path's control solution is assessed in performance by propagation through a refined  $300 \times 300$  LGL pseudospectral quadrature grid of  $\Theta$  to estimate its performance in the non-approximated problem. We note that Path 3, calculated from a  $25 \times 25$  discretisation of  $\Theta$ , does not yet strictly satisfy the


constraint inequality  $P_{ND}(T, \theta) \leq 0.5$  at all  $\theta \in \Theta$  when the control solution is propagated through the refined  $300 \times 300$  grid. The strict satisfaction of the constraint at the discretised nodes yields an asymptotic pointwise convergence. Figures 7 and 8 show the convergence of the constraint as discretisation increases.

## 5. Conclusions

The tools presented in this paper enable the computation of numerical solutions to a wide variety of optimal control problems with parameter dependency in the cost and/or dynamics. These problems include those with state constraints over the parameter domain, constraints over the distribution (such as constrained mean and other statistics), and also minimum time problems. The computational framework presented allows for the flexible choice of many numerical schemes such as pseudospectral methods or sparse grid methods, as well as the ability to use separate methods in the parameter domain versus the time domain, allowing for the application in the time domain of the plentiful available computational methods developed for standard optimal control problems.

These tools enable multiple new avenues for application. As Section 4 mentions, the optimal control framework presented in this paper is applicable to many types of area coverage problems. These problems are increasingly relevant for autonomous vehicles as these vehicles gain in durability and long-term deployability. Problems such as aerial and marine mapping, search, networked communication coverage, and efficient routing can all be approached as control problems with (spatial) parameter dependencies. The use of optimal control for these problems provides the opportunity to generate path plans optimised over specific vehicle and sensor dynamics. This has the potential to provide substantial performance improvements, especially when planning for multi-vehicle teams with heterogeneous dynamics.

The framework also provides a tool for many motion planning problems with uncertainty. The parameter domain can



**Figure 8.** Convergence of constraint satisfaction as discretisation increases.

be used to consider uncertain locations, as in the optimal search problem in Section 4. It can also be used to incorporate model uncertainty through estimated parameter ranges or as the coefficients of series expansion for function approximation. These provide approaches for optimising plans against dynamic targets with unknown dynamics models. Another interesting future direction of application may be in the estimation of the unknown parameters themselves. With sensor-based observations driving updated parameter estimates (for instance through Bayesian updates), path planning for the mobile sensor platforms to optimise observation trajectories for estimating the unknown parameters becomes an optimal control problem dependent on those parameters.

The wealth of potential applications provide many future directions for this problem, as well as many technical challenges. A challenge in the application will be the available methods for solving the resulting standard control problem, which may have to deal with a high number of states and state constraints. Due to the high number of state variables generated through parameter discretisation, efficiency is also key. However, as the example in this paper demonstrates, the implementation of this approach is already feasible. Future work includes building problem models for the applications described above and investigating efficient numerical methods for both parameter and time domain implementations.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Funding

This work was supported by Office of Naval Research [N001415WX01451, N001417WX01098, N001418WX01204].

