

DETERMINISTIC OBSERVATION THEORY AND APPLICATIONS

JEAN-PAUL GAUTHIER

IVAN KUPKA



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, VIC 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press 2001

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2001

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Times Roman 10.25/13 pt. *System* L^AT_EX 2_ε [TB]

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Gauthier, Jean-Paul.

Deterministic observation theory and applications / Jean-Paul Gauthier, Ivan Kupka.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-521-80593-7

1. Observers (Control theory) 2. Missing observations (Statistics) I. Kupka, Ivan,
1937– II. Title.

QA402.3 .G378 2001

003–dc21

2001025571

ISBN 0 521 80593 7 hardback

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page ix</i>
1 Introduction	1
1. Systems under Consideration	1
2. What Is Observability?	2
3. Summary of the Book	2
4. The New Observability Theory Versus the Old Ones	3
5. A Word about Prerequisites	4
6. Comments	5
Part I. Observability and Observers	
2 Observability Concepts	9
1. Infinitesimal and Uniform Infinitesimal Observability	9
2. The Canonical Flag of Distributions	11
3. The Phase-Variable Representation	12
4. Differential Observability and Strong Differential Observability	14
5. The Trivial Foliation	15
6. Appendix: Weak Controllability	19
3 The Case $d_y \leq d_u$	20
1. Relation Between Observability and Infinitesimal Observability	20
2. Normal Form for a Uniform Canonical Flag	22
3. Characterization of Uniform Infinitesimal Observability	24
4. Complements	26
5. Proof of Theorem 3.2	29

4	The Case $d_y > d_u$	36
1.	Definitions and Notations	37
2.	Statement of Our Differential Observability Results	40
3.	Proof of the Observability Theorems	42
4.	Equivalence between Observability and Observability for Smooth Inputs	51
5.	The Approximation Theorem	57
6.	Complements	58
7.	Appendix	59
5	Singular State-Output Mappings	68
1.	Assumptions and Definitions	68
2.	The Ascending Chain Property	71
3.	The Key Lemma	73
4.	The $ACP(N)$ in the Controlled Case	78
5.	Globalization	81
6.	The Controllable Case	84
6	Observers: The High-Gain Construction	86
1.	Definition of Observer Systems and Comments	87
2.	The High-Gain Construction	95
3.	Appendix	120
	Part II. Dynamic Output Stabilization and Applications	123
7	Dynamic Output Stabilization	125
1.	The Case of a Uniform Canonical Form	126
2.	The General Case of a Phase-Variable Representation	132
3.	Complements	141
8	Applications	143
1.	Binary Distillation Columns	143
2.	Polymerization Reactors	163
	<i>Appendix</i>	179
	<i>Solutions to Part I Exercises</i>	195
	<i>Bibliography</i>	217
	<i>Index of Main Notations</i>	221
	<i>Index</i>	224

1

Introduction

In this book, we present a **new, general, and complete theory of observability** and observation, deriving from our papers [18, 19, 32]. This theory is entirely **in the deterministic setting**. Let us mention here that there are several papers preceding these three that exploit the same basic ideas with weaker results. See [16, 17], in collaboration with H. Hammouri.

A list of all main notations is given in an index, page 221.

1. Systems under Consideration

We are concerned with general nonlinear systems of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Sigma) \quad \frac{dx}{dt} &= f(x, u), \\ y &= h(x, u), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

typically denoted by Σ , where x , **the state**, belongs to X , an n -dimensional, connected, Hausdorff paracompact differentiable manifold, y , the **output**, takes values in R^{d_y} , and u , the **control variable**, takes values in $U \subset R^{d_u}$. For the sake of simplicity, we take $U = R^{d_u}$ or $U = I^{d_u}$, where $I \subset R$ is a closed interval. But typically U could be any closed submanifold of R^{d_u} with a boundary, a nonempty interior, and possibly with corners. Unless explicitly stated, X has no boundary.

The set of systems will be denoted by $S = F \times H$, where F is the set of u -parametrized vector fields f , and H is the set of functions h . In general, **except when explicitly stated**, f and h are C^∞ . However, depending on the context, we will have to consider also analytic systems (C^ω), or C^r systems, for some $r \in \mathcal{N}$. Thus, if necessary, the required degree of differentiability will be stated, but in most cases the notations will remain S, F, H .

