

Control Over Noisy Channels

Sekhar Tatikonda and Sanjoy Mitter

Abstract—Communication is an important component of distributed and networked controls systems. In our companion paper, we presented a framework for studying control problems with a digital noiseless communication channel connecting the sensor to the controller. Here, we generalize that framework by applying traditional information theoretic tools of source coding and channel coding to the problem. We present a general necessary condition for observability and stabilizability for a large class of communication channels. Then, we study sufficiency conditions for Internet-like channels that suffer erasures.

Index Terms—Communication, distributed systems, linear control, networked control.

I. INTRODUCTION

Communication is an important component of distributed and networked controls systems. A complete understanding of the interaction between control and communication will need to use tools from both control theory and information theory. In our companion paper, we presented a framework for studying control problems with a digital noiseless communication channel connecting the sensor to the controller [8]. Here, we generalize that framework by examining noisy communication channels. We apply the traditional information theoretic tools of source coding and channel coding to the controls problem. See [8] for a review of the relevant previous literature.

We study linear, discrete time, control problems with a noisy communication channel connecting the sensor to the controller. Here, we view the initial condition and the process disturbances as the source. The job of the encoder and decoder is to transmit information about this source across the noisy channel in a causal, recursive manner. We provide a general necessary condition on the channel capacity needed to achieve almost surely asymptotic observability and stability. We then show that this capacity condition is sufficient for erasure channels.

In Section II, we present our problem formulation and introduce the general channel model. In Section III, we present our necessary conditions. In Section IV, we present sufficient conditions for observability and stabilizability over Internet-like channels that suffer from erasures.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider the following linear time-invariant system:

$$X_0 \in \Lambda_0, \quad X_{t+1} = AX_t + BU_t, \quad Y_t = CX_t \quad \forall t \geq 0 \quad (1)$$

where $\{X_t\}$ is a \mathbb{R}^d -valued state process, $\{U_t\}$ is a \mathbb{R}^m -valued control process, and $\{Y_t\}$ is a \mathbb{R}^l -valued observation process. We have $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$, and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times d}$. The initial position, X_0 , is distributed according to the probability density $p(X_0)$ with support




Fig. 1. System with communication channel.

on the open set $\Lambda_0 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and finite differential entropy $h(X_0)$. See Fig. 1.

Channel: The channel input and output alphabets are denoted by \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} respectively. Let $V^t \doteq (V_0, \dots, V_t)$. The channel is modeled as a sequence of stochastic kernels $\{P(W_t|v^t, w^{t-1})\}$. Specifically for each realization of $(V^t, W^{t-1}) = (v^t, w^{t-1})$ the conditional probability of W_t given (v^t, w^{t-1}) is denoted by $P(W_t|v^t, w^{t-1})$. At time t the encoder produces a channel input symbol $V_t = v_t$ and the channel outputs the channel output symbol W_t according to the probability $P(W_t|v^t, w^{t-1})$. Some typical channels include:

Noiseless digital channel with rate R : The channel input and output alphabets are the same: $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W}$. The alphabet size is $|\mathcal{V}| = 2^R$ where R is called the *rate* of the channel. The channel is noiseless and memoryless: $p(w_t|V^t, W^{t-1}) = 1$ if $W_t = V_t$ and 0 if $W_t \neq V_t$. This is the channel we examined in our companion paper [8].

Delayed noiseless digital channel with delay Δ . This is a noiseless digital channel with delay Δ (Δ is a nonnegative integer): $p(W_t|V^t, W^{t-1}) = 1$ if $W_t = V_{t-\Delta}$ and 0 if $W_t \neq V_{t-\Delta}$.

Erasure channel with erasure probability α . the channel input alphabet has size $|\mathcal{V}| = 2^R$. the channel output alphabet is $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{V} \cup \{e\}$ where e stands for the erasure symbol. The channel is memoryless: $p(W_t|V^t, W^{t-1}) = 1 - \alpha$ if $W_t = V_t$, α if $W_t = e$, and 0 else with erasure probability $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. This channel is often used as a simple model of packet loss on internet-like channels.

Memoryless Gaussian channel with power ρ . The channel input and output alphabets are the real line: $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{W} = \mathbb{R}$. The channel is memoryless: $W_t = V_t + N_t$ where N_t is a Gaussian random variable with mean zero and variance 1. The input symbol V_t satisfies the power constraint: $E(v_t^2) \leq \rho$. This channel is often used as a simplified model of a wireless channel.

The control problems we look at involve the design of an encoder, decoder, and controller. Just as in [8], we specify the *information pattern* [9] of each component. The difference here is the addition of a more general channel. The encoder at time t is a map $\mathcal{E}_t : \mathbb{R}^{l(t+1)} \times \mathcal{V}^t \times \mathbb{R}^{m t} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ taking $(Y^t, V^{t-1}, U^{t-1}) \mapsto V_t$. The decoder at time t is a map $\mathcal{D}_t : \mathcal{W}^{t+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{m t} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ taking $(W^t, U^{t-1}) \mapsto \hat{X}_t$. The output of the decoder is an estimate of the state of the plant. $\mathcal{C}_t : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ taking $\hat{X}_t \mapsto U_t$. Note that we are assuming the controller takes as input only the decoder's state estimate. Hence, we are assuming a separation structure between the decoder and the controller.

III. NECESSARY CONDITIONS

Here, we examine observability and stabilizability over general communication channels. See the appendix for background material on information theory.

