

# AN INTEGRAL CONTROL FORMULATION OF MEAN FIELD GAME BASED LARGE SCALE COORDINATION OF LOADS IN SMART GRIDS.

Arman C. Kizilkale, Rabih Salhab and Roland P. Malhamé

## Abstract

Pressure on ancillary reserves, i.e. frequency preserving, in power systems has significantly mounted due to the recent generalized increase of the fraction of (highly fluctuating) wind and solar energy sources in grid generation mixes. The energy storage associated with millions of individual customer electric thermal (heating-cooling) loads is considered as a tool for smoothing power demand/generation imbalances. The piecewise constant level tracking problem of their collective energy content is formulated as a linear quadratic mean field game problem with integral control in the cost coefficients. The introduction of integral control brings with it a robustness potential to mismodeling, but also the potential of cost coefficient unboundedness. A suitable Banach space is introduced to establish the existence of Nash equilibria for the corresponding infinite population game, and algorithms are proposed for reliably computing a class of desirable, bounded cost coefficients induced, near Nash equilibria. Numerical simulations illustrate the flexibility and robustness of the approach

## I. INTRODUCTION

Since the seventies, load management via direct load control and its predominantly price induced variant, demand response, have been considered as tools for shaping the load demand in power systems so as to achieve peak load shaving and valley filling [1]. Such measures help defer generation and capacity expansion, and operate generators in the vicinity of their most efficient

The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of Natural Resources Canada, and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

Arman C. Kizilkale, Rabih Salhab and Roland P. Malhamé are with the Department of Electrical Engineering at École Polytechnique de Montréal and Groupe d'Études et de Recherche en Analyse des Décisions (GERAD), Canada.

{arman.kizilkale;rabih.salhab;roland.malhame}@polymtl.ca

operating point. However, the seriousness with which demand response (or load dispatch) are being considered is a relatively recent phenomenon. It is mainly caused by the increasing share of intermittent renewable energy sources (such as wind and solar) in the energy mixes of power producers worldwide [2]–[4]. The ensuing variability and diminished predictability of generation has indeed put strong pressures on the ability of independent system operators to maintain grid stability and insure reliable power delivery and transmission to consumers in their power pool [5], [6].

One of the striking characteristics of so-called smart grids is an ability to rely on both an increasingly pervasive communication network, and an improved electricity distribution network, to shift the responsibility of balancing electricity demand with power generation from being solely a generation side task, to one shared increasingly by both producers and customers. Furthermore, the role of consumers is gradually changing in that they can also contribute to power generation or delivery, mostly through rooftop solar panels, electric batteries in dwellings or electric vehicles [7]. This drastically modified electric grid landscape has produced both a need to anticipate the new dynamics via adequate modeling tools, and a need to develop a new control theoretic framework capable of handling a very large number of heterogeneous control points, and the presence of a large number of agents or decision makers. As a result, on the modeling front, the approaches inspired from statistical physics, which start from physically based stochastic microscopic descriptions of loads and build via ensemble analysis macroscopic aggregate descriptions, and started in the eighties, are making a strong comeback (see [8]–[19]). On the control theoretic front, game theory has witnessed a surge. More importantly though, one has to note the relatively novel development of so-called mean field games (MFG’s) ([20]–[24]): they combine in effect the modeling power of statistical physics with the control theoretic potential of game theory. They are at their most basic level a game theory of large groups of class wise interchangeable agents, whose individual influence on the group asymptotically vanishes with the size, thus leading in the limit, under Nash equilibrium conditions to (i) predictability of the group behavior via the law of large numbers, (ii) decentralized individual control policies with a dependence on local state and statistical information on the agents’ dynamic and cost parameters, as well as their initial states distribution. In this paper, we intend to illustrate how MFG’s constitute a natural tool in aggregator based load dispatch, with the particular class of thermostatic electric heating loads aimed at. An aggregator is considered as

a technically equipped broker, acting on behalf of a pool of customers to coordinate their loads as a virtual battery on the energy markets. Its role is to rely on a regularly updated aggregate load model to assess the time dependent load absorption or relief potential of the load pool under its responsibility, and to compute and send piecewise constant mean pool energy content targets which are feasible under comfort and security constraints, and which will result in overall economic gains for the pool, and indirectly, the quality of the environment. An MFG based computation of individual load control strategies will lead to decentralized locally computable and implementable controls thus achieving computational scalability, with minimal communication requirements, local compliance with comfort and security constraints, and as we shall see, a size of device contribution in direct relation to the device current ability to contribute.

Besides the application context, on the technical level, the fundamental novelty here is the introduction of integral control in the cost coefficients of what is otherwise an instance of a linear quadratic Gaussian MFG [23]. The integral control in the cost coefficient introduces with it both the potential benefits of robustness of integral controllers to inadequate modeling and disturbances which has been so successfully leveraged in applications [25], and the unfortunate risk of a cost coefficient going unbounded. After setting up our microscopic controlled device model and defining a cost function which weighs the individual's reluctance to contribute against the objective of having to meet the global aggregate target, we establish the existence of an asymptotic Nash equilibrium on an appropriately defined Banach space. This equilibrium may be on target (desirable equilibrium), or may correspond to an undesirable equilibrium (a cost coefficient going unbounded). We then develop an algorithm to reliably compute a near Nash strategy corresponding to a desirable equilibrium. Numerical results illustrate the flexibility of the approach and the robustness to modeling errors conferred by the integral control structure.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II we introduce the model that will be used throughout the paper and propose our collective target tracking mean field formulation. In Section III we present a fixed point analysis for the equation system characterizing the limiting mean field, and in Section IV we develop our  $\epsilon$ -Nash Theorem indicating that an approximate Nash Equilibrium is attained. We provide in Section V an algorithm that generates approximate desirable fixed point mean trajectories. Lastly, in Section VI, we provide simulation results together with comparisons to a prevailing target tracking control formulation.

The following notation is defined; the set of nonnegative real numbers is denoted by  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . The

set  $\mathbf{C}[0, \infty)$  denotes the family of all continuous functions on  $[0, \infty)$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_l[0, \infty) = \{x : x \in \mathbf{C}[0, \infty), \exists k_0 > 0, 0 \leq x(t) \leq k_0 t, \forall t \geq 0\}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_b[0, \infty) = \{x : x \in \mathbf{C}[0, \infty), \sup_{t \geq 0} |x_t| < \infty\}$ , and for any  $x \in \mathbf{C}_b$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  denotes the supremum norm:  $\|x\|_\infty \triangleq \sup_{t \geq 0} |x_t|$ .

## II. ELECTRIC SPACE HEATER MODELS

In the following, we first introduce the model for space heating dynamics that will be employed throughout the paper. Subsequently, a *collective target tracking mean field* control model is defined together with the individual control actions and the corresponding mean field system of equations is developed.




Fig. 1. Equivalent thermal parameter (ETP) model of a household

We employ a one dimensional equivalent thermal parameter (ETP) model (see Fig. 1) [26] to describe the thermal dynamics of a single household, which is written as

$$dx_t^{in} = \frac{1}{C_a} [-U_a(x_t^{in} - x^{out}) + Q_h(t)]dt + \sigma dw_t, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (1)$$

where  $x^{in}$  is the air temperature inside the household,  $x^{out}$  is the outside ambient temperature,  $C_a$  is the thermal mass of air inside,  $U_a$  is conductance of the walls and  $Q_h$  is the heat flux from the heater. Note that  $w_t$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , is a standard Wiener process defined on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  to reflect the noise on the system caused by random processes of heat gain and loss due to customer activity within the dwellings, and  $\sigma$  is its volatility term.

For brevity of notation, the system for heater  $\mathcal{A}_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , is equivalently written as

$$dx_t^i = [-a^i(x_t^i - x^{out,i}) + b^i u_t^i]dt + \sigma dw_t^i, \quad t \geq 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N, \quad (2)$$

where  $x^i \triangleq x^{in,i}$  and  $u^i \triangleq Q_h^i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ ;  $a^i = U_a^i/C_a^i$  and  $b^i = C_a^{i-1}$ .  $\{w^i, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  are  $N$  independent Wiener processes on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0, T]})$ .  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$  is the augmented filtration of  $\{\sigma(x_0^i, w_s^i, 0 \leq s \leq t, 1 \leq i \leq N)\}_{t \in [0, T]}$  [27, Section 2.7], where  $x_0^i, 1 \leq i \leq N$ , are the initial temperatures assumed i.i.d. with distribution  $P_0$  and finite second moments  $\mathbb{E}|x_0^i|^2 < \infty$ , and also independent of  $\{w^i, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ . Note that this model is similar to the model given in [8], where the thermostat control is exchanged with a linear control.

Recalling the implementation principle (iii), we consider that users “naturally” would like their devices to stay at their initial temperatures (normally attained via thermostatic action and before the intervention of the power utility control center). Thus, we have reformulated the control effort as the signal required to make them deviate from that initial temperature; more precisely, the control effort to stay at the initial temperature is considered free and will not be penalized by the cost function to be defined. The corresponding dynamical equation is written as

$$dx_t^i = [-a^i(x_t^i - x^{out,i}) + b^i(u_t^i + u^{free,i})]dt + \sigma dw_t^i, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (3)$$

where  $u^{free,i} \triangleq b^{i-1}a^i(x_0^i - x^{out,i})$ .

