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Abstract

This paper presents a novel Distributed Stochastic Model Predictive Control algorithm for networks of linear systems with multiplicative uncertainties and local chance constraints on the control inputs and states. The chance constraints are approximated with the Cantelli-Chebyshev inequality in terms of mean and covariance of the states. The algorithm is based on distributed semidefinite programming and the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers, which result in a distributed implementable, recursive feasible and mean square stable control scheme. The aforementioned properties are proven by computing a distributed invariant set and selecting proper distributed terminal constraints for the mean and covariance. Chance constraint satisfaction and convergence are shown on a numerical example for a system with three interconnected systems.
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1 Introduction

Model Predictive Control (MPC) is an optimization based control strategy [16], which became a lot of attention during the last couple of decades in academic research and industrial applications. The theoretical framework evolved ever since and spread into different directions, e.g. Robust/Stochastic MPC or Centralized/Distributed MPC, where each of them has dozens of subcategories. In centralized approaches [22], the plant is modeled as a single unit that is controlled by a centralized controller. Problems occur if the plant represents a large-scale network of dynamical systems, in particular if these systems have communication constraints. In this case, one usually picks a distributed controller structure [7] [8], [15], such that each sub-system is controlled by a local controller, while the controllers are able to communicate with each other.

In recent years the research on stochastic MPC [19] for systems subject to random disturbances and probabilistic constraints got increased interest from the community. There exist basically two approaches, namely scenario-based methods and methods based on analytical approximation of the stochastic problem. Scenario-based methods [3] [2] rely on a sufficient number of disturbance realizations, which are sampled at each time instant in order compute an optimal solution. Even though these methods are able to control systems subject to generic disturbances, their heavy computational load makes them only applicable for small-scale systems. In analytical methods [6] [14] [17] [20], the stochastic control problem is reformulated as a deterministic one. A typical assumption is that the dynamics are linear and an additive and/or multiplicative uncertainty is present.

1.1 Related work

In [12], the authors propose a distributed stochastic MPC (DSMPC) algorithm for linear systems with additive uncertainty. At each time step, each controller optimizes its local control sequence by taking the neighboring state sequences as disturbances to reject. Recursive feasibility is then guaranteed by properly selecting the initial state of each optimization problem. In [18], we recently proposed a non-iterative DSMPC concept based on probabilistic reachable sets. The main drawback of these approaches is the conservatism which is introduced by its decentralized nature and the necessity of a central node for the design procedure.

In [9], the authors propose a DSMPC for linear systems with parameter uncertainty and bounded additive disturbances. Recursive feasibility is guaranteed by...
permitting at every time step that only one subsystem optimizes its control sequence, while the other subsystems directly apply the shifted optimal solution. This approach reduces the communication effort, but relies on a centralized solution for the initialization of the distributed controllers.

While the vast majority of the analytical DSMPC approaches is regarding additive uncertainties, only one approach [9] could be found which is concerned about multiplicative uncertainties. Moreover, all of the aforementioned work relies on a central node or a central backup solution, which is in distributed large-scale systems likely to be impossible, e.g. intractability of the central problem due to the dimension.

1.2 Contribution

In this paper, we propose a DSMPC algorithm for distributed linear systems with unbounded multiplicative disturbances subject to chance constraints on controls and states. The main difference between our approach and the approach from [9] is that we obtain a fully parallelizable controller structure, which makes it applicable for higher dimensional systems due to the scalability advantage over sequential schemes. The large-scale problem is decomposed in multiple small-scale problems, such that the distributed Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers method (ADMM) [5] is applicable. Hence, the need of a centralized node is obsolete since all computations can be made in a distributed manner and the local controllers do not need to be initialized with a centralized backup strategy. We derive conditions for the distributed synthesis of the terminal ingredients, such as terminal weighing matrices and terminal sets, where we used similar techniques as in [8]. The resulting online MPC algorithm is proven to be recursive feasible, while the chance constraints are satisfied in closed-loop with mean square convergence of the states.