Definition 3.1: Let the error be $E_t = X_t - \hat{X}_t$ where \hat{X}_t is the state estimate. System (1) is *almost surely asymptotically observable* if there exists a control sequence $\{U_t\}$ and an encoder and decoder such that the state estimation error $\|E_t\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. System (1) is *almost surely asymptotically stabilizable* if there exists an encoder, decoder, and controller such that $\|\hat{X}_t\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ almost surely.

Manuscript received March 13, 2002; revised November 24, 2003 and March 2, 2004. Recommended by Associate Editor L. Pandolfi. This work was supported by the Army Research Office under MURI Grant: Data Fusion in Large Arrays of Microsensors DAAD19-00-1-0466, and by the Department of Defense under MURI Grant: Complex Adaptive Networks for Cooperative Control Subaward 03-132.

S. Tatikonda is with the Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520 USA (e-mail:sekhar.tatikonda@yale.edu).

S. Mitter is with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139 USA.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TAC.2004.831102

In [8], we provided necessary rate conditions for the noiseless digital channel under the stronger conditions of asymptotic observability and asymptotic stabilizability (as opposed to the almost sure version of the definition given previously). We repeat [8, Props. 3.1 and 3.2] here.

Proposition 3.1: A necessary condition on the rate for asymptotic observability is $R \geq \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, \log |\lambda(A)|\}$. A necessary condition on the rate for asymptotic stabilizability is $R \geq \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, \log |\lambda(A)|\}$.

Our goal is to determine properties of the channel that insure almost sure asymptotic observability and stabilizability for general channels. To that end, we need a measure of channel quality. Shannon's channel capacity turns out to be the correct measure.

Channel Capacity: Given a channel $\{P(W_t|v^t, w^{t-1})\}$, the *Shannon capacity* over a time horizon of length T is defined as the supremum of the mutual information over all channel input distributions $P(V^{T-1})$. Specifically

$$C_T^{\text{cap}} = \sup_{P(V^{T-1})} I(V^{T-1}; W^{T-1})$$

where $I(\cdot; \cdot)$ is the mutual information [2]. (See the appendix for a review of mutual information.) Here, time starts at zero, hence, $V^{T-1} = (V_0, \dots, V_{T-1})$. We list the channel capacity for the channels described previously: the noiseless digital channel with rate R has capacity $C_T^{\text{cap}} = TR$, the delayed noiseless digital channel with delay Δ has capacity $C_T^{\text{cap}} = (T - \Delta)R$, the erasure channel with erasure probability α has capacity $C_T^{\text{cap}} = (1 - \alpha)TR$, and the memoryless Gaussian channel with power ρ has capacity $C_T^{\text{cap}} = (T/2) \log(1 + \rho)$. Here, the supremization in the definition of Shannon capacity is over all $P(V^{T-1})$ such that $E(V_i^2) \leq \rho, \forall i$.

Rate-Distortion: As we have seen in [8], we need to be able to transmit information about the initial condition to the decoder and controller. One way to measure how much information is needed to reconstruct the initial condition to some distortion fidelity is given by the rate distortion function.

Let the source X have distribution $P(X)$. Let $d(x, \hat{x})$ be a distortion measure. Here a distortion measure is any nonnegative function that measures the relative fidelity in reconstructing x by \hat{x} . Given a source $P(X)$, the *rate distortion* function is defined as the infimum of the mutual information over all channels, $P(\hat{X}|x)$, that satisfy the distortion condition [2]

$$R(D) = \inf_{P(\hat{X}|x)} \left\{ I(X; \hat{X}) \text{ such that } E(d(X, \hat{X})) \leq D \right\}.$$

Note that the expectation is taken with respect to the joint measure $P(x, \hat{x}) = P(\hat{x}|x)P(x)$.

We will find the following parameterized family of distortion measures useful in determining conditions for almost sure observability and stabilizability:

$$d^\epsilon(x, \hat{x}) \doteq \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \|x - \hat{x}\|_2 \leq \epsilon \\ 1, & \text{if } \|x - \hat{x}\|_2 > \epsilon \end{cases} \text{ where } \epsilon > 0.$$

This choice of distortion measure will allow us to compute the probability that X and \hat{X} are farther than ϵ apart. Specifically $E(d^\epsilon(X, \hat{X})) = \Pr(\|X - \hat{X}\|_2 > \epsilon)$.

Data-Processing Inequality: The traditional information theoretic setup involves a source X that we wish to transmit over a channel $P(W|v)$ and produce a reconstruction \hat{X} satisfying some fidelity criterion. We have discussed both the rate distortion function and the Shannon capacity.

A necessary condition for reconstructing X up to some distortion D using the channel once is

$$R(D) \leq C_1^{\text{cap}}. \quad (2)$$

To prove (2), we will need the following data-processing inequality whose proof can be found in [2].

Lemma 3.1: Let $X \rightarrow V \rightarrow W \rightarrow \hat{X}$ be a Markov chain then $I(X; \hat{X}) \leq I(V; W)$.