## ORCID

Claire Walton  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7442-1885>

## References

- Becker, A. T. (2012). *Ensemble control of robotic systems* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Brockett, R., & Khaneja, N. (2000). On the stochastic control of quantum ensembles. In *System theory* (pp. 75–96). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Choset, H. (2001). Coverage for robotics – a survey of recent results. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 31, 113–126.
- Darby, C. L., Garg, D., & Rao, A. V. (2011). Costate estimation using multiple-interval pseudospectral methods. *Journal of Spacecraft and Rockets*, 48(5), 856–866.
- Darlington, J., Pantelides, C., Rustem, B., & Tanyi, B. (2000). Decreasing the sensitivity of open-loop optimal solutions in decision making under uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 121, 343–362.
- Davis, P. J., & Rabinowitz, P. (2007). *Methods of numerical integration*. Mineola, New York: Dover Publications.
- Fisher, J., & Bhattacharya, R. (2011). Optimal trajectory generation with probabilistic system uncertainty using polynomial chaos. *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control*, 133(1), 014501.
- Foraker, J. (2011). *Optimal search for moving targets in continuous time and space using consistent approximations* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Naval Postgraduate School.
- Galceran, E., & Carreras, M. (2013). A survey on coverage path planning for robotics. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 61(12), 1258–1276.
- Galceran, E., & Carreras, M. (2012). Coverage path planning for marine habitat mapping. In 2012 *Oceans, Hampton Roads, VA* (pp. 1–8).
- Gerstner, T., & Griebel, M. (1998). Numerical integration using sparse grids. *Numerical Algorithms*, 18(3–4), 209.
- Hess, J., Beinhofner, M., & Burgard, W. (2014). A probabilistic approach to high-confidence cleaning guarantees for low-cost cleaning robots. In 2014 *IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA), Hong Kong, China*, (pp. 5600–5605).
- Hover, F. S., & Triantafyllou, M. S. (2006). Application of polynomial chaos in stability and control. *Automatica*, 42, 789–795.
- Koopman, B. (1956). The theory of search II: Target detection. *Operations Research*, 4(5), 503–531.
- Li, J.-S., & Khaneja, N. (2006). Control of inhomogeneous quantum ensembles. *Physical Review A*, 73(3), 030302.
- Li, J.-S., & Khaneja, N. (2009). Ensemble control of Bloch equations. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(3), 528–536.
- Li, J.-S., & Khaneja, N. (2007). Ensemble control of linear systems. In *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE conference on decision and control*, New Orleans, LA, USA.
- MarineLink (2004, April). *Little usv, big applications*. Retrieved from <https://www.marinelink.com/news/applications-little-big323082>.
- Phelps, C., Gong, Q., Royset, J. O., Walton, C., & Kaminer, I. (2014). Consistent approximation of a nonlinear optimal control problem with uncertain parameters. *Automatica*, 50(12), 2987–2997.
- Phelps, C., Royset, J. O., & Gong, Q. (2016). Optimal control of uncertain systems using sample average approximations. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 54(1), 1–29.
- Pursiheimo, U. (1976). A control theory approach in the theory of search when the motion of the target is conditionally deterministic with stochastic parameters. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 2, 259–264.
- Ross, I. M., Karpenko, M., & Proulx, R. J. (2016). Path constraints in stochastic and unscented optimal control: Theory, application and experimental results. In 2016 *American control conference (ACC)*, Boston, MA (pp. 2918–2923).
- Ross, I. M., Proulx, R. J., Karpenko, M., & Gong, Q. (2015). Riemann-Stieltjes optimal control problems for uncertain dynamic systems. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, 38(7), 1251–1263.
- Ross, I. M., Proulx, R. J., & Karpenko, M. (2014a). Unscented optimal control for orbital and proximity operations in an uncertain environment: A new Zermelo problem. In *Proceedings of AIAA space and astronautics forum and exposition: AIAA/AAS astrodynamics specialist conference*. San Diego, CA.
- Ross, I. M., Proulx, R. J., & Karpenko, M. (2014b). Unscented optimal control for space flight. *Proceedings of the 24th international symposium on space flight dynamics*. Laurel, MD.
- Ruppen, D., Benthack, C., & Bonvin, D. (1995). Optimization of batch reactor operation under parametric uncertainty- computational aspects. *Journal of Process Control*, 5(4), 235–240.
- Ruths, J., & Li, J.-S. (2012). Optimal control of inhomogeneous ensembles. *Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57(8), 2021–2032.
- Terwiesch, P., Ravemark, D., Schenker, B., & Rippin, D. W. T. (1998). Semi-batch process optimisation under uncertainty: Theory and experiments. *Computers and Chemical Engineering*, 22(1), 201–213.
- Trefethen, L. N. (2008). Is Gauss quadrature better than Clenshaw-Curtis. *SIAM Review*, 50(1), 67–87.
- Walton, C., Phelps, C., Gong, Q., & Kaminer, I. (2016). A numerical algorithm for optimal control of systems with parameter uncertainty. *10th IFAC Symposium on Nonlinear Control Systems NOLCOS 2016*, IFAC-PapersOnLine, 49(18), 468–475.
- Wang, X., Peng, H., Zhang, S., Chen, B., & Zhong, W. (2017). A symplectic pseudospectral method for nonlinear optimal control problems with inequality constraints. *ISA Transactions*, 68, 335–352.