**A1:** The initial states  $x_0^i$  are bounded from above and below by comfort levels; i.e.,  $l \leq x_0^i \leq h, 1 \leq i \leq N$ . We assume a population of  $m$  types of agents, that is, the vector of individual parameters  $\theta^i := (a^i, b^i, x^{out,i})$  takes values in a finite set  $\{\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_m\}$ , which does not depend on the size of the population  $N$ . The empirical probability measure of the sequence  $\{\theta^i\}_{i=1, \dots, N}$  is denoted by  $P_\theta^N(\Theta_s) = 1/N \sum_{i=1}^N 1_{\{\theta^i = \Theta_s\}}$  for  $s = 1, \dots, m$ . We assume that  $(P_\theta^N(\Theta_1), \dots, P_\theta^N(\Theta_m))$  converges to  $P_\theta = (n_1, \dots, n_m)$ , as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $n_s > 0$  for all  $1 \leq s \leq m$ . ■

#### A. Benchmark: Classical Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG) Tracking Model

Following the results of a global optimization analysis, and for simplicity here, it is assumed that the central authority wants the mean temperature of a particular population to track some *constant* target temperature signal  $y$ . In the classical linear quadratic Gaussian (LQG) tracking formulation each agent’s cost function is defined as

$$J_i(u^i) = \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} [(x_t^i - y)^2 q + (u_t^i)^2 r] dt. \quad (4)$$

The problem with this approach is that each agent minimizes its own cost function and tracks the same signal  $y$ . Even though the central authority is only interested in aggregate behaviour and *mean* temperature, this control approach causes *all agents* to track the target signal.

### B. Collective Target Tracking Mean Field Model

The currently prevailing mean field LQG control formulation provides the following two requirements: (i) “each controller has to be situated locally” and (ii) “data exchanges should be kept minimum both with the central authority and among users”. However, it fails short of keeping user disturbance at minimum. The reason is that mean field theory is based on a noncooperative dynamic game approach and prevailing cost functions penalize only individual’s Euclidean distance from the mean field signal (which could be a convex combination of agents’ mean and target trajectory; see [28]) together with the squared norm of the control effort. In this work, instead of each agent trying to track a mean field signal, the individual cost structures are formulated such that ultimately, it is only the mean of the population trajectories that tracks a desired signal. In the proposed method, the novelty is that the mean field effect is mediated by the *quadratic cost function parameters* under the form of an integral error. The resulting concept will be called *collective target tracking mean field*.

We employ the dynamics for the heaters given in (2). The infinite horizon discounted cost function for agent  $\mathcal{A}_i, 1 \leq i \leq N$ , is defined as follows:

$$J_i(u^i, u^{-i}) = \mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} \left[ \frac{1}{2} q_t^y (x_t^i - z)^2 + \frac{1}{2} q^{x_0} (x_t^i - x_0^i)^2 + \frac{1}{2} r (u_t^i)^2 \right] dt, \quad (5)$$

where  $z$  defines the direction of temperature motion assigned to each agent in the population and each agent’s state deviation from this  $z$  is penalized by the deviation penalty coefficient  $q_t^y, t \in [0, \infty)$ , which captures the mean field information and is calculated as the following *integrated error signal*:

$$q_t^y = \left| \int_0^t g(x_\tau^{(N)} - y) d\tau \right|, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (6)$$

where  $g$  is a real increasing continuous function on  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $|g(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)$  for some  $C > 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $y$  is the main control center dictated mean target constant level, and  $x^{(N)} \triangleq (1/N) \sum_{i=1}^N x^i$ . Moreover, agents are also penalized with respect to their deviation from their individual initial points, which acts as another layer of heterogeneity for the population. For each heater, the set of admissible control laws is the set  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ –progressively measurable

$u^i$  such that  $\mathbb{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{\delta}{3}t} |u_t^i|^2 dt < \infty$ . It should be noted that whenever  $(u^i, u^{-i}) \in \mathcal{U}^N$ , then  $J_i(u^i, u^{-i}) < \infty$ . The  $\delta/3$  in the definition of  $\mathcal{U}$  is to force the term with  $q_t^y (x_t^i - z)^2$  in the cost to be finite.

The justification for the above cost function is that by pointing individual agents towards what is considered as the minimum (or maximum) comfort temperature  $z$ , it dictates a global decrease (or increase) in their individual temperatures. This pressure persists as long as the differential between the mean temperature and the mean target  $y$  is high. The role of the integral controller is to mechanically compute the *right* level of penalty coefficient  $q_t^y, t \in [0, \infty)$ , which, in the steady-state, should maintain the mean population temperature at  $y$ . When this happens, individual agents reach themselves their steady states (in general different from  $y$  and closer to their initial diversified states than classical LQG tracking would dictate). Furthermore, if the agents mean state is observed, this integral control adds robustness to model imperfections or inaccurate ambient temperature estimation.

In order to derive the limiting infinite population MF equation system we start this time assuming a given (albeit initially unknown) cost penalty trajectory  $q^y \in \mathbf{C}_l[0, \infty)$  and constant  $q^{x_0}$ . We show later in Lemma 3.3 that the candidates  $q^y$  actually belong to  $\mathbf{C}_l[0, \infty)$ . Given  $q^y$  and  $q^{x_0}$ , individual agents  $\mathcal{A}_i, 1 \leq i \leq N$ , solve a classical target tracking LQG problem [29] with time varying cost coefficient. Using techniques similar to those used in [30, Lemma A.2], one can show that the optimal control law of this LQG problem is,

$$(u_t^i)^\circ = -b^i r^{-1} (\pi_t^i x_t^i + \alpha_t^i - \pi_t^i z), \quad t \geq 0, \quad (7)$$

with  $\pi^i$  and  $\alpha^i$  respectively the unique solution and unique bounded solution of

$$-\frac{d\pi_t^i}{dt} = (-2a^i - \delta)\pi_t^i - b^{i2} r^{-1} (\pi_t^i)^2 + q_t^y + q^{x_0}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (8)$$

$$-\frac{d\alpha_t^i}{dt} = (-a^i - \delta - b^{i2} \pi_t^i r^{-1})\alpha_t^i + (a^i \pi_t^i - q^{x_0})(x_0^i - z), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (9)$$

The calculation of the unknown  $q_t^y, t \geq 0$ , is obtained by requiring that  $q_t^y, t \geq 0$ , be such that when individual agents implement their associated best responses, they collectively replicate the posited  $q_t^y, t \geq 0$ , trajectory. This fixed point requirement leads to the specification below of the collective target tracking MF equation system. In the remainder of this paper a superscript  $s$  refers to the type  $s$  of the heater.

*Definition 2.1: Collective Target Tracking (CTT) MF Equation System on  $t \in [0, \infty)$ :*

$$q_t^y = \left| \int_0^t g(\bar{x}_\tau - y) d\tau \right|, \quad (10)$$

$$-\frac{d\pi_t^s}{dt} = (-2a^s - \delta)\pi_t^s - (b^s)^2 r^{-1} (\pi_t^s)^2 + q_t^y + q^{x_0}, \quad \text{for } s = 1, \dots, m \quad (11)$$

$$-\frac{d\alpha_t^s}{dt} = (-a^s - \delta - (b^s)^2 \pi_t^s r^{-1})\alpha_t^s + (a^s \pi_t^s - q^{x_0})(\bar{x}_0 - z), \quad \text{for } s = 1, \dots, m \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{d\bar{x}_t^s}{dt} = (-a^s - (b^s)^2 \pi_t^s r^{-1})\bar{x}_t^s - (b^s)^2 r^{-1} (\alpha_t^s - \pi_t^s z) + a^s \bar{x}_0, \quad \text{for } s = 1, \dots, m \quad (13)$$

$$\bar{x}_t = \sum_{s=1}^m n_s \bar{x}_t^s. \quad (14)$$

■

The calculation of the collective target tracking (CTT) MF equation system (10)-(14) is performed offline locally by each agent with statistical information  $P_\theta = (n_1, \dots, n_m)$  and  $P_0$ , available at the start of the control horizon. In theory, the control scheme is fully decentralized; i.e., no communication takes place among the controllers throughout the horizon. In practice however, because of the anticipated prediction error accumulations over time, we intend to readjust periodically the control laws over long intervals based on aggregate system measurements (see Figure 2).

Note that the MF Equations for this model are significantly different from (4.6)-(4.9) in [23] which is amenable to analysis within a linear systems framework, while uniqueness of the fixed point is obtained via a sufficient contraction condition. In contrast, system (10)-(14) is fundamentally nonlinear (because of the form of  $q_t^y$ ,  $t \geq 0$ ), and  $q^y$  itself could indeed become unbounded. Special arguments have to be developed for the analysis.

### III. FIXED POINT ANALYSIS

We now tackle the fixed point analysis for (10)-(14). We consider the case  $y \leq \bar{x}_0$ , i.e. when the target temperature of the central authority is less than or equal to the initial mean temperature of the population. The analysis is very similar for the case  $\bar{x}_0 \leq y$ ; which therefore will be omitted. Note that for  $y \leq \bar{x}_0$ ,  $z$  is set to be less than  $y$ ; i.e.,  $z = l \leq y \leq \bar{x}_0 \leq h$ , so that the agents *collectively decrease* their temperatures by moving towards that target (see Figure 3).