We can generalize our encoder and decoder by modeling them as stochastic kernels. Deterministic encoders and decoders can be modeled as stochastic kernels that are Dirac measures. Then, for any encoder $P(V|x)$ and decoder $P(\hat{X}|w)$ such that the resulting joint distribution $P(X, V, W, \hat{X})$ satisfies the distortion bound $E(d(X, \hat{X})) \leq D$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} R(D) &= \inf_{\substack{P(\hat{X}|x) \\ E_{P(d(X, \hat{X}))} \leq D}} I(X; \hat{X}) \leq I(X; \hat{X}) \\ &\leq I(V; W) \leq \sup_{P(V)} I(V; W) = C_1^{\text{cap}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have shown (2). More generally we will want to reconstruct the source X by using the channel T times instead of just once. In this case $X \rightarrow (V_0, \dots, V_{T-1}) \rightarrow (W_0, \dots, W_{T-1}) \rightarrow \hat{X}$ forms a Markov chain. Thus, $I(X; \hat{X}) \leq I(V^{T-1}; W^{T-1})$ and a necessary condition for reconstruction is $R(D) \leq C_T^{\text{cap}}$.

The following technical lemma gives a lower bound on the rate distortion function for reconstructing $X_t = A^t X_0$ at time t under the distortion measure $d^\epsilon(x, \hat{x})$.

Lemma 3.2: Assume X_0 has density $p(X_0)$ with finite differential entropy $h(X_0)$. Let $R_t^\epsilon(D)$ represent the rate distortion function for the source $X_t = A^t X_0$ under the distortion measure $d^\epsilon(x, \hat{x})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} R_t^\epsilon(D) &\geq t(1 - D) \sum_{\lambda(A)} \log |\lambda(A)| \\ &\quad + \left((1 - D)h(X_0) - \log(K_d \epsilon^d) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where K_d is the constant in the formula for the volume of a d -dimensional sphere.

Proof: Let $\delta_t = d^\epsilon(X_t, \hat{X}_t)$. Let $P(X_t, \hat{X}_t)$ be any joint distribution such that the distortion constraint is met: $E(d^\epsilon(X_t, \hat{X}_t)) = \Pr(\|X_t - \hat{X}_t\|_2 > \epsilon) \leq D$. Hence, the $\Pr(\delta_t = 1) \leq D$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} I(X_t; \hat{X}_t) &= I(X_t; \delta_t, \hat{X}_t) - I(X_t; \delta_t | \hat{X}_t) \\ &= I(X_t; \delta_t, \hat{X}_t) - H(\delta_t | \hat{X}_t) + H(\delta_t | X_t, \hat{X}_t) \\ &\stackrel{\text{a)}}{=} I(X_t; \delta_t, \hat{X}_t) - H(\delta_t | \hat{X}_t) \\ &= h(X_t) - h(X_t | \delta_t, \hat{X}_t) - H(\delta_t | \hat{X}_t) \\ &= h(X_t) - h(X_t | \delta_t = 0, \hat{X}_t) \Pr(\delta_t = 0) \\ &\quad - h(X_t | \delta_t = 1, \hat{X}_t) \Pr(\delta_t = 1) - H(\delta_t | \hat{X}_t) \\ &\stackrel{\text{b)}}{\geq} h(X_t) - h(X_t - \hat{X}_t | \delta_t = 0, \hat{X}_t) \\ &\quad - h(X_t | \delta_t = 1, \hat{X}_t) D - \frac{1}{2} \\ &\stackrel{\text{c)}}{\geq} h(X_t) - h(X_t - \hat{X}_t | \delta_t = 0) - h(X_t) D - \frac{1}{2} \\ &\stackrel{\text{d)}}{\geq} h(X_t) - \log(K_d \epsilon^d) - h(X_t) D - \frac{1}{2} \\ &= h(A^t X_0) (1 - D) - \log(K_d \epsilon^d) - \frac{1}{2} \\ &\stackrel{\text{e)}}{=} (1 - D)(t \log |A| + h(X_0)) - \log(K_d \epsilon^d) - \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

where a) follows because δ_t is a deterministic function of X_t and \hat{X}_t . Point b) follows because δ_t is a binary valued random variable whose

discrete entropy cannot be larger than $1/2$. Point c) follows because conditioning reduces entropy. Point d) follows because $\|X_t - \hat{X}_t\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ and the uniform distribution maximizes the continuous entropy over all random variables with bounded support. Point e) follows because $h(A^t X_0) = t \log |A| + h(X_0)$. (See the Appendix).

The lower bound is independent of $P(\hat{X}_t|x_t)$. Hence, $R_t^c(D) = \inf_{P(\hat{X}_t|x_t)} I(X_t; \hat{X}_t) \geq t(1 - D) \sum_{\lambda(A)} \log |\lambda(A)| + (1 - D)h(X_0) - \log(K_d \epsilon^d) - 1/2$. \square

For any given channel define $C^{\text{cap}} \doteq \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} 1/T C_T^{\text{cap}}$. We now present our necessary conditions for almost sure observability and stabilizability for general channels.

Proposition 3.2: For (1) a necessary condition on the channel capacity for almost sure asymptotic observability is $C^{\text{cap}} \geq \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, \log |\lambda(A)|\}$.

Proof: Assume that there exists an encoder and decoder such that (1) is almost surely asymptotically observable. As in [8, Prop. 3.1], we see that, possibly after a coordinate transformation, the matrix A can be written in the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_s & \\ & A_u \end{bmatrix}$$

where the A_s block corresponds to the stable subspace (that subspace corresponding to the eigenvalues of A that are strictly inside the unit circle) and the A_u block corresponds to the marginally stable and unstable subspace (that subspace corresponding to the eigenvalues of A that are either on the unit circle or outside the unit circle).