1.3 Outline

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 the system structure and its constraints are introduced. Section 3 introduces the controller structure and a reformulation of the chance constraints, where afterwards a method for the computation of distributed terminal cost functions and constraints is presented. The section ends with an intermediate result on mean square convergence of the state trajectories. Section 4 is dedicated to the introduction of the ADMM algorithm, the DSMPC algorithm and the main result of the paper, while in Section 5 a numerical example is discussed. The paper ends with some concluding remarks in Section 6. For the sake of readability, the proofs of the results can be found in the appendix.

1.4 Notations

Positive definite and semidefinite matrices are indicated as $A > 0$ and $A \succeq 0$, respectively. For an event $E$ we define the probability of occurrence as $\Pr(E)$. For a random variable $w$ we define the expected value $\mathbb{E}(w)$ and its variance as $\text{var}(w)$. A bar above matrices $\bar{P}$ denotes a lifted matrix into the desired dimension. Local matrices are denoted with a sub index, e.g. $A_{ij}$, whereas global matrices are denoted without any sub index. The set $\{1, ..., M\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is denoted as $\mathcal{M}$.

2 Problem formulation

We consider a network of $M$ linear time-invariant systems with $q$ uncertainty matrices

$$
x_i(k+1) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} A_{ij} x_j(k) + B_i u_i(k) + \sum_{l=1}^{q} (C_{ij}^l x_j(k) + D_{ij}^l u_i(k)) w_l(k), \forall i \in \mathcal{M} \tag{1}
$$

where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ are the state and input vectors, for all $l = 1, ..., q$, $w_l \in \mathbb{R}$ is a zero-mean white noise with unitary variance and unbounded support.

Assumption 1 (Uncorrelated disturbances)

$$
\mathbb{E}(w_l(k)w_p(t)) = 0 \text{ for all } t, k \text{ and for all } l \neq p.
$$

The matrices $A_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_j}$ and $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times m_i}$ describe the nominal model, whereas $C_{ij}^l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_j}$ and $D_{ij}^l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times m_i}$ are used to model the multiplicative uncertainties of the dynamics. The local subsystems can equivalently be rewritten in the neighborhood notation by considering the following definition from [8].

Definition 2 System $j$ is a neighbor of system $i$ if $A_{ij} \neq 0$. The set of all neighbors of system $i$, including system $i$ itself, is denoted as $\mathcal{N}_i$. The states of all systems $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ are denoted as $x_{\mathcal{N}_i} = \text{col}_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i}(x_j)$

Under the assumption that for all $A_{ij} = 0 \Rightarrow C_{ij} = 0$, equation (1) can be written as

$$
x_i(k+1) = A_{\mathcal{N}_i} x_{\mathcal{N}_i}(k) + B_i u_i(k) + \sum_{l=1}^{q} (C_{\mathcal{N}_i}^l x_{\mathcal{N}_i}(k) + D_{\mathcal{N}_i}^l u_i(k)) w_l(k), \forall i \in \mathcal{M}. \tag{2}
$$

In order to simplify the notation throughout the paper we make the following assumption on communication and availability of the state information.

Assumption 3 (Communication topology) The communication between neighboring systems $i$ and $j$ is bidirectional and the full state information is available.
The local states and inputs are constrained in convex polytopes which contain the origin in the interior
\[ X_i = \{ x_i | H_i^u x_i \leq h_i^u \}, \quad U_i = \{ u_i | H_i^u u_i \leq h_i^u \}, \forall i \in \mathcal{M}, \]
where afterwards the stochastic nature of the problem is utilized to reformulate the original constraints as individual chance constraints
\[ \Pr (H_i^u z_i(t|k) \leq h_i^u) \geq p_i.z, \quad (3a) \]
\[ \Pr (H_i^u u_i(t|k) \leq h_i^u) \geq p_i.u. \quad (3b) \]