Fig. 2. Control Architecture in Practice

Fig. 3. An Energy Release Situation ( $z \leq y \leq \bar{x}_0$ )

### A. CTT MF Equation System

Considering the CTT MF Equation System (10)-(14), we introduce in the following the operators  $\Delta$  and  $\mathcal{T}^s$ ,  $1 \leq s \leq m$ , where  $\mathcal{M} \triangleq \sum_{s=1}^m n_s \mathcal{T}^s \circ \Delta$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(\bar{x}) : \mathbf{C}_b[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}[0, \infty)$ , characterizes the complete equation system. We define the operator  $\Delta : \mathbf{C}_b[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_l[0, \infty)$ :

$$q_t^y = \left| \int_0^t g(\bar{x}_\tau - y) d\tau \right|$$

$$\triangleq \Delta(\bar{x})(t). \quad (15)$$

Next for each  $1 \leq s \leq m$ , we define  $\mathcal{T}^s : \mathbf{C}_l[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}[0, \infty)$  for the equation system (11)-(13) with input  $q_t^y$  and output  $\bar{x}_t^s$ , which is equivalent to

$$\bar{x}_t^s \triangleq (\mathcal{T}^s q)(t). \quad (16)$$

Hence, one can write the MF equation system for CTT as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{x}_t &= \left( \sum_{s=1}^m n_s \mathcal{T}^s \circ \Delta \right) (\bar{x})(t) \\ &\triangleq (\mathcal{M}\bar{x})(t), \quad t \in [0, \infty).\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

*Remark 1:* It should be noted that the image by  $\mathcal{T}^s$  of  $q$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^s(q)$ , is the optimal state of the following deterministic LQR tracking optimal control problem,

$$\begin{aligned}J(u) &= \int_0^\infty e^{-\delta t} \left( \frac{1}{2} q_t (x_t - z)^2 + \frac{1}{2} q^{x_0} (x_t - \bar{x}_0)^2 + \frac{1}{2} r u^2 \right) dt \\ \text{s.t. } \frac{d}{dt} x &= -a^s (x - \bar{x}_0) + b^s u, \quad x(0) = \bar{x}_0.\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

We need to restrict the operator  $\mathcal{M}$  on an invariant subset of a Banach Space over which it is continuous to apply a fixed point theorem, such as Schauder's theorem [31], in order to show the existence of a solution to the CTT MF equations. As shown later, the image of  $\mathcal{M}$  is included in the set  $\mathcal{G} := \{x : x \in \mathbf{C}_b[0, \infty), \quad z \leq x(t) \leq x_0\}$ . Hence, one of the candidate subsets is  $\mathcal{G} \subset (\mathbf{C}_b[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ . Indeed, the Banach space  $(\mathbf{C}_b[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$  was used in the classical LQG MFG theory. We give however in the following subsection, an example where the continuity of  $\mathcal{M}$  fails to hold on  $\mathcal{G} \subset (\mathbf{C}_b[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ . As a result, existence of a fixed point is not guaranteed. Instead here, we propose a suitable norm that weakens the topology and enlarges the space in order to force continuity. This paves the way in Subsection III-C for our proof of the existence of a fixed point.

### B. Failure of continuity under the sup-norm and suitable Banach space

We start by giving an explicit formula for the operator  $\mathcal{T}^s \circ \Delta$ . Solving equation (12), and replacing the solution in (13) give for all  $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{G}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{T}^s \circ \Delta)(\bar{x})(t) &= \phi^s(t, 0) \bar{x}_0 + (b^s)^2 r^{-1} z \int_0^t \phi^s(t, \eta) \pi_\eta^s d\eta \\ &\quad + a^s \bar{x}_0 \int_0^t \phi^s(t, \eta) d\eta + (b^s)^2 r^{-1} (\bar{x}_0 - z) \int_0^t \phi^s(t, \eta) \int_\eta^\infty \psi^s(\tau, \eta) (-a^s \pi_\tau^s + q^{x_0}) d\tau d\eta,\end{aligned}$$

with  $\phi^s(t, \eta) = \exp\left(-\int_\eta^t (a^s + (b^s)^2 \pi_\tau^s r^{-1}) d\tau\right)$  and  $\psi^s(t, \eta) = \exp\left(-\int_\eta^t (a^s + \delta + (b^s)^2 \pi_\tau^s r^{-1}) d\tau\right)$ . Using the fact that  $(b^s)^2 \pi_t^s r^{-1}$  is the derivative w.r.t.  $t$  of  $\int_\tau^t (b^s)^2 \pi_\eta^s r^{-1} d\tau$ , one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{T}^s \circ \Delta)(\bar{x})(t) &= z + \phi^s(t, 0)(\bar{x}_0 - z) \\ &\quad + ((b^s)^2 r^{-1} q^{x_0} + (a^s)^2 + a^s \delta)(\bar{x}_0 - z) \int_0^t \phi^s(t, \eta) \int_\eta^\infty \psi^s(\tau, \eta) d\tau d\eta. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The proof of the following lemma is given in Appendix A.

*Lemma 3.1:* Consider  $g(x) = x$ ,  $\bar{x}_0 = 1$ ,  $y = 0$  and  $z = -1$ . The operator  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{G} \subset (\mathbf{C}_b[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_\infty) \rightarrow (\mathbf{C}_b[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$  is not continuous.

In the proof of Lemma 3.1 it is shown that the continuity of  $\mathcal{M}$  does not hold because of the way the sup-norm evaluates the magnitude of a function. Indeed, the proof involves a sequence  $\mathcal{M}(\bar{x}^n)$  which converges uniformly to  $\mathcal{M}(y)$  when restricted to any *finite* time horizon. But, since the sup-norm assigns a non-negligible value to any function with a non-negligible value at the tail,  $\mathcal{M}(\bar{x}^n)$  does not converge to  $\mathcal{M}(y)$  under this norm. Thus, we need a norm that suppresses the value of a function at the tail. A good candidate is the norm  $\|x\|_k := \sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} |e^{-kt} x_t|$ . We also need to enlarge the space  $\mathbf{C}_b[0, \infty)$  to get a Banach space under this new norm. Thus, we define the following function space,

$$\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty) = \left\{ x : x \in \mathbf{C}[0, \infty) \text{ such that } \sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} |e^{-kt} x_t| < \infty \right\},$$

where  $k > 0$ . We establish in Lemma A.1 of Appendix A some properties of the spaces  $\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty)$ , which are used in the remainder of this paper.

Before showing the existence of a fixed point for  $\mathcal{M}$ , we need the following preliminary results. The proofs are given in Appendix B.

*Lemma 3.2:*  $Im(\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathcal{G}$ .

We make the following technical assumption.

**A2:** We assume that the function  $g$  is Lipschitz continuous on compact subsets. ■

*Lemma 3.3:* Under **A2**, the following statements hold:

- i. There exists  $k_0 > 0$ , such that  $\forall \bar{x} \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $\Delta(\bar{x})(t) = q_t^y \leq k_0 t$ .
- ii. There exist  $k_1 > 0$  and  $k_2 > 0$ , such that  $\forall \bar{x} \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $\pi_t^s \leq k_1 t + k_2$ . Here  $\pi_t^s$  is the solution of the Riccati equation (11), with  $q^y = \Delta(\bar{x})$ .

- iii. Fix  $0 < k < 2 \min_s a^s + \delta$ . There exists  $k_3 > 0$ , such that  $\forall \bar{x}, \bar{x}' \in \mathcal{G}$ , we have  $\|\pi^s - (\pi^s)'\|_k \leq k_3 \|\bar{x} - \bar{x}'\|_k$ . Here  $\pi_t^s$  and (resp.  $(\pi^s)'$ ) is the solution of the Riccati equation (11), with  $q^y = q := \Delta(\bar{x})$  (resp.  $q^y = q' := \Delta(\bar{x}')$ ).

*Lemma 3.4:*  $\overline{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})}$  is compact in  $(\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_k)$ .

### C. Fixed Point Theorem

Following the preliminary results, we present our fixed point existence theorem.

*Theorem 3.5:* Fix  $0 < k < \min_s a^s + \delta$ . Under **A2**, the following statements hold:

- for all  $\bar{x}'$  and  $\bar{x}''$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ ,  $\|\mathcal{M}(\bar{x}') - \mathcal{M}(\bar{x}'')\|_k \leq \lambda R_k \|\bar{x}' - \bar{x}''\|_k$ , where  $R_k$  is a positive constant that depends on  $k$ , and  $\lambda$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $g$  on  $[-|\bar{x}_0 - y|, |\bar{x}_0 - y|]$ .
- the map  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{G} \subset (\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_k) \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \subset (\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_k)$  has at least one fixed point.

*Proof:* The second point follows from Lemmas A.1, 3.3, 3.4, Schauder's fixed point Theorem [31], and the first point of this theorem, which we show in the remainder of this proof. Let  $\bar{x}'$  and  $\bar{x}''$  belong to  $\mathcal{G}$ . We denote respectively by  $(\pi^s)'$  and  $(\pi^s)''$  the corresponding Riccati solutions. Define  $C^s = (b^s)^2 r^{-1} q^{x_0} + (a^s)^2 + a^s \delta$ . We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}^s \circ \Delta(\bar{x}')(t) - \mathcal{T}^s \circ \Delta(\bar{x}'')(t) &= (\phi_1^s(t, 0) - \phi_2^s(t, 0)) (\bar{x}_0 - z) \\ &+ C^s(\bar{x}_0 - z) \int_0^t \phi_1^s(t, \eta) \int_\eta^\infty \psi_1^s(\tau, \eta) d\tau d\eta - C^s(\bar{x}_0 - z) \int_0^t \phi_1^s(t, \eta) \int_\eta^\infty \psi_2^s(\tau, \eta) d\tau d\eta \\ &+ C^s(\bar{x}_0 - z) \int_0^t \phi_1^s(t, \eta) \int_\eta^\infty \psi_2^s(\tau, \eta) d\tau d\eta - C^s(\bar{x}_0 - z) \int_0^t \phi_2^s(t, \eta) \int_\eta^\infty \psi_2^s(\tau, \eta) d\tau d\eta \\ &\triangleq \xi_1 + \xi_2 - \xi_3 + \xi_3 - \xi_4, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\phi_1^s(t, \eta) = \exp(-\int_\eta^t (a^s + (b^s)^2 (\pi_\tau^s)' r^{-1}) d\tau)$ ,  $\phi_2^s(t, \eta) = \exp(-\int_\eta^t (a^s + (b^s)^2 (\pi_\tau^s)'' r^{-1}) d\tau)$ ,  $\psi_1^s(t, \eta) = \exp(-\int_\eta^t (a^s + \delta + (b^s)^2 (\pi_\tau^s)' r^{-1}) d\tau)$ , and  $\psi_2^s(t, \eta) = \exp(-\int_\eta^t (a^s + \delta + (b^s)^2 (\pi_\tau^s)'' r^{-1}) d\tau)$ .