Let Π_s represent the projection onto the stable subspace. Fix an arbitrary control sequence $\{U_t\}$. Then $X_t = A^t X_0 + \alpha_t$ where $\alpha_t = \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} A^{t-1-j} B U_j$. For any control sequence we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_s(X_t - \alpha_t) = 0$. Thus, knowledge of the control signals alone is enough to estimate the projection of the state onto the stable subspace. Thus, without loss of generality, we can restrict our attention to A matrices that contain only unstable eigenvalues.

By almost sure asymptotic observability we know that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $T(\epsilon)$ such that the error $E_t = X_t - \hat{X}_t$ satisfies $\Pr(\sup_{t \geq T(\epsilon)} \|E_t\|_2 > \epsilon) \leq \epsilon$. Thus, for $t \geq T(\epsilon)$ we have $E(d^c(X_t, \hat{X}_t)) = \Pr(\|X_t - \hat{X}_t\|_2 > \epsilon) \leq \epsilon$. Then, by the data processing inequality and Lemma 3.2 the channel capacity and rate distortion function must for all $t \geq T(\epsilon)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{t} C_t^{\text{cap}} &\geq \frac{1}{t} R_t^c(\epsilon)(1 - \epsilon) \sum_{\lambda(A)} \log |\lambda(A)| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{t} \left((1 - \epsilon)h(X_0) - \log(K_d \epsilon^d) - \frac{1}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $C^{\text{cap}} = \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} (1/t) C_t^{\text{cap}} = (1 - \epsilon) \sum_{\lambda(A)} \log |\lambda(A)|$. Since ϵ can be chosen arbitrarily small we see $C^{\text{cap}} \geq \sum_{\lambda(A)} \log |\lambda(A)|$ and, if we reintroduce A matrices with some stable eigenvalues, we get $C^{\text{cap}} \geq \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, \log |\lambda(A)|\}$. \square

Proposition 3.3: For (1) with (A, B) , a stabilizable pair a necessary condition on the channel capacity for almost sure asymptotic stabilizability is $C^{\text{cap}} \geq \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, \log |\lambda(A)|\}$.

Proof: Assume there exists an encoder, decoder, and controller such that the system (1) is almost surely asymptotically stabilizable. For a given control sequence U_0, U_1, \dots, U_{t-1} , we have

$$X_t = A^t X_0 - \alpha_t(U_0, \dots, U_{t-1})$$

where $\alpha_t(U_0, \dots, U_{t-1}) \doteq -\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} A^{t-1-i} B U_i$. Almost sure asymptotic stabilizability implies that for any ϵ there exists a $T(\epsilon)$ such that $\Pr(\sup_{t \geq T(\epsilon)} \|X_t\|_2 > \epsilon) \leq \epsilon$. We can view α_t as a reconstruction of $A^t X_0$ with distortion $E(d^c(A^t X_0, \alpha_t)) \leq \epsilon$. By

Proposition 3.2, a necessary condition to achieve this distortion is $C^{\text{cap}} \geq \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, \log |\lambda(A)|\}$. \square

In the previous proposition, we interpreted the following function of the control signals, $\alpha_t(U_0, \dots, U_{t-1}) = -\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} A^{t-1-i} B U_i$, as a reconstruction of $A^t X_0$. We can view a particular sequence of control signals as a ‘‘codeword’’ in a reconstruction codebook [2].

In proving the necessary conditions shown previously, we did not need to explicitly describe the encoder, decoder, and controller nor did we use the assumption of separation between the observer and the controller. Hence, the conditions hold independently of the choice of these components. In Section IV, we will provide explicit constructions of the encoder, decoder, and controller that can achieve almost sure asymptotic observability and stabilizability for the erasure channel.

IV. ACHIEVABILITY RESULTS

In this section, we first quickly review our achievability results from [8] and then treat control over an erasure channel.

Recall that the encoder at time t is a map \mathcal{E}_t that takes $(Y^t, V^{t-1}, U^{t-1}) \mapsto V_t$. In this case the encoder knows the past states, past channel input symbols, and past controls. In our companion paper we distinguished between two different encoder classes: one where the encoder observes the control signals, called *encoder class 1*, and one where it does not, called *encoder class 2* [8]. In this note, we restrict our attention to the situation where the encoder observes the control signals being applied to the plant.

Often times the rate condition for the noiseless digital channel will not be an integer. We can achieve an average rate by employing a time-sharing scheme as discussed in [8]. Hence, the statement ‘‘a rate R can be achieved’’ should be interpreted to mean a fixed rate in the case R is an integer and an average rate in the case R is a not an integer. We repeat [8, Props. 5.3 and 5.4] here.

Proposition 4.1: For system (1) with (A, C) an observable pair a sufficient condition for asymptotic observability over a noiseless digital channel is $R > \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, \log |\lambda(A)|\}$. For system (1) with (A, C) , an observable pair and (A, B) a stabilizable pair a sufficient condition on the rate for asymptotic stabilizability over a noiseless digital channel is $R > \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, \log |\lambda(A)|\}$.

We will need [8, Lemma 5.1].

Lemma 4.1: Let A be a stable matrix. Let B_t be a set of matrices such that $\|B_t\| \leq L < \infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|B_t\| = 0$. Let $S_t = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} A^{t-1-i} B_i$. Then, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|S_t\| = 0$.

From Section III, we know that the Shannon capacity of an erasure channel with erasure probability α over T channel uses is $C_T^{\text{cap}} = (1 - \alpha)TR$. At each time step, this channel will with probability $1 - \alpha$ deliver a ‘‘packet’’ of size R bits and with probability α drop that ‘‘packet.’’