\( p_x \) and \( p_u \) are the probabilities of constraint satisfaction for the states and inputs. By stacking the local states and control as \( x = \text{col}(x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n, u = \text{col}(u_i) \in \mathbb{R}^m, \) we can write the global system dynamics as
\[ x(k+1) = Ax(k) + Bu(k) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (C_i^x x(k) + D_i^u u(k)) w(k). \quad (4) \]

The global system matrix \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) and the global uncertainty matrices \( C^l \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, l = 1, \ldots, q \) are block-diagonal with blocks \( A_{ij} \) and \( C^l_{ij} \), respectively. The matrices \( B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \) and \( D^l \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}, l = 1, \ldots, q \) are block diagonal. Similar to [8] it is assumed that the pair \((A, B)\) is stabilizable with a structured linear controller
\[ \kappa(x) := K x = \text{col}(K_{N_i} x_{N_i}). \quad (5) \]

### 3 Distributed Controller Synthesis

The following section addresses the distributed controller synthesis. The distributed system dynamics are first separated into a nominal and error part, where afterwards conditions for chance constraint satisfaction are formulated. Based on these considerations, a procedure for the synthesis of the terminal ingredients is presented, which allows the designer to compute the distributed terminal cost and distributed terminal constraints via distributed optimization. We emphasize that the design can be done fully distributed, which is mandatory if no central node is available.

#### 3.1 Distributed Controller

Let \( z_i(t) = \mathbb{E}(x_i(t)) \) be the nominal system state and define the control law
\[ u_i(t|k) = v_i(t|k) + K_{N_i} e_{N_i}(t|k), \forall i \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (6) \]
where \( K_{N_i} \) is a stabilizing structured linear feedback according to (5) and \( v_i(t|k), t = 0, \ldots, N - 1 \) is the nominal input sequence, obtained as the solution of an optimization problem solved at time \( k \). Let further \( e(t|k) = x(t|k) - z(t|k) \) be the deviation between the real and nominal state. From Assumption 1 and the fact that \( w \) is zero mean, the dynamics (2) can be separated into
\[ z_i(t+1|k) = A_{N_i} z_i(t|k) + B_i v_i(t|k), \forall i \in \mathcal{M}, \quad (7a) \]
\[ e_i(t+1|k) = A_{N_i} e_i(t|k) + \sum_{l=1}^{q} C^l_{N_i} e_{N_i}(t|k) + C^l_{N_i} z(t|k) + D_i v_i(t|k), \forall i \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (7b) \]

where \( A_{N_i} = A_{N_i} + B_i K_{N_i} \), \( C^l_{N_i} = C^l_{N_i} + D_i K_{N_i} \). In the following we ease the notation and consider the case of only \( q = 1 \) pair of uncertainty matrices \((C_{N_i}, D_i)\).

#### 3.2 Chance constraints

In this work, the individual chance constraints (3) are implemented as probabilistic approximations, which similar to [11] rely on Cantelli’s inequality. The chance constraints are verified in prediction if (3) is replaced by the linearized deterministic expressions
\[ H^u_z z_i(t|k) \leq (1 - 0.5\epsilon) h_i^u - \frac{f(p)}{2\alpha_n^3} H^u_z \Sigma_i(t|k) H^u_z \Sigma_i^T \]
\[ H^u_u v_i(t|k) \leq (1 - 0.5\epsilon) h_i^u - \frac{f(p)}{2\alpha_n^3} H^u_u \Sigma_i(t|k) H^u_u \Sigma_i^T, \]

where \( \Sigma_i = K_{N_i} \Sigma_{N_i} K_{N_i}^T, \Sigma_{N_i} = \mathbb{E}(e_{N_i} e_{N_i}^T), f(p) = \sqrt{p/(1-p)} \) and \( \epsilon \in [0, 1], \) which forms an additional design parameter [11]. The matrix \( \Sigma_{N_i} \) is by definition a dense matrix, therefore we have to introduce the following block diagonal matrix as an upper bound
\[ \Sigma_{N_i} \leq \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (9) \]

**Remark 4** The introduction of block diagonal matrices \( \Sigma_{N_i}, \forall i \in \mathcal{M} \) introduces conservatism but is necessary to render the problem amendable for distributed optimization. In [8, Sec. 4.1.2] a similar issue is discussed for the distributed synthesis of terminal cost.