Using the inequality,  $|e^{-x} - e^{-y}| \leq e^{-\min(x, y)} |x - y|$ , for  $x$  and  $y$  positive, we obtain that

$$|\xi_1| \leq |\bar{x}_0 - z| (b^s)^2 r^{-1} e^{-a^s t} \|(\pi^s)' - (\pi^s)''\|_k \int_0^t e^{k\tau} d\tau \leq \lambda \frac{|\bar{x}_0 - z| (b^s)^2 r^{-1}}{k^2 (2 \min_s a^s + \delta - k)} \|\bar{x}' - \bar{x}''\|_k e^{kt},$$

where the second inequality follows from the third point of Lemma 3.3 and the definition of the constant  $k_3$  as developed in Appendix B. Hence,

$$\|\xi_1\|_k \leq \lambda \frac{|\bar{x}_0 - z| (b^s)^2 r^{-1}}{k^2 (2 \min_s a^s + \delta - k)} \|\bar{x}' - \bar{x}''\|_k \triangleq \lambda c_1^{sk} \|\bar{x}' - \bar{x}''\|_k$$

Using the same inequality as above, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi_2 - \xi_3| &\leq \lambda \frac{(b^s)^2 r^{-1} C^s(\bar{x}_0 - z)}{k^2 (2 \min_s a^s + \delta - k)} \|\bar{x}' - \bar{x}''\|_k \int_0^t e^{-a^s(t-\eta)} \int_\eta^\infty e^{-(a^s+\delta)(\tau-\eta)} (e^{k\tau} - e^{k\eta}) d\tau d\eta \\ &= \lambda \frac{(b^s)^2 r^{-1} C^s(\bar{x}_0 - z)}{k (2 \min_s a^s + \delta - k) (a^s + \delta) (a^s + \delta - k) (a^s + k)} \|\bar{x}' - \bar{x}''\|_k (e^{kt} - e^{-a^s t}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|\xi_2 - \xi_3\|_k \leq \lambda \frac{(b^s)^2 r^{-1} C^s(\bar{x}_0 - z)}{k (2 \min_s a^s + \delta - k) (a^s + \delta) (a^s + \delta - k) (a^s + k)} \|\bar{x}' - \bar{x}''\|_k \triangleq \lambda c_2^{sk} \|\bar{x}' - \bar{x}''\|_k.$$

We have that,

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi_3 - \xi_4| &\leq \lambda \frac{(b^s)^2 r^{-1} C^s(\bar{x}_0 - z)}{k (2 \min_s a^s + \delta - k) (a^s + \delta)} \|\bar{x}' - \bar{x}''\|_k \int_0^t e^{-a^s(t-\eta)} (e^{kt} - e^{k\eta}) d\eta \\ &\leq \lambda \frac{(b^s)^2 r^{-1} C^s(\bar{x}_0 - z)}{k a^s (2 \min_s a^s + \delta - k) (a^s + \delta)} \|\bar{x}' - \bar{x}''\|_k e^{kt}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\|\xi_3 - \xi_4\|_k \leq \lambda \frac{(b^s)^2 r^{-1} C^s(\bar{x}_0 - z)}{k a^s (2 \min_s a^s + \delta - k) (a^s + \delta)} \|\bar{x}' - \bar{x}''\|_k \triangleq \lambda c_3^{sk} \|\bar{x}' - \bar{x}''\|_k.$$

Finally, the coefficient  $R_k$  is defined as follows,

$$R_k = \sum_{s=1}^m n_s (c_1^{sk} + c_2^{sk} + c_3^{sk}). \quad (20)$$

■

*Remark 2:* If  $\lambda$  is small enough, then the operator  $\mathcal{M}$  is a contraction, and there exists a *unique* fixed point  $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{G}$ . The existence of a fixed point for (10)-(14) in essence implies the existence of a Nash equilibrium for an infinite population game. In the equilibrium, the prescribed control actions are the best responses for infinitesimal agents, and there is no unilateral profitable deviation.

#### IV. $\epsilon$ -NASH THEOREM

Here, we establish that the infinite population Nash equilibrium of Theorem 3.5 is in fact an  $\epsilon$ -Nash equilibrium when applied to the practical case of a large but finite population.

*Theorem 4.1: Collective Target Tracking MF Stochastic Control Theorem:* Assume that **A1** and **A2** hold. Then, the set  $\{(u^i)^\circ; 1 \leq N < \infty\}$ , where  $(u^i)^\circ$  is defined in (7) for a fixed point

$\bar{x}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$ , yields an  $\epsilon$ -Nash equilibrium in the sense that, for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $N(\epsilon)$  such that for all  $N \geq N(\epsilon)$

$$J_i^N((u^i)^\circ, (u^{-i})^\circ) - \epsilon \leq \inf_{u^i \in \mathcal{U}} J_i^N(u^i, (u^{-i})^\circ) \leq J_i^N((u^i)^\circ, (u^{-i})^\circ).$$

*Proof:* The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 5.6 in [23], and is therefore omitted. ■

## V. DESIRABLE NEAR FIXED POINT ALGORITHM

Theorem 3.5 states that there exists at least one fixed point of  $\mathcal{M}$ . However, it does not guarantee the existence of a practically useful fixed point. A fixed point which is desirable in practice is a sustainable mean trajectory (i.e. replicated as the mean of best responses to the associated pressure field), such that its steady-state value is *equal* to the target temperature  $y$ . In the following, we propose an algorithm that generates desirable approximate fixed points in case (i)  $g(x) = \mu x$ , and (ii)  $g$  is a continuous function equal to  $\mu(e^{\beta x} - 1)$  when restricted to  $[z - y, \bar{x}_0 - y]$ , and constant outside this interval. Here  $\beta$  and  $\mu$  are positive scalars. In both cases, the function  $g$  satisfies  $|g(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)$ , for some  $C > 0$ , under Assumption **A2**. In the second case, the part of  $g$  that is actually involved in determining the fixed points is  $\mu(e^{\beta x} - 1)$ , since a fixed point always belongs to the set  $\mathcal{G}$ . The extension of  $g$  by a constant function outside the interval  $[z - y, \bar{x}_0 - y]$  is to force the inequality  $|g(x)| \leq C(1 + |x|)$  to hold everywhere. In the following, we denote the operators  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\Delta$  by  $\mathcal{M}_\mu$  and  $\Delta_\mu$  to emphasize their dependence on  $\mu$ . We consider only the uniform case, i.e. a population with only one type of space heater. Thus, we omit the superscript  $s$  in this section.

The idea of the algorithm is to construct a family of mean trajectories indexed by  $\mu$ ,  $\{\bar{x}(\mu)\}_\mu$ , such that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x}_t(\mu) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_\mu(\bar{x}(\mu))_t = y$ . Subsequently, we find a  $\mu_*$  that minimizes  $\|\bar{x}(\mu) - \mathcal{M}_\mu(\bar{x}(\mu))\|_{L_2}$ . In this way, the mean trajectory  $\bar{x}(\mu_*)$  is approximately a fixed point, i.e. a near Nash equilibrium of the infinite population limit. Moreover, when the infinite population optimally responds to this mean, its mean  $\mathcal{M}_{\mu_*}(\bar{x}(\mu_*))$  converges to  $y$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . In order to get  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_\mu(\bar{x}(\mu))_t = y$ , the cost coefficient trajectory  $q_t^y(\mu) = \Delta_\mu(\bar{x}(\mu))$  must converge to  $q_\infty^{y*}$ ,

satisfying the following algebraic equations:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (-2a - \delta)\pi_\infty - b^2 r^{-1} \pi_\infty^2 + q_\infty^{y*} + q^{x_0}, \\ 0 &= (-a - \delta - b^2 \pi_\infty r^{-1})s_\infty + (a\pi_\infty - q^{x_0})(\bar{x}_0 - z), \\ 0 &= (-a - b^2 \pi_\infty r^{-1})y - b^2 r^{-1}(s_\infty - \pi_\infty z) + a\bar{x}_0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\pi_\infty$ ,  $s_\infty$  denote the steady state values for Riccati and offset equations respectively. Solving the equation system for  $q_\infty^{y*}$  yields the unique solution:

$$q_\infty^{y*} = \frac{[a(a + \delta)r + q^{x_0}b^2]}{b^2} \left( \frac{\bar{x}_0 - y}{y - z} \right). \quad (21)$$