By Proposition 3.2, a necessary condition for almost sure asymptotic observability is $C^{\text{cap}} = (1 - \alpha)R \geq \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, \log |\lambda(A)|\}$. Hence, we require a packet size of at least

$$R \geq \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, \log |\lambda(A)|\}.$$

Now, we examine sufficiency. To that end, we will extend the erasure channel model to include acknowledgment. Specifically the decoder will feed back to the encoder an acknowledgment whether the packet was erased or not. This acknowledgment feature is common in the TCP network protocol. The encoder then knows what information has been delivered to the decoder. Hence, in the language of [8], we say that the encoder and decoder are equimemory. Because the erasure channel is memoryless, acknowledgment feedback cannot increase the channel capacity [2]. Hence, the necessity condition above continues to hold

for erasure channels with acknowledgment feedback. We discuss how to relax this acknowledgment feature at the end of this section.

For simplicity, we consider (1), $X_{t+1} = AX_t + BU_t$, with full state observation, $C = I$, at the encoder. The partially observed case can be treated in the manner described in [8].

Proposition 4.2: Given (1), a bound on Λ_0 , and an erasure channel with erasure probability α and feedback acknowledgment the packet size $R > (1/1 - \alpha) \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, |\log \lambda(A)|\}$ is sufficient to ensure almost sure asymptotic observability.

Proof: We first treat the scalar case: $X_{t+1} = aX_t + bU_t$. Let $E_t = X_t - \hat{X}_t$ and $E_0 = X_0 \in \Lambda_0 \subseteq [-L_0, L_0]$. At time t let L_t represent the box that the error lives in: $E_t \in [-L_t, L_t]$. We will construct a scheme such that $L_t \rightarrow 0$ almost surely and, hence, $E_t \rightarrow 0$ almost surely.

The decoder feeds back acknowledgments to the encoder. Hence, the encoder can compute the decoder's uncertainty set $[-L_t, L_t]$. At time $t + 1$ the encoder partitions the interval $[-|a|L_t, |a|L_t]$ into 2^R equal sized regions and sends the index of that region across the channel. If the erasure channel does not drop the packet, then $L_{t+1} = (|a|/2^R)L_t$. If the packet is dropped then $L_{t+1} = |a|L_t$. This can be described by the stochastic difference equation: $L_{t+1} = |a|F_t L_t$ where the random variables F_t are IID with common distribution: $\Pr(F_t = 1) = \alpha$ and $\Pr(F_t = 2^{-R}) = 1 - \alpha$.

Since $L_t = L_0 \prod_{j=0}^{t-1} |a|F_j$ we need to show that $\prod_{j=0}^{t-1} |a|F_j \rightarrow 0$ almost surely. By the strong law of large numbers we know $(1/t) \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \log |a|F_j \rightarrow E(\log |a|F)$ almost surely.

If $E(\log |a|F) < 0$, then

$$\prod_{j=0}^{t-1} |a|F_j = 2^{t((1/t) \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \log |a|F_j)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

This result can be found in any standard text on large deviations. See, for example, [3]. Now

$$\begin{aligned} E(\log |a|F) &= \alpha \log |a| + (1 - \alpha) \log \frac{|a|}{2^R} \\ &= \log |a| - (1 - \alpha)R. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $E(\log |a|F)$ is negative if and only if $R > (\log |a|/1 - \alpha)$.

In the vector case, the stochastic difference equation takes the form $\underline{L}(t+1) = \bar{\Upsilon} F_{\underline{R}}(t) \underline{L}(t)$ where

$$P(F_{\underline{R}}(t)) = \begin{cases} \alpha, & \text{if } F_{\underline{R}}(t) = \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1) \\ 1 - \alpha, & \text{if } F_{\underline{R}}(t) = \text{diag}(2^{-R_1}, \dots, 2^{-R_d}) \end{cases}$$

and $\bar{\Upsilon}$ is described in [8, Sec. IV]. Since $\underline{L}(0)$ is bounded we need only show that $\prod_{j=0}^{t-1} \bar{\Upsilon} F_{\underline{R}}(j)$ converges to zero almost surely. Since $\bar{\Upsilon}$ is upper triangular and $F_{\underline{R}}(t)$ is a random diagonal matrix we see from the argument above that each eigenvalue of $\prod_{j=0}^{t-1} \bar{\Upsilon} F_{\underline{R}}(j)$ converges to zero almost surely if and only if $R_i > (\log |\lambda_i|/1 - \alpha)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, d$. \square

Proposition 4.3: Given an erasure channel with erasure probability α and feedback acknowledgments the packet size $R > (1/1 - \alpha) \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, |\log \lambda(A)|\}$ is sufficient to ensure almost sure asymptotic stabilizability.

Proof: Let K be a stabilizing controller, i.e., $A + BK$ is stable. Apply the certainty equivalent controller $U_t = K \hat{X}_t$ where \hat{X}_t is the decoder's state estimate. As before let $e_t = X_t - \hat{X}_t$. Then

$$X_t = (A + BK)^t X_0 - \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} (A + BK)^{t-1-j} BK e_j.$$

Since $A + BK$ is stable the first addend in the above equation goes to zero almost surely. By Proposition 4.3, we know that the state estimation error converges to zero almost surely: $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|e_t\| = 0$ a.s.

