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1 Consider the active shock absorber in Figure 1. The dynamics of the system satisfies the balance of forces $m a+k p+c v=f_{h}$, where $a$ is the acceleration of the mass $m, p$ is the displacement of the mass, $v$ is the velocity of the mass, $f_{h}$ is the force exerted by a hydraulic actuator, $k$ is the spring constant, and $c$ is the damping coefficient. The actuator dynamics are approximated by a first order lag $\tau\left(\frac{d}{d t} f_{h}\right)=-f_{h}+u$ with time constant $\tau>0$ and input $u$.
(a) (i) Given the state vector $x=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}p & v & f_{h}\end{array}\right]^{T}$ and measured output $y=p$, show that the overall system behaviour is characterised by the linear equations
$\dot{x}=A x+B u, y=C x+D u$, where

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{rrr}
0 & 1 & 0  \tag{1}\\
-\frac{k}{m} & -\frac{c}{m} & \frac{1}{m} \\
0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\tau}
\end{array}\right], \quad B=\left[\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
0 \\
\frac{1}{\tau}
\end{array}\right], \quad C=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
1 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right], \quad D=0
$$

(ii) Show that this system is stable.
(b) Let $Q$ be the infinite-time observability gramian: $Q=\int_{0}^{\infty} e^{A^{T} t} C^{T} C e^{A t} d t$.
(i) Show that $Q$ is a solution to the Lyapunov equation $A^{T} Q+Q A+C^{T} C=0$.
(ii) If $Q>0$, show that $(A, C)$ is observable (without computing the observability matrix).
(c) (i) What is meant by a balanced realisation of a transfer function, and by its Hankel singular values?
(ii) Explain how a balanced realisation of a stable system can be used to obtain lower-order approximations of the system.
(iii) Let $G(s)=C(s I-A)^{-1} B$, where $A, B, C$ are defined in (1) for some particular parameter values. $\hat{G}(s)$ is a second-order approximate model of $G(s)$, obtained from a balanced realisation. Figure 2 shows the Bode magnitude plot of $E(s)=$ $G(s)-\hat{G}(s)$. Estimate $\|E\|_{\infty}$, and hence obtain lower and upper bounds for the third Hankel singular value of $G(s)$.


Fig. 1


Fig. 2
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2 A mass-spring-damper system with a unit mass is described by the state-space equations

$$
\dot{x}=A x+B u+B w=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
0 & 1  \tag{2}\\
0 & 0
\end{array}\right] x+\left[\begin{array}{l}
0 \\
1
\end{array}\right] u+\left[\begin{array}{l}
0 \\
1
\end{array}\right] w, \quad y=C x=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0
\end{array}\right] x
$$

where $u=K x=-[k, c] x$ is the force acting on the mass, $y$ is the position of the mass, $k$ is the spring stiffness and $c$ is the damper coefficient.
(a) Take $w=0$ and consider the cost

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{\infty}\left[x(t)^{T} Q x(t)+u(t)^{T} R u(t)\right] d t, \quad \text { where } \quad Q=C^{T} C \text { and } R=1 . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

(i) Show that the values of $k$ and $c$ which minimise the cost (3) are given by

$$
\left[\begin{array}{ll}
k & c
\end{array}\right]=B^{T} X \text { for } X=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
\sqrt{2} & 1 \\
1 & \sqrt{2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

(ii) Noting that $(A, B)$ is controllable and $(A, C)$ is observable, what conclusion can be drawn about the stability of $(A+B K)$, if $K=-[k, c]$ is chosen as in part (i)?
(b) Let $u$ and $y$ be the input and output signal vectors of a system with transfer function $G(s)$.
(i) The infinity norm $\|G\|_{\infty}$ satisfies the relationship $\|G\|_{\infty}=\sup \|y\|_{2} /\|u\|_{2}$ where the supremum is taken over all non-zero inputs with $\|u\|_{2}<\infty$. How are the signal norms $\|u\|_{2}$ and $\|y\|_{2}$ defined?
(ii) If $V(x)=x^{T} X x$ for some $X=X^{T}>0, G(s)=C(s I-A)^{-1} B$, and $X$ satisfies the Riccati equation