Thus, it remains to find a family of mean trajectories  $\{\bar{x}(\mu)\}_\mu$  that converge to  $y$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , and such that their corresponding cost coefficient trajectories converge to  $q_\infty^{y*}$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Indeed, the near Nash desirable mean trajectory will be sought for within that family. We construct the family as follows. We start by applying the cost coefficient trajectory  $q_t^y = nq_\infty^{y*}$  for  $t \in [0, t_0]$  and  $q_t^y = q_\infty^{y*}$  for  $t > t_0$ , for some  $n > 1$  and  $t_0 > 0$ . This cost coefficient trajectory generates a mean trajectory  $\bar{x}^{sup} = \mathcal{T}(q_t^y)$  which will constitute an upper boundary of our search set. Clearly,  $\bar{x}^{sup}$  converges to  $y$ , in fact exponentially so, since the  $q_t^y$  that generates it becomes constant after finite time  $t_0$ . Similarly, we get  $\bar{x}^{inf}$ , the lower boundary of the search set, by applying the same cost coefficient where we replace  $n$  by a larger number  $N$ .  $\bar{x}^{sup}$  is greater than  $\bar{x}^{inf}$  since it is generated by a cost coefficient lower than that of  $\bar{x}^{inf}$ , thus corresponding to a lower pressure field [32]. Afterward, we define  $\mu_{sup} = q_\infty^{y*} / \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_1(\bar{x}^{sup})$ , with the integral in the denominator guaranteed to remain finite, because of the exponential convergence of the mean to the target. Thus, by construction,  $q^{sup} = \Delta_{\mu_{sup}}(\bar{x}^{sup})$  converges to  $q_\infty^{y*}$ . Similarly, we define  $\mu_{inf}$ , such that  $q^{inf} = \Delta_{\mu_{inf}}(\bar{x}^{inf})$  converges to  $q_\infty^{y*}$ . If we choose  $t_0$  small,  $n$  and  $N$  close to one, then  $\bar{x}^{inf}$  and  $\bar{x}^{sup}$  undershoot the target temperature  $y$  for a small interval of time and climb back to  $y$ . As a result, the negative parts of the integrals  $\int_0^\infty g(\bar{x}^{inf} - y)dt$  and  $\int_0^\infty g(\bar{x}^{sup} - y)dt$  do not outweigh the positive parts. In this way, for any  $\mu > 0$ , if  $\bar{x}^{inf} \leq \bar{x} \leq \bar{x}' \leq \bar{x}^{sup}$ , then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_\mu(\bar{x}) \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_\mu(\bar{x}')$ . In particular,  $\mu_{sup} < \mu_{inf}$ . Hence, for each  $\mu_{sup} < \mu < \mu_{inf}$ ,  $\Delta_\mu(\bar{x}^{sup})$  converges to a value greater than  $q_\infty^{y*}$ , while  $\Delta_\mu(\bar{x}^{inf})$  to a value lower than  $q_\infty^{y*}$ . We define for each  $f \in [0, 1]$  the trajectory  $\bar{x}^f = f\bar{x}^{inf} + (1 - f)\bar{x}^{sup}$ . Using the continuity of  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta_\mu(\bar{x}^f)$  with respect to  $f$ , one can use the dichotomy method to find for each  $\mu_{sup} < \mu < \mu_{inf}$ , a  $f^\mu \in [0, 1]$ ,

equivalently, a convex combination  $\bar{x}(\mu) = \bar{x}^{f^\mu}$  of  $\bar{x}^{sup}$  and  $\bar{x}^{inf}$ , such that  $\Delta_\mu(\bar{x}(\mu))$  converges to  $q_\infty^y$ . This gives the desired family of mean trajectories.

## VI. SIMULATIONS

For our numerical experiments we simulate a population of 200 space heaters. We consider a uniform population of heaters; adopt a one layer ETP model given in (1), where the capacitance ( $C_a$ ) and conductance ( $U_a$ ) parameters [33] are chosen to be 0.57 kWh/°C and 0.27 kW/°C respectively, the ambient temperature is set to -10 °C, and the volatility parameter is set to 0.15 °C/ $\sqrt{h}$ . The initial temperatures of the heaters are drawn from a Gaussian distribution with a mean of 21°C and a variance of 1. The cost function parameters  $\delta$ ,  $q^{x_0}$  and  $r$  are uniformly chosen to be 0.001, 200 and 10 respectively. We consider two scenarios. In the first scenario the heaters are controlled by the mean-field controllers (7), while in the second scenario they apply, for comparison purposes, the LQG controllers of Section II-A. We limit the size of computations by considering a finite time horizon of length  $T = 3$  hours. For the mean field game based controller, we use the function  $g(x) = \mu_* x$ , where  $\mu_* = 1484$  is computed using the algorithm of Section V.

Figure 4 shows the Near Nash Trajectory (NNT), i.e. near fixed point desirable temperature trajectory  $\bar{x}$  generated by the algorithm of Section V, the resulting Theoretical Output Mean Trajectory (TOMT)  $\mathcal{M}(\bar{x})$  and the Empirical Average Temperature (EAT) of the 200 space heaters when they optimally respond to  $\bar{x}$  by applying the mean-field controllers (7). As shown in the figure, the three trajectories are approximately identical and converge to the target temperature  $y = 20^\circ\text{C}$ . This figure illustrates also the EAT under the LQG controllers. It should be noted that both approaches, MF and LQG, succeed in forcing the empirical average space heater temperatures to converge to the target temperature. But, as shown in Figure 5 the user disturbance is much greater in the LQG case than it is in the mean field case. Indeed, this figure, which reports the temperature profiles of 10 heaters when they apply respectively the mean field and LQG controllers, shows that all the temperatures must move to  $y$  in the LQG case, while in the mean field case the temperatures stay close to their initial values, and individual devices contribution is in direct relation with their initial energy content.

Next, we consider the case where  $g(x) = \mu_*(e^{3x} - 1)$ , with  $\mu_* = 218$  is determined by the algorithm of Section V. As shown in Figure 6, the TOMT reaches for the first time the target



faster than the case with linear  $g$ , but needs more time to resettle on  $y$ . This is due to the fact that when  $\bar{x} > y$ , the dominant part of  $g$  is the exponential. This creates a high pressure field towards  $y$ . When  $\bar{x}$  undershoots  $y$ , the linear part of  $g$ , the scalar  $-1$ , becomes the dominant part, and the mean climbs slowly towards  $y$ .

Finally, we consider the case where the heaters have biased a priori estimates of the initial mean and ambient temperatures. We assume that the estimates are respectively equal to  $21^\circ C$  and  $-10^\circ C$ , while the actual values are respectively equal to  $21.5^\circ C$  and  $-11^\circ C$ . If the heaters apply the mean field controllers with linear  $g$ , which are computed based on the estimates, then the EAT will not converge to the target temperature  $y = 20^\circ C$ . To compensate the estimation error, the heaters apply at the beginning the mean field controllers. When the EAT reaches a steady state, the controllers switch to the steady-state mean field controllers, i.e. (7) where the coefficient  $q_t^y$  is replaced by a constant equal to the current  $q_t$  computed using the EAT. This constant is updated continuously, and the controller recomputed at each instant. The results are illustrated in Figure 8. The mean field controllers are applied between  $t = 0$  and  $t = 0.75$  hours. Because of the biased mean and ambient temperatures estimates, the EAT reaches a steady-state value equal to  $20.5^\circ C$  at  $t = 0.75$  hours. At this instant, the heaters switch to the steady-state mean field controllers. As a result, the controllers compensate the estimation error and force the EAT to converge to  $y = 20^\circ C$ .




Fig. 4. NNT and EAT in the mean-field (linear  $g$ ) and LQG control cases




Fig. 5. Sample paths in the mean-field (linear  $g$ ) and LQG control cases




Fig. 6. NNT and EAT in the mean-field (exponential  $g$ ) and LQG control cases




Fig. 7. Sample paths in the mean-field (exponential  $g$ ) and LQG control cases




Fig. 8. Robustness of the mean field integral control

## VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, the power of mean field game based control methodologies is applied to the problem of modulating the aggregate load of vast numbers of energy storage associated devices in power systems, in particular electric space heaters or air conditioners, acting as a buffer against the intermittency of renewable energy sources such as solar and wind. Given a target mean device temperature trajectory computed via an optimization scheme operating on a high level aggregate model of the devices, as well as the initial mean temperature in the controlled group, the devices are able generate their own control in a decentralized manner, and thus enforce their safety and comfort constraints locally and with minimal communication requirements. The proposed solution deviates from a more classical "rendez-vous" formulation which would have each element track the desired mean temperature thus introducing unnecessary control actions and causing maximum customer disturbance. The solution made possible by mean field theory enforces collective mean temperature tracking while leaving individual devices freer to remain, if possible within their comfort zone. In the proposed approach, an essential novelty is that the mean field effect is mediated by the quadratic cost function parameters under the form of an integral error, as compared to currently prevailing mean field control formulations where the mean field

effect is concentrated on the tracking signal. This variation introduces the risk of unbounded cost coefficients and a delicate mathematical analysis is necessary to establish that despite this risk, at least one fixed point solution to the associated Nash equilibrium characterizing mean field equations always exists. Also, an  $\epsilon$ -Nash Theorem guaranteeing that the Nash equilibrium is approached arbitrarily as the number of controlled devices increases is presented. The risk introduced by integral control is outweighed by the fact, as known from classical disturbance rejection theory, that the integral control structure allows robustness of tracking to a number of error sources in the modeling. While a Nash equilibrium with an unbounded cost coefficient is undesirable and may correspond to divergence from target, a numerical algorithm is developed to reliably lead to a desirable *near Nash* fixed point with finite cost coefficients. Numerical simulation results illustrate the flexibility and potential of this form of decentralized collective control, as well as the robustness character gained thanks to the introduction of integral control in the cost coefficients. Note that more accurate higher dimensional elemental models such as presented in [19] can be accommodated in a straightforward manner in the current theory.

In future work, the analysis of a cooperative framework will be carried out. Also, the extension to time varying target tracking problems and the impact of constraints on the synthesis of control laws will be subjects of future study.