Hence, by Lemma 4.1, the second addend goes to zero almost surely. \square

Now, we consider the case when there are process disturbances

$$X_{t+1} = AX_t + BU_t + Z_t \quad Y_t = X_t, \quad t \geq 0 \quad (3)$$

where $\|Z_t\|_2 \leq D$.

Proposition 4.4: Given (3), a bound on the Λ_0 , and an erasure channel with erasure probability α and feedback acknowledgment the packet size $R > (1/1 - \alpha) \sum_{\lambda(A)} \max\{0, |\log \lambda(A)|\}$ is sufficient to ensure that the state estimation error is bounded almost surely.

Proof: We first treat the scalar case: $X_{t+1} = aX_t + bU_t + Z_t$. Assume that $E_0 = X_0 \in [-L_0, L_0]$. At time t let L_t be such that $E_t \in [-L_t, L_t]$. We will construct a scheme such that the sequence L_t is bounded almost surely.

Just as in Proposition 4.3, the encoder can compute the decoder's uncertainty set $[-L_t, L_t]$. If the erasure channel does not drop the packet at time t then $L_{t+1} = (|a|/2^R)L_t + D$. If the packet is dropped, then $L_{t+1} = |a|L_t + D$. This is described by the stochastic difference equation

$$L_{t+1} = |a|F_t L_t + D$$

where the random variables F_t are IID with common distribution: $\Pr(F_t = 1) = \alpha$ and $\Pr(F_t = 2^{-R}) = 1 - \alpha$. Now

$$L_t = L_0 \prod_{i=0}^{t-1} |a|F_i + \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{t-1} |a|F_j \right) D.$$

By Proposition 4.3, we know that if $R > (\log |a|/1 - \alpha)$ then the first addend converges to zero almost surely. We need to show that the second addend converges almost surely to a finite limit.

First note that $\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \left(\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} |a|F_j \right)$ has the same distribution as $\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \left(\prod_{j=i+1}^{t-1} |a|F_j \right)$. Choose δ so that $E(\log |a|F) + \delta < 0$. By the strong law of large numbers we have

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{T-1} |a|F_i \right)^{1/T} &= \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} 2^{(1/T) \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} \log |a|F_i} \\ &\leq 2^{(E(\log |a|F) + \delta)} \\ &< 1 \text{ almost surely.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by applying Cauchy's root criterion, we see that the series $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \left(\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} |a|F_j \right)$ converges almost surely.

For the vector case, we know from [8, Prop. 5.2], that the stochastic difference equation takes the form

$$\underline{L}(t+1) = \bar{\Upsilon} F_{\underline{R}}(t) \underline{L}(t) + D \times \text{ones}(d)$$

where

$$P(F_{\underline{R}}(t)) = \begin{cases} \alpha, & \text{if } F_{\underline{R}}(t) = \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1) \\ 1 - \alpha, & \text{if } F_{\underline{R}}(t) = \text{diag}(2^{-R_1}, \dots, 2^{-R_d}) \end{cases}$$

and $\text{ones}(d)$ is the d -dimensional vector of all ones. As in the scalar case, we need to show that the product

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \left(\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \bar{\Upsilon} F_{\underline{R}}(j) \right)$$

converges almost surely. Since $\bar{\Upsilon}$ is upper triangular and $F_{\underline{R}}(t)$ is a random diagonal matrix we see from the argument above that this series converges if and only if $R_i > (\log |\lambda_i|/1 - \alpha)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, d$. See [1, Th. 1.1] and [4] for more details. \square

In Propositions 4.2–4.4, we assumed that there exists acknowledgment feedback from the decoder to the encoder. Relaxing this assumption is in general difficult. There are, though, a few scenarios where we do not need an explicit feedback acknowledgment. We discuss two here. Both require signaling the occurrence of an erasure via the control signal U_t . In this way, the control takes on a “dual effect:” that of satisfying the control objective and of helping the encoder/decoder estimate the state. This signaling will ensure that the encoder continues to track the decoder’s estimate of the state.

Scenario 1: Here we assume that the encoder knows the control policy K where $U_t = K\hat{X}_t$. We will prove using induction that the encoder can compute the decoder’s estimate at each time step. At time zero, the encoder knows the decoder’s state estimate. Assume that at time $t - 1$ the encoder knows the decoder’s state estimate: \hat{X}_{t-1} . At time t the decoder’s state estimate, based on \hat{X}_{t-1} and the channel message, can take one of two values depending on whether there was an erasure or not. Hence, the control U_t can take one of two values. The encoder, by observing U_t and using its knowledge of the control law K , can determine whether an erasure has occurred or not and hence can determine the decoder’s estimate \hat{X}_t . Thus, the encoder can compute the decoder’s estimate at each time step.