The simplest case is when U is empty, the so-called “uncontrolled case.” In that situation, we will be able to prove more results than in the general case.

Usually, in practical situations, the output function h of the system does not depend on u . Unfortunately, from the theoretical point of view, this assumption is very awkward and leads to clumsy statements. For that reason, we will currently assume that h depends on the control u .

2. What Is Observability?

The preliminary definition we give here is the oldest one; it comes from the basic theory of linear control systems.

Roughly speaking, “observability” stands for the possibility of reconstructing the full trajectory from the observed data, that is, from the output trajectory in the uncontrolled case, or from the couple (output trajectory, control trajectory) in the controlled case. In other words, observability means that the mapping

$$\text{initial} - \text{state} \rightarrow \text{output} - \text{trajectory}$$

is injective, for all fixed control functions. More precise definitions will be given later in the book.

3. Summary of the Book

1. When the number d_y of observations is smaller than or equal to the number d_u of controls, then the relevant observability property is very rigid and is not stable under small perturbations, for germs of systems. Because of that rigidity, this observability property can be given a simple geometric characterization. This is the content of the paper [18] and the purpose of Chapter 3.

2. If, on the contrary, $d_y > d_u$, a remarkable phenomenon happens: The observability becomes generic, in a very strong sense, and for very general classes of control functions.

In Chapter 4, we state and prove a cornucopia of genericity results about observability as we define it. The most important of these results are contained in paper [19]. Some of these results present real technical difficulties.

3. The singular case: in the preceding two cases, the *initial – state* \rightarrow *output – trajectory* mapping is regular. What happens if it becomes singular? This problem is too complex. In classical singularity theory, there is a useful and manageable concept of mapping with singularities: that of a “finite mapping.” It is interesting that, in the uncontrolled analytic case, this concept can be extended to our *initial – state* \rightarrow *output – trajectory* mappings, according to a very original idea of P. Jouan. This idea leads to the very interesting results of paper [32]. The controlled case is very different: If the system is singular, then it is not controllable. In this case, we also have several results,

giving a complete solution of the observation problem. These developments form the content of Chapter 5.

4. Observers: An observer is a device that performs the practical task of state reconstruction. In all cases mentioned above, (1, 2, 3), an asymptotic observer can be constructed explicitly, under the guise of a differential equation that estimates the state of the system asymptotically. The estimation error has an arbitrarily large exponential decay. This is the so-called “high gain construction.”

This construction is an adaptation to the nonlinear case of the “Luenberger,” or of the “extended Kalman filter” method. The last one performs very well in practice. We will present these topics in Chapter 6.

5. Output stabilization: this study can be applied to output stabilization in the preceding cases 1, 2, and 3 above. One of our main results in [32] states that one can stabilize asymptotically a system via an asymptotic observer, using the output observations only, if one can stabilize it asymptotically using smooth state feedback.

This result is “semi-global”: One can do this on arbitrarily large compacta. Let us note that, in cases 1 and 2, the *initial – state* \rightarrow *output – trajectory* mapping is always immersive. In that case, the stabilizing feedback can be arbitrary. But, if the *initial – state* \rightarrow *output – trajectory* mapping is not immersive, then it has to belong to a certain special ring of functions. These results are developed in Chapter 7.

6. In the last chapter, Chapter 8, we give a summary description of two applications in the area of chemical engineering. These represent the fallout from our long cooperation with the Shell company.

The first one, about distillation columns, is of practical interest because distillation columns really are **generic** objects in the petroleum and chemical industries. This application is a perfect illustration of the methods we are proposing for the problems of both observation and dynamic output stabilization.

The second application deals with polymerization reactors, and it constitutes also a very interesting and pertinent illustration. Both applications are the subjects of the articles [64, 65].

The classical notions of observability are inadequate for our purposes. For reasons discussed in the next section, Chapter 2 is devoted to the introduction of new concepts of observability. We hope that our book will vindicate our iconoclastic gesture of discarding the old observability concepts.

4. The New Observability Theory Versus the Old Ones

As we have said, observability is the injectivity of the mapping: *initial – state* \rightarrow *output – trajectory*. However, the concept of injectivity per se is

very hard to handle mathematically because it is unstable. Hence, we have to introduce stronger concepts of observability, for example adding to the injectivity the condition of immersivity (infinitesimal injectivity), as in the classical theory of differentiable mappings.