## APPENDIX

### A. Preliminary results

*Proof of Lemma 3.1:* The idea for finding a counter example to continuity in the sup norm is to construct a sequence of mean trajectories  $\{\bar{x}^n\}_n \in \mathcal{G}$  (recall that  $\mathcal{G} := \{x : x \in \mathbf{C}_b[0, \infty), \quad z \leq x(t) \leq x_0\}$ ) that converges uniformly to  $y$ , in a way that the corresponding coefficients  $q_t^n$  increase to infinity as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , for each  $n \geq 0$ . Based on Remark 1 in Section III-A, we expect that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}(\bar{x}^n)(t) = z$ , for each  $n$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{M}(y)(t) = \bar{x}_0$ . Hence,  $\|\mathcal{M}(\bar{x}^n) - \mathcal{M}(y)\|_\infty$  does not converge to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

In particular, consider the sequence  $\bar{x}_t^n = y + 0.5^n$ . We have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\bar{x}^n - y\|_\infty = 0$ . The coefficients  $q^y$  that correspond to  $\bar{x}_t^n$  and  $y$  are respectively  $\Delta(\bar{x}^n) = q_t^n = 0.5^n t$  and  $\Delta(y) = 0$ , and the corresponding Riccati equations are  $(\pi_t^s)^n$  and  $\pi_b^s$ . Here,  $\pi_b^s$  is the positive solution of the following algebraic Riccati equation,

$$(-2a^s - \delta)\pi_b^s - (b^s)^2 r^{-1} (\pi_b^s)^2 + q^{x_0} = 0. \quad (22)$$

Since  $q_t^n = 0.5^n t$  increases to infinity as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , one can show that the corresponding Riccati solution  $(\pi_t^s)^n$  also increases with  $t$  to infinity. We have  $\mathcal{M}(y)(t) = \bar{x}_0$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}^s \circ \Delta(\bar{x}^n)(t) &= z + \exp\left(-\int_0^t (a^s + (b^s)^2(\pi_\tau^s)^n r^{-1}) d\tau\right) (\bar{x}_0 - z) \\ &+ ((b^s)^2 r^{-1} q^{x_0} + (a^s)^2 + a^s \delta)(\bar{x}_0 - z) \\ &\times \int_0^t \exp\left(-\int_\eta^t (a^s + (b^s)^2(\pi_\tau^s)^n r^{-1}) d\tau\right) \int_\eta^\infty \exp\left(-\int_\eta^\gamma (a^s + \delta + (b^s)^2(\pi_\tau^s)^n r^{-1}) d\tau\right) d\gamma d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Define  $f_n^s(\eta) = \int_\eta^\infty \exp\left(-\int_\eta^\gamma (a^s + \delta + (b^s)^2(\pi_\tau^s)^n r^{-1}) d\tau\right) d\gamma$ .  $f_n^s$  is the unique bounded solution of

$$\frac{df_n^s}{d\eta} = (a^s + \delta + (b^s)^2(\pi_\eta^s)^n r^{-1}) f_n^s - 1.$$

Since  $f_n^s$  is bounded,  $(\pi_\eta^s)^n$  is increasing in  $\eta$  and  $a^s + \delta + (b^s)^2(\pi_\eta^s)^n r^{-1} > 0$ , one can show that

$$0 \leq f_n^s(\eta) \leq \frac{1}{a^s + \delta + (b^s)^2(\pi_\eta^s)^n r^{-1}}.$$

Thus,  $f_n^s$  is decreasing with time and it converges to zero as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Now define the function  $g_n^s(t) = \int_0^t \exp\left(-\int_\eta^t (a^s + (b^s)^2(\pi_\tau^s)^n r^{-1}) d\tau\right) f_n^s(\eta) d\eta$ .  $g_n^s$  is the unique solution of

$$\frac{dg_n^s}{dt}(t) = - (a^s + (b^s)^2(\pi_t^s)^n r^{-1}) g_n^s(t) + f_n^s(t), \quad g_n^s(0) = 0.$$

$a^s + (b^s)^2(\pi_t^s)^n r^{-1} > 0$ , thus one can show that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g_n^s(t) = 0$ . Hence,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}^s \circ \Delta(\bar{x}^n)(t) = z$  for  $1 \leq s \leq m$ , which gives  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}(\bar{x}^n)(t) = z$ . This implies that  $\|\mathcal{M}(\bar{x}^n) - \mathcal{M}(y)(t)\|_\infty \geq |\bar{x}_0 - z|$ , and  $\mathcal{M}$  is not continuous on  $\mathcal{G} \subset (\mathbf{C}_b[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ .  $\blacksquare$

*Lemma A.1:* The following statements hold:

- i.  $(\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_k)$  is a Banach space.
- ii.  $\mathcal{G}$  is a nonempty bounded closed convex subset of  $(\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_k)$ .
- iii. If  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}$  is a family of equicontinuous functions w.r.t. the sup-norm  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ , then  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$  is a compact subset of  $(\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_k)$ .

*Proof:* i)  $\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty)$  is obviously a vector space. Let  $x^n$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty)$ . Fix a  $t \geq 0$ . We have for all  $n, m > 0$ ,  $e^{-kt}|x_t^n - x_t^{n+m}| \leq \|x^n - x^{n+m}\|_k$ . Hence,  $x_t^n$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $\mathbb{R}$ . We define  $x$  to be the pointwise limit of  $x^n$ . Fix  $t \geq 0$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . There exists  $n_0(\epsilon)$ , such for all  $n > n_0$ ,  $\|x^n - x^{n+m}\|_k < \epsilon$ , for all  $m > 0$ . Thus for all  $n > n_0$  and  $m > 0$

$$e^{-kt}|x_t^n - x_t| \leq \|x^n - x^{n+m}\|_k + e^{-kt}|x_t^{n+m} - x_t| \leq \epsilon + e^{-kt}|x_t^{n+m} - x_t|$$

Hence, for all  $t$ ,  $e^{-kt}|x_t^n - x_t| \leq \epsilon + \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} e^{-kt}|x_t^{n+m} - x_t| = \epsilon$ . Therefore,  $\|x^n - x\|_k \leq \epsilon$ , which implies that  $x^n$  converges to  $x$  under  $\|\cdot\|_k$ . It remains to show that  $x \in \mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty)$ . In fact,  $x^n$  converges to  $x$  under the norm  $\|\cdot\|_k$  means that the function  $e^{-kt}x_t^n$  converges uniformly to  $e^{-kt}x_t$ . Thus,  $e^{-kt}x_t$  is continuous and bounded, and as a result  $x$  is continuous and  $\sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} |e^{-kt}x_t| < \infty$ . This implies that  $x \in \mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty)$  and  $\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty)$  is a Banach space.

ii) The proof of non-emptiness and convexity are straightforward. For the boundedness, it suffices to remark that  $|e^{-kt}x_t| \leq |x_t|$ . It remains to prove that  $\mathcal{G}$  is closed. Let  $x^n \in \mathcal{G}$  a sequence that converges to  $x$  in  $\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty)$ . This implies that  $x^n$  converges pointwise to  $x$ . Thus, for all  $t \geq 0$ ,  $z \leq x_t \leq \bar{x}_0$ . Hence,  $x \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  is closed.

iii)  $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$  is a closed subset of the Banach space  $\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty)$ . To prove the compactness, it is sufficient to show that  $\mathcal{F}$  is totally bounded [34, Appendix A, Theorem A4], that is for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$  can be covered by a finite number of balls of radius  $\epsilon$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$ , then, there exists a time  $T(\epsilon) > 0$ , such that  $|e^{-kt}(\bar{x}_0 - z)| < \epsilon$  for all  $t \geq T$ . The set  $\mathcal{F}_T = \{f|_{[0, T]}, \text{ for } f \in \mathcal{F}\}$  is uniformly bounded and equicontinuous in  $(\mathbf{C}[0, T], \|\cdot\|_{[0, T]})$ . Hence, by Arzela-Ascoli Theorem [34], it is totally bounded in  $(\mathbf{C}[0, T], \|\cdot\|_{[0, T]})$ . Here,  $\mathbf{C}[0, T]$  denotes the set of continuous functions on  $[0, T]$ ,  $\|\cdot\|_{[0, T]}$  the corresponding sup-norm, and  $f|_{[0, T]}^j$  denotes the restriction of  $f^j$  to  $[0, T]$ . Thus, there exist  $f_{[0, T]}^1, \dots, f_{[0, T]}^n \in \mathcal{F}_T$  such that  $\mathcal{F}_T = \cup_{i=1}^n B(f_{[0, T]}^i, \epsilon)$ , where the balls  $B(f_{[0, T]}^i, \epsilon)$  are defined w.r.t.  $(\mathbf{C}([0, T]), \|\cdot\|_{[0, T]})$ . Let  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , then there exists  $1 \leq i \leq n$  such that  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |f(t) - f^i(t)| < \epsilon$ . Hence,  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} e^{-kt}|f(t) - f^i(t)| < \epsilon$ . Moreover, for all  $t \geq T$ ,  $e^{-kt}|f(t) - f^i(t)| \leq e^{-kt}|\bar{x}_0 - z| < \epsilon$ . Hence,  $\|f - f^i\|_k < \epsilon$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{F} = \cup_{i=1}^n B(f^i, \epsilon)$ , where the balls are now defined w.r.t.  $(\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_k)$ . This implies that  $\mathcal{F}$  is totally bounded in  $(\mathbf{C}_k[0, \infty), \|\cdot\|_k)$ . ■