$$
A^{T} X+X A+C^{T} C+\frac{1}{\gamma^{2}} X B B^{T} X=0
$$

then it can be shown that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d V}{d t}+y^{T} y-\gamma^{2} u^{T} u \leq 0 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Show that, if (4) holds, then $\|G\|_{\infty} \leq \gamma$.
(iii) For the system defined in (2), let $H(s)$ be the transfer function from $w$ to $y$. If the coefficients $k$ and $c$ are chosen as in part (a)(i), show that $\|H\|_{\infty} \leq 1$.
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3
(a) (i) How is a convex set defined?
(ii) When is an optimisation problem convex?
(iii) Give two examples of convex optimisation problems.
(b) A plant with state $x_{k}$ and input $u_{k}$ at time $k$ is described by the discrete-time statespace model $x_{k+1}=A x_{k}+B u_{k}$. A predictive controller minimises the cost function

$$
V\left(x_{0}, u_{0}, u_{1}, \ldots, u_{N-1}\right)=x_{N}^{T} P x_{N}+\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\left(x_{k}^{T} Q x_{k}+u_{k}^{T} R u_{k}\right)
$$

subject to the constraints $M x_{k}+E u_{k} \leq b$ for $k=0,1, \ldots, N-1$. Show that this problem can be written as a standard quadratic programming problem of the form

$$
\text { minimise } \theta^{T} H \theta \quad \text { subject to } \quad F \theta-f=0 \quad \text { and } \quad G \theta-g \leq 0
$$

for suitable matrices $F, G, H$ and suitable vectors $f, g$, with the vector $\theta$ containing the decision variables $u_{0}, u_{1}, \ldots, u_{N-1}$ and $x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{N}$.
(c) A 'terminal constraint' of the form $M_{N} x_{N} \leq b_{N}$ is sometimes added to predictive control problems. Comment briefly (without technical details) on the reason for adding such a constraint, and on the properties that it should satisfy.
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4 An unconstrained predictive controller determines the input signal $u(k)$ at time $k$ by minimising the cost function

$$
V(x(k), \mathbf{u})=x_{N}^{T} P x_{N}+\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}\left(x_{i}^{T} Q x_{i}+u_{i}^{T} R u_{i}\right)
$$

where $x(k)$ is the measured current state, $x_{0}=x(k)$,

$$
x_{i+1}=A x_{i}+B u_{i} \quad \text { for } \quad i=0,1, \ldots, N-1
$$

and setting $u(k)=u_{0}^{*}$, where the minimising input sequence is

$$
\mathbf{u}^{*}=\left(u_{0}^{*}, u_{1}^{*}, \ldots, u_{N-1}^{*}\right) .
$$

(a) Explain why repeated determination of the input signal in this manner results in a feedback system.
(b) What is meant by the phrase terminal cost in this context?
(c) Assume that $P>0, Q>0$ and $R>0$, and that $K$ is a matrix such that all the eigenvalues of $A+B K$ lie within the unit circle. Show that, if

$$
(A+B K)^{T} P(A+B K)-P \leq-Q-K^{T} R K
$$

then the origin $(x=0)$ of the closed-loop system with the predictive controller is asymptotically stable.
(d) A particular 1-input, 1-state system has $A=1.2, B=1$, and the control system designer chooses $Q=5$ and $R=2$. Find a $P$ which results in an asymptotically stable closed-loop system.

## END OF PAPER

## ANSWERS

Q.1(C)(iii): $0.0067 \leq \sigma_{3} \leq 0.0133$ (but $0.007 \leq \sigma_{3} \leq 0.014$ is acceptable).
Q.4(d): There is no unique answer to this question. $K$ must be chosen in the range $-2.2<K<-0.2$. Once a $K$ is chosen in this range, $P$ must be chosen to be larger than the value given in the following table:

| K | -2.1 | -2.0 | -1.9 | -1.8 | -1.7 | -1.6 | -1.5 | -1.4 | -1.3 | -1.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P | 72.74 | 36.11 | 23.96 | 17.94 | 14.37 | 12.05 | 10.44 | 9.29 | 8.46 | 7.88 |
| K | -1.1 | -1.0 | -0.9 | -0.8 | -0.7 | -0.6 | -0.5 | -0.4 | -0.3 |  |
| P | 7.49 | 7.29 | 7.27 | 7.48 | 7.97 | 8.94 | 10.78 | 14.78 | 27.26 |  |