Since (8) depends on the covariance \( \Sigma_i \) and \( \Sigma_{N_i} \), respectively, we have to incorporate a covariance prediction along the state prediction (7a). Under Assumption 1 the evolution of \( \Sigma_i = \text{var}(e_i) = \mathbb{E}(e_i e_i^T) \) can be characterized via (7b)
\[ \Sigma_i(t+1|k) = (C_{N_i} z_{N_i}(t|k) + D_i v_i(t|k))(C_{N_i} z_{N_i}(t|k) + D_i v_i(t|k))^T + C_{N_i} K_{N_i} \Sigma_{N_i}(t|k) K_{N_i}^T + A_{N_i} \Sigma_{N_i} A_{N_i}^T. \quad (10) \]

The former equation allows us to propagate the covariance, i.e. \( \Sigma_i(t|k), t \geq 0 \) is the predicted covariance sequence conditioned on the information available at time \( k \). In order to use distributed semidefinite programming...
to characterize the successor covariance, we relax equation (10) to hold as an inequality (≥). For positive definite $\tilde{\Sigma}_N$, this allows us to cast the inequality version of (10) into a structured linear matrix inequality (LMI) via the Schur complement. For $\tilde{\Sigma}_N = 0$ condition (10) simplifies, since $\Sigma_i(t + 1|k)$ only depends on $z_{N_i}(t|k)$ and $v_i(t|k)$.

**Lemma 5** The inequality version of (10) is equivalent to the following LMI

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\Sigma_i(t + 1|k) \\
(A_{N_i} \tilde{\Sigma}_N(t|k) + B_i U_{N_i})^T \\
(C_{N_i} \tilde{\Sigma}_N(t|k) + D_i U_{N_i})^T \\
(C_{N_i} z_{N_i}(t|k) + D_i v_i(t|k))^T
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\Sigma_i(t|k) & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \tilde{\Sigma}_N(t|k) & 0 \\
0 & 0 & I
\end{bmatrix}
\geq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{M},
$$

(11)

where $U_{N_i} = K_{N_i} \tilde{\Sigma}_N(t|k)$.

The propagation of the covariance is done via distributed optimization, which is explained in detail in Section 4.

### 3.3 Cost function

Each controller minimizes the local finite horizon cost function

$$J_i = \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} l_i(x_i(t|k), u_i(t|k)) + V_{f,i}(x_i(N|k)) \right)$$

(12a)

$$l_i(x_i(t|k), u_i(t|k)) = ||x_i(t|k)||_{Q_i}^2 + ||u_i(t|k)||_{R_i}^2$$

(12b)

$$V_{f,i}(x_i(N|k)) = ||x_i(N|k)||_{P_i}^2$$

(12c)

where $Q_i$ and $R_i$ are positive definite weighting matrices, (12b) denotes the stage cost function, (12c) the terminal cost function with positive definite weighting matrix $P_i$ and $N$ denotes the time horizon. A key challenge in designing distributed controllers is the computation of a separable terminal cost, such that the global cost can be decomposed into a sum of local cost functions

$$V_f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} V_{f,i}(x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} x_i^TP_ix_i.$$  

(13)

In the following, we use the expected value version of [8, Theorem 6] in order to find terminal weighting matrices $P_i$ and terminal controllers $K_{N_i}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{M}$, such that the cost along the closed-loop trajectories decreases with

$$\mathbb{E}(V_{f,i}(x_i^+)) - V_{f,i}(x_i) \leq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{M}$$