## B. Proofs

### *Proof of Lemma 3.2:*

As noted in Remark 1,  $\bar{x}^s = \mathcal{T}^s(q_t)$ ,  $1 \leq s \leq m$ , is the optimal state of the optimal control problem (18). We denote by  $u_*^s$  the optimal control law of (18). At first, we show by contradiction that  $\bar{x}^s \leq \bar{x}_0$ . Suppose that there exists  $t_0 > 0$  such  $\bar{x}_{t_0}^s > \bar{x}_0$ . Hence, there exist  $t_1 < t_2$  such that  $\bar{x}_{t_1}^s = \bar{x}_0$  and  $\bar{x}_{t_2}^s = \bar{x}_0$  if  $t_2 < \infty$ , and such that  $\bar{x}_t^s > \bar{x}_0$  for all  $t \in (t_1, t_2)$ . Let the control law  $v$  be equal to  $u_*^s$  on  $[t_1, t_2]^c$ , and to 0 on  $[t_1, t_2]$ . This means that the state that corresponds to  $v$  is equal to  $\bar{x}_0$  on  $[t_1, t_2]$ , and to the optimal state  $\bar{x}^s$  otherwise. Hence, considering the cost

in (18),  $\inf_u J(u) > J(v)$ , which is impossible. We now show the  $z$  lower bound inequality by contradiction. We assume without loss of generality that  $\bar{x}_0 = 0$ . Suppose that there exists  $t_0 > 0$  such  $\bar{x}_{t_0}^s < z$ . Hence, there exist  $t_1 < t_2$  such that  $\bar{x}_{t_1}^s = z$  and  $\bar{x}_{t_2}^s = z$  if  $t_2 < \infty$ , and such that  $\bar{x}_t^s < z$  for all  $t \in (t_1, t_2)$ . We define the control law  $v$  to be equal to  $u_*^s$  on  $[t_1, t_2]^c$ , and to  $a^s z / b^s$  otherwise. Hence, the state that corresponds to  $v$  is equal to  $z$  on  $[t_1, t_2]$ , and to  $\bar{x}^s$  on  $[t_1, t_2]^c$ .

We have,

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{-\delta t} v^2 dt = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{-\delta t} \frac{(a^s)^2}{(b^s)^2} z^2 dt \\ I_2 &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{-\delta t} (u_*^s)^2 dt = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{-\delta t} \left\{ \frac{(a^s)^2}{(b^s)^2} (\bar{x}^s)^2 + \frac{1}{(b^s)^2} \left( \frac{d\bar{x}^s}{dt} \right)^2 + \frac{2a^s}{(b^s)^2} \bar{x}^s \frac{d\bar{x}^s}{dt} \right\} dt \\ &> I_1 + \frac{a^s}{(b^s)^2} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{-\delta t} 2\bar{x}^s \frac{d\bar{x}^s}{dt} dt. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality follows from the fact that  $\bar{x}_t^s < z$  on  $[t_1, t_2]$  with  $z < 0$  according to our assumption.

Furthermore:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} e^{-\delta t} 2\bar{x}^s \frac{d\bar{x}^s}{dt} dt &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \left\{ e^{-\delta t} 2\bar{x}^s \frac{d\bar{x}^s}{dt} - \delta e^{-\delta t} (\bar{x}^s)^2 + \delta e^{-\delta t} (\bar{x}^s)^2 \right\} dt \\ &= z^2 (e^{-\delta t_2} - e^{-\delta t_1}) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \delta e^{-\delta t} (\bar{x}^s)^2 dt \geq z^2 (e^{-\delta t_2} - e^{-\delta t_1}) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \delta e^{-\delta t} z^2 dt = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\inf_u J(u) = J(u_*^s) > J(v)$ , which is impossible. As a result  $\bar{x}^s \in \mathcal{G}$ , for  $1 \leq s \leq m$ , which implies that  $\sum_{s=1}^m n_s \bar{x}^s \in \mathcal{G}$ , and proves the result.  $\blacksquare$

*Proof of Lemma 3.3:*

i) We have  $\forall \bar{x} \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $q_t^y = \left| \int_0^t g(\bar{x}_\tau - y_\tau) d\tau \right| \leq \max_{|x| \leq |\bar{x}_0 - z|} |g(x)| t \triangleq k_0 t$ .

ii)  $\forall \bar{x} \in \mathcal{G}$ ,

$$\frac{d\pi_t^s}{dt} = (2a^s + \delta)\pi_t^s + (b^s)^2 r^{-1} (\pi_t^s)^2 - q_t^y - q^{x_0} = (2a^s + \delta + (b^s)^2 r^{-1} \pi_t^s) \pi_t^s - q_t^y - q^{x_0}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_t^s &= \int_t^\infty \exp \left( - \int_t^\eta (2a^s + \delta + (b^s)^2 r^{-1} \pi_\tau^s) d\tau \right) (q_\eta^y + q^{x_0}) d\eta \leq \int_t^\infty (k_0 \eta + q^{x_0}) e^{-2a^s(\eta-t)} d\eta \\ &\leq \frac{k_0}{2 \min_s a^s} t + \frac{k_0}{4 \min_s (a^s)^2} + \frac{q^{x_0}}{2 \min_s a^s} \triangleq k_1 t + k_2. \end{aligned}$$

iii) We have  $\forall \bar{x}, \bar{x}' \in \mathcal{G}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-kt} |q_t - q'_t| &\leq e^{-kt} \int_0^t |g(\bar{x}_\tau - y_\tau) - g(\bar{x}'_\tau - y_\tau)| d\tau \leq \lambda e^{-kt} \int_0^t e^{k\tau} e^{-k\tau} |\bar{x}_\tau - \bar{x}'_\tau| d\tau \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda}{k} \|\bar{x} - \bar{x}'\|_k, \end{aligned}$$



where  $\lambda$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $g$  on the compact subset  $[-|\bar{x}_0 - z|, |\bar{x}_0 - z|]$ . We define  $\bar{\pi}_t^s = e^{-kt}\pi_t^s$ ,  $(\bar{\pi}_t^s)' = e^{-kt}(\pi_t^s)'$ ,  $\tilde{\pi}_t^s = \bar{\pi}_t^s - (\bar{\pi}_t^s)'$ , and  $\tilde{q}_t = e^{-kt}(q_t - q_t')$ . We obtain that,

$$\frac{d\tilde{\pi}_t^s}{dt} = (2a^s + \delta - k + e^{kt}(b^s)^2 r^{-1} (\bar{\pi}_t^s + (\bar{\pi}_t^s)')) \tilde{\pi}_t^s - \tilde{q}_t.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\pi}_t^s| &= \left| \int_t^\infty \tilde{q}_\eta \exp \left( - \int_t^\eta (2a^s + \delta - k + e^{k\tau}(b^s)^2 r^{-1} (\bar{\pi}_\tau^s + (\bar{\pi}_\tau^s)')) d\tau \right) d\eta \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda}{k(2\min_s a^s + \delta - k)} \|\bar{x} - \bar{x}'\|_k \triangleq k_3 \|\bar{x} - \bar{x}'\|_k. \end{aligned}$$

■

*Proof of Lemma 3.4:*

Based on the third point of Lemma A.1, it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$  forms a family of equicontinuous functions w.r.t. the sup-norm. This can be done by showing that the family of derivatives of the functions in  $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{G})$  is uniformly bounded. We have for all  $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{G}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathcal{T}^s \circ \Delta(\bar{x})}{dt}(t) &= (a^s + (b^s)^2 \pi_t^s r^{-1}) \phi^s(t, 0) (\bar{x}_0 - z) \\ &\quad + ((b^s)^2 r^{-1} q^{x_0} + (a^s)^2 + a^s \delta) (\bar{x}_0 - z) \int_t^\infty \psi^s(\tau, t) d\tau d\eta \\ &\quad - ((b^s)^2 r^{-1} q^{x_0} + (a^s)^2 + a^s \delta) (\bar{x}_0 - z) \int_0^t (a^s + (b^s)^2 \pi_t^s r^{-1}) \phi^s(t, \eta) \int_\eta^\infty \psi^s(\tau, \eta) d\tau d\eta \\ &\triangleq \xi_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3. \end{aligned}$$

The function  $\phi^s(t, 0)$  is the unique solution of the following differential equation,

$$\frac{d\phi^s(t, 0)}{dt} = -A_t^s \phi^s(t, 0), \quad \phi^s(0, 0) = 1.$$

with  $A_t^s = a^s + (b^s)^2 r^{-1} \pi_t^s$ . We show in the following that the product  $\phi^s(t, 0) A_t^s$  is bounded.

