

Mid term conflict resolution: A Model Predictive Control Approach

JOHN LYGEROS



Automatic Control Laboratory, ETH Zürich

WWW.CONTROL.ETHZ.CH



Credits

- ETH
 - G. Chaloulos
- National Technical University of Athens
 - K. Kyriakopoulos
 - G. Roussos
- University of Cambridge
 - J. Maciejowki
 - E. Siva



<http://ifly.nlr.nl/>


Short term CR

- Short Term CR algorithms should
 - Be fast, as they should resolve conflicts in minutes
 - Guaranteed conflict avoidance, last CR layer
 - Decentralized in self-separation airspace
- Example: Navigation functions
 - Guaranteed convergence and conflict avoidance
 - Computationally efficient
 - Decentralized fashion, implicit coordination
 - Closed loop, account for disturbances and errors

Difficulties


- Short term horizon source of complications
- Guaranteed resolution may require large inputs
 - Speed changes, rates of turn, ...
- More difficult to optimize “secondary” objectives
 - Fuel consumption, delay, passenger comfort, ...
- More difficult to provide alternatives
 - Alternative resolution maneuvers for crew to select
- Etc.
- Longer preview may help with all of these

Hierarchical approach




Navigation Functions

- Build artificial potential using measured aircraft positions and destination information



Preview by Model Predictive Control

Navigation Functions



MPC

MPC algorithm

1. Measure aircraft positions
2. Use a model to predict the future
 - Say for the next 20 minutes
 - Taking into account actions of short term CR
3. Formulate an optimization problem to
 - Minimize cost (fuel, delay, ...)
 - Impose constraints (speed, turning, passenger comfort)
 - Satisfy aircraft dynamics
4. Compute optimal solution
5. Apply first part (say first 3 minutes)
6. Return to 1 and repeat

Several proposals in the literature

- Centralized:
 - [Feron et.al.], [El Ghaoui, Duong et.al]
 - Implicit in long-term methods of [Bertsimas, Odoni et.al.], [Castelli et.al.]
- Decentralized:
 - [Richards & How], [Boreli, Balas et.al.], [Dunbar & Murray], [Bitmead et.al.]
 - [Raimondo, Scattolini, et.al.]
 - [Hiskens, Rawling et.al.], [Negenborn, de Schutter]
 - [Maciejowski & Siva]
 - [Roussos, Chaloulos, Kyriakopoulos, Lygeros]

Advantages


- Flexibility in optimization problem formulation
- Cost can reflect range of considerations
 - Fuel, delays, human factor preferences
- Constraints can reflect range of considerations
 - Aircraft dynamics, input constraints
 - Passenger comfort
- Integrate intent information, priorities, ...
- Short term CR actions can be integrated in model
- Repeated measurements provide feedback
 - Correct for disturbances and errors (e.g. in model)

Difficulties

- Formulation of optimization problem an art
- Resulting optimization problem difficult to solve
 - Non convex due to collision avoidance requirement
 - Complicated further by dynamic nonlinearities, ...
 - And by integration of short term CR actions
- Decentralization for self separation concepts
 - Optimize separately and communicate solutions
 - Formulate optimization problem of each aircraft
 - How to take effect on others into account?
 - How to provide performance (e.g. collision avoidance) guarantees?
 - Robust optimization, conservatism, ...

Our approach

- Model taking lower hierarchy levels into account




Our approach

- Predict (21 minutes) into the future
- Formulate optimization problem
 - Decision variables: Targets of navigation functions
 - Cost: Deviation from track
 - Constraints: Speed and turning radius bounds
- Solve, give resulting target to navigation function
- Fly for 3 minutes
 - Navigation function feedback
- Measure positions and repeat
 - Model Predictive Control feedback

Our approach


- Resulting optimization problem very difficult
 - Non convex due to collision avoidance constraint
 - Navigation model very complex
 - Can, however, be easily simulated
- Randomized optimization algorithm
 - Randomly select proposed target
 - Evaluate by simulation
 - Accept or reject based on performance
 - Repeat
- Evaluate on simulation with stochastic wind
 - Monte-Carlo simulation
 - Can also be introduced in randomized optimization

Randomized Optimization



Simulation Setup


- Several aircraft converging to the same point
- Aircraft try to reach as close as possible to their destination at the end of the 21mins horizon
- Every 3 minutes algorithm searches for the optimal intermediate targets for the next 21 minutes
- Searching often enough and look-ahead time of ~20 minutes needed to avoid infeasibility




Simulation Results

- Constraint handling (cost incurring only for violating the speed constraints):

Without MPC




With MPC




Simulation Results

- Aircraft speeds for the two cases:

Without MPC



With MPC



Decentralized MPC

- Aircraft solve individual MPC problems in round-robin
- Separate cost function and constraints for each aircraft
- First aircraft
 - Ignores future actions of other aircraft
 - Computes its solution, announces to other aircraft
- Subsequent aircraft
 - Take solutions of previous aircraft as constraints
- Implicit priority scheme
 - Earlier aircraft have an advantage

Algorithm overview

Algorithm 1 Decentralized MPC algorithm

Require: $\mathbf{q}_i(t), t = 0$ and $\mathbf{q}_{id}^F, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$


- 1: **while** $\exists i$ s.t. $\|\mathbf{q}_i(t) - \mathbf{q}_{id}^F\|_2 > \Delta$ **do**
 - 2: Fix a priority for the aircraft
 - 3: **for** $j = 1$ to m **do**
 - 4: Solve problem (9) for aircraft j
 - 5: Broadcast $\bar{\mathbf{q}}_{jd}$ to all aircraft
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: Evolve the system according to (1) and (8) from t to $t + T$
 - 8: Set $t = t + T$
 - 9: Measure new aircraft position $\mathbf{q}_i(t)$
 - 10: **end while**
-

Decentralized approach


- Feasibility:
 - If centralized problem feasible so is decentralized
- No need for an initial centralized solution
- Previous round solutions can be used as “seed”
- Aircraft only need to communicate targets
- Every aircraft optimizes only its own cost
- No incentive to be a team player
- To be “fair”:
 - Introduce a fairness factor
 - Randomize optimization sequence at each step
 - Variable, soft priorities

Simulation Results

Centralized




Decentralized (Round Robin)




Simulation Results

Random order




Round Robin




Simulation Results

Round Robin with additional cost



Round Robin



Simulation Results

- Round–robin implicitly define priority
- Implicit coordination of Navigation Functions limits benefit of being the first to optimize
- Effect can be further reduced by
 - Changing optimization order at each round
 - Introducing a “team player incentive”
- On the down side:
 - Optimization problem still hard
 - Addition of human factor considerations, maneuver alternatives, etc.
 - Proofs of performance very difficult

Summary

- A hierarchical control scheme for decentralized Mid to Short Term Conflict Resolution has been proposed
- The scheme combines the proven conflict avoidance of the Navigation Functions method with the constraint handling by the use of MPC, allowing to minimize a desired cost function
- The algorithm carries all the feasibility properties of the corresponding centralized scheme

Outlook

- Introducing the pilot in the hierarchy
- Tuning the cost function to produce simpler to implement maneuvers
- Extending the scheme in 3D
- Testing the algorithm against realistic flight plans

Thank you for your attention!