(14)

where $x_i^+$ denotes the closed-loop successor of $x_i$. The function $\gamma_i(x_{N_i}) = x_{N_i}^+ - l(x_{N_i}, K_{N_i}, x_{N_i})$ is introduced to allow the local cost to partially increase, as long as the global cost always decreases, which is enforced by the additional constraint $\sum_{i=1}^{M} \gamma_i(x_{N_i}) \leq 0$. Recall that we consider zero-mean white noise with unitary variance, then we can apply the expected value operator to (14), which yields an expression that depends on $z_{N_i}$. Since the inequality has to hold for all $z_{N_i}$, we obtain the following set of nonlinear matrix inequalities

$$A_{N_i}^T P_i A_{N_i} + C_{N_i}^T P_i C_{N_i} - \hat{P}_i \leq - (Q_i + K_{N_i}^T R_i K_{N_i}) + \Gamma_{N_i}, \forall i \in \mathcal{M}$$

(15a)

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M} W_i^T \Gamma_{N_i} W_i \leq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{M},$$

(15b)

where $\hat{P}_i = W_iT_i^T P_i T_i W_i^T$ and $\hat{Q}_i = W_iT_i^T Q_i T_i W_i^T$ are lifted into $\mathbb{R}^{N_i}$ via lifting matrices $W_i \in \{0, 1\}^{N_i \times n}$ and $T \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$. These matrices are similar to permutation matrices and have the property that each row has exactly one element to 1 and the rest is 0, such that $\hat{z}_{N_i} = W_i z_i$ and $z_i = T_i z$. Condition (15a) is now decoupled from other subsystems and enables us to rewrite (15) as a structured LMI with one coupling constraint (15b). The following lemma is an extension of [8, Lemma 10].

**Lemma 6** Condition (15) is equivalent to the following set of LMIs

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
\bar{E}_i + F_{N_i} & \bar{A}_{N_i} E_{N_i} + B_i Y_{N_i} \\
C_{N_i}^T E_{N_i} + D_i^T Y_{N_i} & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
\bar{E}_i & 0 & 0 \\
0 & E_i & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\geq 0,$$

(16a)

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M} W_i^T F_{N_i} W_i \leq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{M}$$

(16b)

where $E_i = P_i^{-1}$, $\bar{E}_i = W_i T_i^T P_i^{-1} T_i W_i^T$, $E_{N_i} = W_i E W_i^T$, $F_{N_i} = E_{N_i} \Gamma_{N_i} E_{N_i}$ and $Y_{N_i} = K_{N_i} E_{N_i}$.

Since the above lemma is a straightforward extension of [8, Lemma 10], we discarded the proof and refer to [8].

### 3.4 Terminal constraints

In order to guarantee recursive feasibility, terminal constraints are commonly enforced at the end of the prediction horizon [22] $z(N|k) \in Z_f$, where $Z_f$ is a positive invariant set for the global nominal system, such that $\forall z \in Z_f : (A + BK)z \in Z_f$. As already pointed out in [13], we additionally need to impose a terminal constraint for the covariance sequence $\Sigma(N|k) \leq \Sigma_f$. The
remainder of this section is dedicated to the reformulation of the global terminal constraints, such that they hold in a distributed setting.

In this paper, we adopted the idea of time-varying local terminal sets from [8, Sec. 3.3]

\[ Z_{f,i}(\alpha_i(k)) = \{ z_i^\top P_i z_i \leq \alpha_i(k) \}, \]  

(17)

where the global terminal set is defined as the Cartesian product of all local terminal sets

\[ Z_f(\alpha_1(k), ..., \alpha_M(k)) := \prod_{i \in M} Z_{f,i}(\alpha_i(k)). \]  

(18)

Assumption 7

1. There exist terminal controllers \( K_N \), relaxation matrices \( \Gamma_{N,i} \), and terminal weights \( P_i \), such that (14) holds for all \( i \in M \).

