

## Model Predictive Control : Exercise 6

### Prob 1 | Solving Explicit MPC using parametric LCPs

Consider the discrete-time linear time-invariant system defined by the dynamics

$$x^+ = 2x + u - 1$$

with constraints

$$U = \{u \mid 0 \leq u \leq 2\}$$

We formulate the following MPC problem with horizon  $N = 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) = \min \quad & x^2 + u^2 + (x^+)^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x^+ = 2x + u - 1 \\ & 0 \leq u \leq 2 \end{aligned}$$

Your goal is to calculate the explicit solution  $f^*(x)$  of the parametric program and the corresponding explicit control policy  $u^*(x)$ .

Tasks:

- To simplify the problem, eliminate the decision variable  $x^+$ .
- Write down the Lagrangian function  $\mathcal{L}(x, u, \lambda, \nu)$  where  $\lambda$  corresponds to the constraint  $0 \leq u$  and  $\nu$  corresponds to the constraint  $u \leq 2$ .
- Write down the KKT conditions (stationarity, primal/dual feasibility, complementarity).
- Give matrices  $M$ ,  $Q$  and vector  $q$  such that the optimal solution of the problem is a linear transform of the solution  $y(x)$  to the following parametric LCP:

$$w - My = Qx + q \qquad w, y \geq 0 \qquad w^T y = 0$$

- Draw the complementarity cones of the pLCP.
- Compute the optimal value function  $f^*(x)$  and its corresponding control policy  $u^*(x)$ .
- Use Matlab to estimate  $u^*(x)$  and  $f^*(x)$  by solving the optimization problem for a number of different values of  $x$  and compare this to your parametric solution.

## Prob 2 | Implement explicit MPC using MPT3

We revisit the MPC problem from exercise 4, where we considered the discrete-time linear time-invariant system defined by

$$x^+ = \begin{bmatrix} 0.9752 & 1.4544 \\ -0.0327 & 0.9315 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 0.0248 \\ 0.0327 \end{bmatrix} u$$

with constraints

$$X = \{x \mid |x_1| \leq 5, |x_2| \leq 0.2\} \quad U = \{u \mid |u| \leq 1.75\}$$

This is a second-order system with a natural frequency of  $0.15r/s$ , a damping ratio of  $\zeta = 0.1$  which has been discretized at  $1.5r/s$ . The first state is the position, and the second is velocity.

Your goal is to implement an explicit MPC controller for this system with a horizon of  $N = 10$  and a stage cost given by  $l(x, u) := 10x^T x + u^T u$  using the MPT3 toolbox.

Tasks:

- Define your MPC problem using **MPT3**. You can proceed as follows:
  - Define the system `sys = LTISystem('A', A, 'B', B)`
  - Define the constraints on the signals by setting the values `sys.x.max = ...`, `sys.x.min = ...`, etc
  - Define the stage costs by setting the penalty terms for  $x$  and  $u$ , e.g., `sys.x.penalty = QuadFunction(Q)`
  - Extract desired sets and weights with `sys.LQRGain`, `sys.LQRPenalty.weight` and `sys.LQRSet`,
  - Set the terminal cost and terminal set with `model.x.with('terminalPenalty')`, `model.x.terminalPenalty = QuadFunction(Qf)` and `model.x.with('terminalSet')`, `model.x.terminalSet = Xf`,
  - Define the MPC controller with `controller = MPCController(sys, N)`.
- Generate the explicit MPC with `empc = controller.toExplicit()`.
- Plot the generated solution, including regions, with `empc.feedback.fplot()`.
- Simulate the closed-loop system starting from the state  $x = [3 \ 0]^T$ . Confirm that your constraints are met. Reuse the simulation code from exercise 4. You can evaluate the explicit controller with `empc.evaluate(x)`.

### Prob 3 | Compare explicit MPC with YALMIP implementation

We now compare the explicit MPC with the YALMIP implementation from exercise 4.

Tasks:

- If (for some reason) you skipped exercise 4, implement the controller using YALMIP.
- Plot the position, velocity, and input of the system using the YALMIP controller. Confirm that your solution is the same as for the explicit MPC case.
- Compare the solve times of the explicit MPC against the YALMIP implementation. What do you notice, is it as expected?