Scenario 2: Here we assume that the controller adds signaling information, β_t , to the control signal: $U_t = K\hat{X}_t + \beta_t$. Then

$$X_t = (A + BK)^t X_0 - \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} (A + BK)^{t-i-j} B(Ke_j - \beta_j).$$

By Lemma 4.1, if $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \beta_t = 0$ then the sum $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} (A + BK)^{t-i-j} B\beta_j = 0$ and hence does not effect the long term behavior of the state. Fix an integer M and assume that the controller knows if an erasure has occurred or not. Let

$$\beta_t = \begin{cases} -2^{-Mt} [K\hat{X}_t]_{2^{-Mt}}, & \text{if erasure} \\ -2^{-Mt} [K\hat{X}_t]_{2^{-Mt}} + 2^{-Mt} \text{ones}(m), & \text{if no erasure} \end{cases}$$

where $[K\hat{X}_t]_{2^{-Mt}}$ is a $\{0, 1\}^m$ -valued vector that contains the coefficient of 2^{-Mt} in the component-wise binary expansion of the vector $K\hat{X}_t$. Note that $\beta_t \rightarrow 0$. The controller applies the control $U_t = K\hat{X}_t + \beta_t$ to the plant. In words U_t replaces the coefficient of 2^{-Mt} in the binary expansion of $K\hat{X}_t$ by a vector of all zeroes or all ones depending on whether there was an erasure or not. The encoder observes the control applied. Thus, it can determine the coefficient of 2^{-Mt} in the binary expansion of U_t . Hence, the encoder will know if an erasure has occurred or not. Thus, the encoder can compute the decoder’s estimate at each time step.

Neither scenario is completely satisfactory. The first case assumes the encoder knows the control policy. The second case is not robust if there is noise on the channel connecting the controller to the plant. But both cases show that the necessary conditions presented in Propositions 3.2 and 3.3 are tight even for scenarios without explicit acknowledgment feedback.

V. CONCLUSION

In this note, we have been concerned with almost sure asymptotic observability and stabilizability. Sahai, in [5] and [6], treats the case of mean-square observability. In his *any-time capacity* framework, he presents channel capacity results that ensure mean-square observability. In general, the capacity conditions are different under the almost sure and the mean-square convergence criteria.

Depending on the control application, one may prefer an almost sure convergence criteria or a mean-square convergence criteria. In the former, one is interested in finding a channel capacity so that almost all realizations of the system’s trajectories are typical. In fact,

with probability one, all realizations will satisfy the control objective. Atypical realizations, also called large deviations excursions, can occur but with probability approaching zero. If in addition, one wants to penalize the atypical trajectories by the size of their large deviation excursion then the mean-square formulation is appropriate. The fact that one gets different results under the almost sure convergence criteria and the mean-square convergence criteria is a generic property of the multiplicative law of large numbers [3].

In this note, we examined linear systems with a communication channel connecting the plant to the controller. We generalized the necessity conditions first presented in [8] to general noisy channels. We then examined control over Internet-like channels that suffer erasures. Two important future research directions include generalizing the achievability results to more general classes of channels and analyzing erasure channels without acknowledgment feedback.

APPENDIX

The mutual information between two random variables X and Y with distribution $P(X, Y)$ is defined as

$$I(X; Y) \doteq \begin{cases} \int \log \frac{dP}{dQ} dP, & \text{if } P \ll Q \\ +\infty, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

where $Q(x, y) = P(x) \times P(y)$ and dP/dQ is the Radon–Nikodym derivative. Note that the mutual information is a function of $P(X, Y) = P(Y|x)P(X)$. In the capacity computation one supremizes the mutual information over input distributions $P(X)$ and in the rate distortion computation one infimizes the mutual information over *forward channels* $P(Y|x)$ subject to the distortion criterion.

If X is a discrete valued random variable, then its *entropy* is defined as: $H(X) \doteq -\sum_i P(X = x_i) \log P(X = x_i)$ and its *conditional entropy* is defined as: $H(X|Y) \doteq -\int (\sum_i P(X = x_i|y) \log P(X = x_i|y)) p(dy)$. If X is a random variable admitting a density, p_X , then its *differential entropy* is defined as: $h(X) \doteq -\int p_X(x) \log p_X(x) dx$ and its *conditional differential entropy* is defined as: $h(X|Y) \doteq -\int (\int p_{X|Y}(x|y) \log p_{X|Y}(x|y) dx) p(dy)$.

The following useful properties can be found in [2].

- $I(X; Y) \geq 0$ and
- $I(X; Y) = \begin{cases} H(Y) - H(Y|X), & \text{if } Y \text{ is a discrete random variable} \\ h(Y) - h(Y|X), & \text{if } Y \text{ admits a density for each } x. \end{cases}$
- This implies conditioning reduces entropy.
- If X is a vector valued random variable admitting a density, then $h(AX) = h(X) + \log |A|$ where $|A|$ is the absolute value of the determinant of A .
- If $Z = f(X)$ where Z is discrete, then $H(Z|X) = 0$.
- $I(X; Z|Y) = I(X, Y; Z) - I(Y; Z)$.
- $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$ forms a Markov chain if and only if $I(X; Z|Y) = 0$.

If X is a discrete random variable taking on M values, then $H(X) \leq \log M$. If X admits a density with bounded support Λ , then $h(X) \leq \log(\text{volume}(\Lambda))$ [2].

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank N. Elia and A. Sahai for many helpful discussions and the reviewers for their detailed comments.

REFERENCES

- P. Bougerol and N. Picard, “Strict stationarity of generalized autoregressive processes,” *Ann. Probab.*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 1714–1730, Oct. 1992.

- [2] T. Cover and J. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*. New York: Wiley, 1991.
- [3] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni, *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [4] H. Kesten, "Random difference equations and renewal theory for products of random matrices," *Acta. Math.*, vol. 131, pp. 207–248, 1973.
- [5] A. Sahai, "Evaluating channels for control: Capacity reconsidered," in *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, vol. 4, June 2000, pp. 2358–2362.
- [6] ———, "Any-time capacity and a separation theorem for tracking unstable processes," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Information Theory*, Sorrento, Italy, June 2000.
- [7] S. Tatikonda, "Control under communication constraints," Ph.D. dissertation, Mass. Inst. Technol., Cambridge, MA, 2000.
- [8] S. Tatikonda and S. Mitter, "Control under communication constraints," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 49, pp. 1056–1068, July 2004.
- [9] H. Witsenhausen, "Separation of estimation and control for discrete time systems," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 59, pp. 1557–1566, Nov. 1971.