2. There exist positive constants \( \psi \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \), such that the local time-varying set scalings \( \alpha_i(k) \) satisfy \( \sum_{i=1}^{M} \alpha_i(k) = \alpha \leq \psi, \forall k \geq 0 \). Constants \( \alpha \) and \( \psi \) ensure that for all \( z_i \in Z_{f,i}(\alpha_i) \) constraints \( (8) \) are satisfied for a predefined \( \epsilon \in [0, 1] \).

Let Assumption 7 hold, then we can guarantee distributed invariance by updating \( \alpha_i \) according to [8]

\[ \alpha_i(k+1) = \alpha_i(k) + z_N^\top(k) \Gamma_N z_N(k), \forall i \in M. \]  

(19)

Remark 8 The constant \( \alpha \) is necessary to ensure distributed invariance, whereas \( \psi \) is an additional bound for mean square convergence of the states. This property is exploited to guarantee chance constraint satisfaction of (8) for each system \( i \in M \) in the interior of (18).

Note that for each \( z_i \in Z_{f,i}(\alpha_i) \) the terminal controller \( v_i = K_N z_N \) is active. Hence, the terminal covariance only depends on \( z_N \) and satisfies the following Lyapunov like steady state equation

\[ \Sigma_{f,i} = A_{N,i,K} \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} A_{N,i,K}^\top + C_{N,i,K} \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} C_{N,i,K}^\top + C_{N,i,K} \Psi_{N_i} C_{N,i,K}^\top, \]  

(20)

where the arbitrary matrix \( \Psi_{N_i} \) is defined in such way, that \( \Psi_{N_i} \geq z_N^\top z_N \). In view of (20) it is always possible to satisfy constraints (8) for all \( z_i \in Z_{f,i}(\alpha_i) \) by selecting a sufficiently small terminal set (17). That is, the smaller the local \( \alpha_i \) terminal set, the smaller \( \Psi_{N_i} \) and therefore the smaller the local terminal covariances \( \Sigma_{f,i} \).

From condition \( \sum_{i=1}^{M} \alpha_i \leq \alpha \leq \psi \) follows that the design has a centralized nature, which in turn implies that \( \alpha \) needs to be upper bounded by the smallest eigenvalue of the global \( \Psi \). In order to solve the central problem via distributed optimization, we have to cast (20) into a structured LMI by relaxing it as an inequality \( (\geq) \) and setting \( \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} = \Psi_{N_i} \), which can be achieved by enforcing

\[ \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} \geq \psi I, \]  

(21)

such that \( \psi I \geq z_N^\top z_N \).

Lemma 9 The inequality version of (20) and (21) are equivalent to the following set of LMIs

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{f,i} & \ast \ast \\ ((A_{N,i} \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} + B_i U_{N_i})^\top & \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{f,N_i} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \]  

(22a)

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{f,N_i} & I \\ I & \frac{1}{\psi} I \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \]  

(22b)

where \( U_{N_i} = K_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} \).

The following proposition shows how the LMIs from Lemma 6 and 9 can be solved together, such that a unique terminal weight is obtained. The additional constraint \( U_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i}^{-1} = Y_{N_i} E_{N_i}^{-1} \) is necessary for the uniqueness of the terminal weights \( P_i \), but would lead to a loss of convexity [13]. This can be circumvented by conservatively setting \( E_{N_i} = \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} \) and \( U_{N_i} = Y_{N_i} \).

Proposition 10 Set \( E_{N_i} = \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} \), \( U_{N_i} = Y_{N_i} \), \( \forall i \in M \). If the following optimization problem admits a feasible solution

\[ \max \sum_{i=1}^{M} \log(\det(E_i)) \]  

(23a)

s.t. (16a), (16b), (22a), (22b),

(23b)

then \( P_i, i \in M \) are unique and the volume of each 1-level set of \( V_{f,i} \) is maximized.