In this book, we haven't discussed any of the other approaches to observability that have been proposed elsewhere, and we haven't referenced any of them. The reason for this is simple: We have no use for either the concepts nor the results of these other approaches.

In fact, we claim that our approach to observability theory, which is entirely new, is far superior to any of the approaches proposed so far.

Since we cannot discuss all of them, let us focus on the most popular: **the output injection method**.

The **output injection method** is in the spirit of the **feedback linearization** method (popular for the control of nonlinear systems). As for the feedback linearization, one tries to go back to the well-established theory of linear systems. First, one characterizes the systems that can be written as a linear system, plus a perturbation depending on the outputs only (in some coordinates). Second, for these systems only, one applies slight variations of the standard linear constructions of observer systems. This approach suffers from terminal defects.

- A. It applies to an extremely small class of systems only. In precise mathematical terms, it means the following. In situation 2 above, where observability is generic, it applies to a class of systems of infinite codimension. In case 1, where the observability is nongeneric, it also applies to an infinite codimension subset of the set of observable systems.
- B. Basically, the approach ignores the crucial distinction between the two cases: 1. $d_y \leq d_u$, 2. $d_y > d_u$.
- C. The approach does not take into account generic singularities, and it is essentially local in scope.

Of course, these defects have important practical consequences in terms of sensitivity. In particular, in case 2, where the observability property is stable, the method is unstable.

5. A Word about Prerequisites

In this book, we have tried to keep the mathematical prerequisites to a strict minimum. What we need are the following mathematical tools: transversality theory, stratification theory and subanalytic sets, a few facts from several complex variables theory, center manifold theory, and Lyapunov's direct and inverse theorems.

For the benefit of the reader, a summary of the results needed is provided in the Appendix. It is accessible to those with only a modest mathematical background.

6. Comments

6.1. Comment about the Dynamic Output Stabilization Problem

At several places in the book, we make the assumption that the state space X , is just the Euclidean space R^n . If one wants only to estimate the state, this is not a reasonable assumption: the state space can be anything. However, for the dynamic output stabilization of systems that are state-feedback stabilizable, it is a reasonable assumption because the basin of attraction of an asymptotically stable equilibrium point of a vector field is diffeomorphic to R^n (see [51]).

6.2. Historical Comments

6.2.1. About “Observability”

The observability notion was introduced first in the context of linear systems theory. In this context, the **Luenberger observer**, and the **Kalman filter** were introduced, in the deterministic and stochastic settings, respectively.

For linear systems, **the observability notion is independent of the control function** (either the *initial – state \rightarrow output – trajectory* mapping is injective for all control functions, or it is not injective for each control function). **This is no longer true for nonlinear systems.** Moreover, as we show in this book, in the general case where $d_y \leq d_u$, observability (for all inputs) is not at all a generic property. For these reasons (and certainly also just for tractability), several weaker different notions of observability have been introduced, which are generic and which agree with the old observability notion in the special case of linear systems. In this setting, there is the pioneer work [24]. As we said, these notions are totally inadequate for our purposes, and we just forget about them.

6.2.2. About Universal Inputs

Let us say that a control function **separates** two states, if the corresponding output trajectories, from these two initial states, do not coincide.

For a nonlinear system, a **universal input** is a control function that separates all the couples of states that can be separated by some control.

We want to mention a pioneer work by H. J. Sussmann [47], in which it is proved, roughly speaking, that “universal inputs do exist.” For this purpose, the author made use of the properties of subanalytic sets, in a spirit very similar to the one in this book.

6.2.3. *About the Applications*

In Chapter 8, we present two applications from chemical engineering science. There are already several other applications of our theory in many fields, but we had to choose.

The two applications we have chosen look rather convincing, because they are not “academic,” and some refinements of the theory are really used. Moreover, these two applications, besides their illustrative character, are very important in practice and have been addressed by research workers in control theory, using other techniques, for many years. It is hard to give an exhaustive list of other studies (related to control and observation theory) on distillation columns and polymerization reactors. However, let us give a few references that are significant:

For distillation columns: [58], [61], [62].

For polymerization reactors: [56], [57], [60], [59].

Regarding distillation columns, it would be very interesting (and probably very difficult) to study the case of **azeotropic distillations**, which is not addressed in this volume. It seems that all the theory collapses in this case of azeotropic distillations.