But,  $\phi^s(t, 0) A_t^s$  satisfies

$$\frac{d(\phi^s(t, 0) A_t^s)}{dt} = -A_t^s (\phi^s(t, 0) A_t^s) + \dot{A}_t^s \phi^s(t, 0).$$

Hence,  $\phi^s(t, 0) A_t^s = A_0^s e^{-\int_0^t A_\tau^s d\tau} + \int_0^t e^{-\int_\eta^t A_\tau^s d\tau} \dot{A}_\eta^s \phi^s(\eta, 0) d\eta$ . We have  $|A_0^s| \leq a^s + (b^s)^2 r^{-1} k_2$  and  $\|\phi^s(t, 0)\|_\infty \leq 1$ , where  $k_2$  is defined in the second point of Lemma 3.3. Fix  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ , and define the functions  $\tilde{\pi}_t^s = \pi_{t+h}^s - \pi_t^s$  and  $\tilde{q}_t = q_{t+h}^y - q_t^y$ . We have

$$-\frac{d\tilde{\pi}_t^s}{dt} = -(2a^s + \delta + (b^s)^2 r^{-1} (\pi_t^s + \pi_{t+h}^s)) \tilde{\pi}_t^s + \tilde{q}_t.$$

Hence,  $\tilde{\pi}_t^s = \int_t^\infty \tilde{q}_\tau \exp\left(-\int_t^\tau (2a^s + \delta + (b^s)^2 r^{-1}(\pi_\eta^s + \pi_{\eta+h}^s))d\eta\right) d\tau$ . Thus,

$$|\tilde{\pi}_t^s| \leq h \frac{\max_{|x| \leq |\bar{x}_0 - z|} |g(x)|}{2a^s} \Rightarrow \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left| \frac{\tilde{\pi}_t^s}{h} \right| \leq \frac{\max_{|x| \leq |\bar{x}_0 - z|} |g(x)|}{2a^s} \Rightarrow \left\| \frac{d\pi_t^s}{dt} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\max_{|x| \leq |\bar{x}_0 - z|} |g(x)|}{2a^s}.$$

Hence recalling the definition of  $A^s$  above,  $\dot{A}^s$  is uniformly bounded, and as a result  $\phi^s(t, 0)A_t^s$  is uniformly bounded by  $M^s > 0$ . This implies that  $|\xi_1| \leq M^s |\bar{x}_0 - z| \triangleq K_1^s$ . Recalling the definition of  $\psi^s(\tau, t)$  in Section III-B above, the second and third terms satisfy the following inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi_2| &\leq ((b^s)^2 r^{-1} q^{x_0} + (a^s)^2 + a^s \delta) |\bar{x}_0 - z| \int_0^\infty e^{-a^s \tau} d\eta \triangleq K_2^s \\ |\xi_3| &\leq \frac{1}{a^s} ((b^s)^2 r^{-1} q^{x_0} + (a^s)^2 + a^s \delta) |\bar{x}_0 - z| \int_0^t (a^s + (b^s)^2 \pi_\eta^s r^{-1}) \phi^s(t, \eta) d\eta. \end{aligned}$$

We define on  $[0, \infty)$ ,  $f_t^s = \int_0^t \phi^s(t, \eta) d\eta$ .  $f_t^s$  is the unique solution of

$$\frac{df_t^s}{dt}(t) = -A_t^s f_t^s + 1, \quad f_0^s = 0,$$

where  $A$  is defined above. Therefore,  $\frac{d(f_t^s A_t^s - 1)}{dt} = -A_t^s (f_t^s A_t^s - 1) + \dot{A}_t^s f_t^s$ . Solving this equation gives

$$f_t^s A_t^s - 1 = -e^{-\int_0^t A_\tau^s d\tau} + \int_0^t e^{-\int_\eta^t A_\tau^s d\tau} \dot{A}_\eta^s f_\eta^s d\eta.$$

We have  $\|f_t^s\|_\infty \leq 1/a^s$ . Hence,  $f_t^s A_t^s - 1$  is uniformly bounded. Denote  $M_1^s$  the bound of  $f_t^s A_t^s$ . We get that the third term  $|\xi_3| \leq \frac{1}{a^s} ((b^s)^2 r^{-1} q^{x_0} + (a^s)^2 + a^s \delta) |\bar{x}_0 - z| M_1^s = K_3^s$ . Finally, the derivative  $\left\| \frac{d\mathcal{M}(\bar{x})}{dt} \right\|_\infty \leq \sum_{s=1}^m n_s (K_1^s + K_2^s + K_3^s)$ , where  $K_1^s$ ,  $K_2^s$  and  $K_3^s$  do not depend on  $q_t^y$ . This proves the result. ■

## REFERENCES

- [1] B. M. Mitchell, W. G. Manning, and J. P. Acton, *Electricity pricing and load management: Foreign experience and California opportunities*. Internat. Inst. of Management, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin, 1977.
- [2] “California renewable energy overview and programs,” <http://www.energy.ca.gov/renewables/>.
- [3] “Germany leads way on Renewables, sets 45% target by 2030,” <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/5430>.
- [4] “A tricky transition from fossil fuel,” <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/11/science/earth/denmark-aims-for-100-percent-renewable-energy.html>.
- [5] L. Hirth and I. Ziegenhagen, “Control power and variable renewables,” in *European Energy Market (EEM), 2013 10th International Conference on the*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1–8.

- [6] T. Ackermann, E. M. Carlini, B. Ernst, F. Groome, A. Orths, J. O'Sullivan, M. de la Torre Rodriguez, and V. Silva, "Integrating variable renewables in europe: Current status and recent extreme events," *IEEE Power and Energy Magazine*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 67–77, 2015.
- [7] G. El Rahi, W. Saad, A. Glass, N. B. Mandayam, and H. V. Poor, "Prospect theory for prosumer-centric energy trading in the smart grid," in *Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference (ISGT), 2016 IEEE Power & Energy Society*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–5.
- [8] R. P. Malhamé and C.-Y. Chong, "Electric load model synthesis by diffusion approximation of a high-order hybrid-state stochastic system," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 30, no. 9, pp. 854–860, Sep. 1985.
- [9] J. C. Laurent and R. P. Malhamé, "A physically-based computer model of aggregate electric water heating loads," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 1209 – 1217, 1994.
- [10] D. S. Callaway, "Tapping the energy storage potential in electric loads to deliver load following and regulation, with application to wind energy," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 50, pp. 1389–1400, 2009.
- [11] J. Mathieu, S. Koch, and D. Callaway, "State estimation and control of electric loads to manage real-time energy imbalance," in *Power and Energy Society General Meeting (PES), 2013 IEEE*, July 2013, pp. 1–1.
- [12] L. Totu, J. Leth, and R. Wisniewski, "Control for large scale demand response of thermostatic loads," in *American Control Conference (ACC), 2013*, June 2013, pp. 5023–5028.
- [13] S. Meyn, P. Barooah, A. Bušić, and J. Ehren, "Ancillary service to the grid from deferrable loads: The case for intelligent pool pumps in Florida," in *Proceedings of the 52nd IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, Dec 2013, pp. 6946–6953.
- [14] Y. Chen, A. Bušić, and S. Meyn, "Individual risk in mean-field control models for decentralized control, with application to automated demand response," in *Proceedings of the 53rd IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, Dec 2014, pp. 6425–6432.
- [15] —, "State estimation and mean field control with application to demand dispatch," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1504.00088, 2015.
- [16] J. L. Mathieu, D. S. Callaway, and S. Kiliccote, "Examining uncertainty in demand response baseline models and variability in automated response to dynamic pricing," in *49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2010, pp. 4332–4339.
- [17] F. Tahersima, J. Stoustrup, S. Afkhami, and H. Rasmussen, "Contribution of domestic heating systems to smart grid control," in *50th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2011, pp. 3677–3681.
- [18] Z. Ma, D. S. Callaway, and I. Hiskens, "Decentralized charging control for large populations of plug-in electric vehicles," in *49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2010, pp. 206–212.
- [19] W. Zhang, J. Lian, C.-Y. Chang, and K. Kalsi, "Aggregated modeling and control of air conditioning loads for demand response," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 4655–4664, Nov 2013.
- [20] J. M. Lasry and P.-L. Lions, "Jeux à champ moyen. i - le cas stationnaire," *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I*, vol. 343, pp. 619–625, 2006.
- [21] M. Huang, P. E. Caines, and R. P. Malhamé, "Individual and mass behaviour in large population stochastic wireless power control problems: centralized and Nash equilibrium solutions," in *42nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Maui, Hawaii, Dec. 2003, pp. 98–103.
- [22] M. Huang, R. P. Malhamé, and P. E. Caines, "Large population stochastic dynamic games: Closed loop McKean-Vlasov systems and the Nash certainty equivalence principle," *Special issue in honour of the 65th birthday of Tyrone Duncan, Communications in Information and Systems*, vol. 6, pp. 221–252, Nov. 2006.
- [23] M. Huang, P. E. Caines, and R. P. Malhamé, "Large population cost-coupled LQG problems with non-uniform agents: individual-mass behaviour and decentralized  $\epsilon$  - Nash equilibria," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 1560–1571, Sep. 2007.

- [24] P. E. Caines, “Mean field games,” in *Encyclopedia of Systems and Control*, T. Samad and J. Baillieul, Eds. Springer London, 2014, pp. 1–6. [Online]. Available: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-5102-9\\_30-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-5102-9_30-1)
- [25] R. Ortega, A. Astolfi, and N. E. Barabanov, “Nonlinear pi control of uncertain systems: an alternative to parameter adaptation,” *Systems & control letters*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 259–278, 2002.
- [26] R. Soderregger, “Dynamic models of house heating based on equivalent thermal parameters,” Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1978.
- [27] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve, *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*. Springer-Verlag, 1988.
- [28] M. Nourian, P. E. Caines, R. P. Malhamé, and M. Huang, “Mean field LQG control in leader-follower stochastic multi-agent systems: Likelihood ratio based adaptation,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Cont.*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 2801–2816, 2012.
- [29] B. Anderson and J. B. Moore, *Optimal Control: Linear Quadratic Methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1989.
- [30] M. Huang, “Large-population LQG games involving a major player: the Nash Certainty Equivalence principle,” *SIAM J. on Control and Optimization*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 3318–3353, 2010.
- [31] J. B. Conway, *A Course in Functional Analysis - 2nd ed.* Springer, 1990.
- [32] R. R. Bitmead and M. Gevers, *Riccati Difference and Differential Equations: Convergence, Monotonicity and Stability*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1991, pp. 263–291.
- [33] “Residential module user’s guide, [online]. Available: = [http://gridlab-d.shoutwiki.com/wiki/residential\\_module\\_user%27s\\_guide,](http://gridlab-d.shoutwiki.com/wiki/residential_module_user%27s_guide,),”
- [34] W. Rudin, *Functional Analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.