PROOF. For \( E_{N_i} = \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} \), \( U_{N_i} = Y_{N_i} \), \( \forall i \in M \) the LMIs (16a), (16b), (22a), (22b) are convex in \( E_{N_i} \) and \( Y_{N_i} \), therefore the minimizer is unique. The objective \( \sum_{i=1}^{M} \log(\det(E_i)) \) is convex and maximizes the 1-level set of \( V_f(x) [4] \).

Remark 11 The solution of (23) yields a separable terminal cost function (13) with weights \( P_i \), terminal controllers \( K_{N,i} \), and relaxation functions \( \Gamma_{N,i}, \forall i \in M \), which satisfy the first part of Assumption 7. Constraint (22b) yields that \( \lambda_{\min}(E_{N_i}) = \lambda_{\min}(P_{N_i}^{-1} \geq \psi, \forall i \in M. \) This implies the global condition \( \lambda_{\min}(P^{-1}) \geq \psi, \)
where \( \psi = \min \psi_i \). Finally, we can compute the global terminal set scaling \( \alpha \), which can be done with the distributed optimization problem from [8, Sec. 4.2]. By additionally constraining each local optimization problem with \( \alpha \leq \psi_i \), \( \forall i \in \mathcal{M} \), we achieve that \( \alpha \leq \psi \) holds. The local set scalings \( \alpha_i \) are then trivially initialized with \( \alpha_i = \alpha/M \). This satisfies the second part of Assumption 7. The optimization problem is therefore fully separable, such that a centralized node is not necessary.

The result from Proposition 10 together with the optimization problem from Remark 11 satisfy Assumption 7, which can furthermore be used to show mean square stabilizability of the structured terminal controller.

Lemma 12 Let Assumption 7 hold. If the distributed system (2) is controlled by a structured terminal controller \( v_i = K \xi_i \), with control law (6) for any \( z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_{f,i}(\alpha_i) \) and the local sets are updated according to (19), then the global system (4) is mean square stable.

4 Distributed Optimization for DSMPC

The following section is dedicated to the introduction of the global DSMPC optimization problem and the distributed reformulation, such that ADMM [5] is applicable.

4.1 MPC algorithm

In stochastic MPC approaches with unbounded disturbances, recursive feasibility cannot be achieved by constraint tightening. Therefore, the initial conditions for the mean and covariance are usually treated as decision variables [12] [13] [14]. We distinguish between the following two strategies.

The first strategy (S1) is based on robust initialization. The following global optimization problem is tried to be solved at every time instant \( k \geq 0 \) with initial conditions \( z_i(0|k) = x_i(k) \) and \( \Sigma_i(0|k) = 0 \).

Problem 13 (Global optimization problem)

\[
J^*(z) = \min_{z,v} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} l_i(z_i(t|k), v_i(t|k)) + V_{f,i}(z_i(N|k)) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad (7a), (8), (11), \forall t = 0, ..., N-1, \forall i \in \mathcal{M} \\
z_i(0|k) = x_i(k), \Sigma_i(0|k) = 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{M} \\
z_i(N|k) = \Delta_i
\]

Problem 13 is clearly not recursive feasible, since we initialize it with a disturbance affected measurement. Hence, we define the backup strategy (S2), which uses the shifted optimal solution. Note that we do not aim for recursively solving Problem 13, since this would increase the computational and communication demand of the online algorithm, whereas the closed-loop performance increase would be only marginal.

Let \( c \in \mathbb{N} \) be the time instant when the last feasible solution was obtained with (S1), then the shifted optimal solution is defined for any \( k > c \) by \( z_i(0|k) = z_i^*(k-c|c) \) and \( v_i(0|k) = v_i^*(k-c|c) \). Note that for \( k-c \geq N-1 \) the terminal controller ensures recursive feasibility.