The Posture Control of a Two-Link Free Flying Acrobot With Initial Angular Momentum

Xin Xin, Tsutomu Mita, and Masahiro Kaneda

Abstract—This note studies the posture control problem of a two-link free flying Acrobot with nonzero initial angular momentum, where the control objective is to design an acceleration based control law such that the robot can pass through a desired posture at a given time. Based on the previous results, this posture control problem can be tackled by solving the problem of stabilizing the origin of a system obtained via an appropriate coordinate transformation. The main contribution of this note is to provide a control scheme which globally asymptotically stabilizes the origin of the system. The numerical simulations are given to validate the provided theoretical results.

Index Terms—Backstepping, free flying acrobot, global asymptotic stabilization, nonholonomic control, posture control.

I. INTRODUCTION

The control of nonholonomic systems has been studied greatly, see, e.g., [4], [6], [10], [14], and [16]. Nonholonomic systems most arise in mechanical systems where constraints are imposed on the motion (velocity or acceleration) that are not integrable. The nonholonomic constraint on velocity arises for example in the situation of the conservation of angular momentum in a multibody system such as the motion of a diver or gymnast in mid-air maneuvers [10]. The nonholonomic constraint on acceleration arises in some underactuated mechanical systems which possess fewer actuators than degrees of freedom [16], such as the Acrobot [17], which is a two-link planar robot with only one actuator at the joint of two links.

Manuscript received October 22, 2002; revised November 24, 2003 and March 9, 2004. Recommended by Associate Editor M. Reyhanoglu. This work was supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Encouragement of Young Scientists, Electric Technology Research Foundation of Chugoku, and by the Mazda Foundation's Research Grant.

X. Xin and M. Kaneda are with Department of Communication Engineering, Faculty of Computer Science and System Engineering, Okayama Prefectural University, Okayama 719-1197, Japan (e-mail: xxin@c.oka-pu.ac.jp; kaneda@c.oka-pu.ac.jp).

T. Mita, deceased, was with Department of Control and Systems Engineering, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo 152, Japan.

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TAC.2004.831093

This note addresses the posture control problem for the Acrobot in free flying phase with nonzero initial angular momentum such that the Acrobot can pass through a desired posture at a given time. In what follows, we briefly introduce some related existing works.

Olfati-Saber presented a series of seminal works for nonlinear control of underactuated mechanical systems in recent years, e.g., [12]–[15]. One of main contributions of these works is to provide explicit change of coordinates and control that transforms several classes of underactuated systems into cascade nonlinear systems with structural properties, which are convenient for control design purposes. Note that the key notions in the coordinate transformation are the normalized momentums and their integrals. For example, [12] proposed a global change of coordinate and control that transforms the dynamics of the Acrobot (not in flying phase) into the normal form, which is a fourth order system in strict feedback form with the input being the acceleration of the shape variable (the relative angle between two links). A design method for the global asymptotic stabilization of the system in the normal form proposed in [13] and [14].

On the other hand, note that considerable research activity has been received in the study of the control of free flying objects with zero initial angular momentum, see, e.g., [5], [9], and [11]. While for the case of a free flying object having nonzero angular momentum, since its motion is described by an affine nonlinear system which has a drift term and has not any equilibrium point, the related posture control problem is difficult to solve in comparison with the case of the zero initial angular momentum, see, e.g., [3], [7], and [8]. Reference [3] studied the control problem for a class of nonholonomic systems with drift, where the open-loop path planning problem was solved with a procedure providing numerical solutions with bang–bang controls. The procedure was then applied to the mathematical model of a planar driver with bang–bang velocity control inputs. [7] presented an analytical time optimal control solution for the posture control problem of the kinematic model of a two-link planar Acrobot, where the proposed velocity control input is also in bang–bang form. It was indicated in [3] that future work should concentrate on extending results to larger classes of controls, including smooth inputs. Indeed, it is difficult to generate noncontinuous velocity from the actual control input such as the acceleration of the shape variable or torque of the actuator.

By introducing a coordinate transformation which consists of a variable corresponding to that of the integral of the normalized momentum in [12] and a time-varying reference trajectory of the variable, [8] showed that the posture control problem can be reduced to the stabilization of the origin of a nonlinear system. This is an interesting approach. In [8], a control strategy combining two controllers is proposed where the controller proposed in [12] is used when the state is far away from the origin, while the stabilizing controller designed based on linearized model of the system is used when the state is driven close to the origin. However, there is no discussion on whether the proposed control strategy is free of encountering singular points and can achieve the global asymptotic stabilization.

Motivated by the aforementioned studies, this note studies how to design an acceleration based control input for the posture control problem of the Acrobot in free flying phase. Based on the results of the change of coordinates in [8] and [12] such problem can be reduced to the problem of stabilizing the origin of a third order system. The main contribution of this note is to show how to design a continuously differentiable velocity based input, and then to design an acceleration based control input which contains no singular points and can globally asymptotically stabilize the third order system.

Note that the normal form (the fourth-order system) of the Acrobot [12] in the case of *zero gravity* has the order degeneration of one. It is