Remark 14 An alternative backup strategy is to initialize Problem 13 with the shifted state and covariance \( z_i(0|k) = z_i^*(1|k-1) \) and \( \Sigma_i(0|k) = \Sigma^*(1|k-1) \), which is guaranteed to be feasible. The result on chance constraint satisfaction and convergence would remain unchanged, as reported in [14].

4.2 ADMM Algorithm

The first step towards the distributed solution is to cast Problem 13 into the consensus form. Let \( \xi \) be the global variable that contains a copy of all predictions of \( e, z \) and \( \Sigma, \) and \( y_i, i \in \mathcal{M} \) a vector of local predictions. Each local prediction \( y_i \) contains the input, state and covariance \( v_i, z_{X_i} \) and \( \Sigma_{X_i} \), predicted by system \( i \). In this formulation, each subsystem contains the neighboring states as independent decision variables in \( y_j, j \in \mathcal{N}_i \) and in \( \xi \), which are coupled by a consensus constraint \( \Delta_i = 0 \). The matrix \( \Delta_i \) is defined as

\[
\Delta_i = \begin{bmatrix}
\text{diag}(y_{i,z} - W_i \xi) & 0 \\
0 & y_{i,\Sigma} - W_i \xi \Sigma
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( y_{i,z} \) contains \( z_{X_i}^*(t|k), t = 0, ..., N \) and \( y_{i,\Sigma} \) the predicted covariance \( \Sigma_{X_i}^*(t|k), t = 0, ..., N \). Note that this leads to a diagonal structure for the states and a block diagonal structure for the covariance. The augmented Lagrangian for the consensus constraint can now be written as

\[
L_i(y_i, \xi, \Lambda_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} l_i(z_i^*(t|k), v_i(t|k)) + V_{f,i}(z_i^*(N|k)) + \frac{\rho}{2} \text{tr}(\Lambda_i \Delta_i), \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{M}
\]

where \( l_i(z_i^*(t|k), v_i(t|k)) = \|z_i^*(t|k)\|^2_Q + \|v_i(t|k)\|^2_R \), \( V_{f,i}(z_i^*(N|k)) = \|z_i^*(N|k)\|^2_P \), \( \Lambda_i \) a matrix Lagrange multiplier and \( \rho \) the augmentation factor. With the augmented Lagrangian it is now possible to decompose Problem 13 into \( \mathcal{M} \) local optimization problems.

Problem 15 (Local optimization problem)

\[
y_{i}^* = \min_{y_i} L_i(y_i, \xi, \Lambda_i) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad (7a), (8), (11), \forall t = 0, ..., N-1 \\
z_i(N|k) = \mathcal{Z}_{f,i}(\alpha_i(k)) \\
z_i(0|k) = x(k), \Sigma_i(0|k) = 0
\]
Now we are ready to state the ADMM algorithm for consensus. Note that the original ADMM algorithm averages the dual consensus variables in step 5 of Algorithm 1, but, as already pointed out in [23], the dual average is zero after the first iteration and can therefore be neglected. Since each subsystem predicts the trajectories of its neighbors, we introduce the notation $y_i^{k+1}$, which indicates $y_i^k$ predicted by subsystem $j$.

Algorithm 1 Consensus ADMM

1: For each subsystem $i \in \mathcal{M}$ in parallel:
2: Initialize $\Lambda_i = 0$, $\xi_i = 0$
3: repeat
4: Solve Problem 15 and get $y_i^k$
5: Communicate $y_i^k$ to neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$
6: $\xi_i^k = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_i|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} y_i^k$
7: Communicate $\xi_i^k$ to neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$
8: $\Lambda_i^* = \Lambda_i + \rho \cdot \text{diag}(y_i^k - W_i^*\xi^k)$
9: until convergence

The convergence of Algorithm 1 can be evaluated by checking for primal optimality $\|y_i^k - y_i\| \leq \epsilon_p$ and consensus feasibility $\|y_i - \xi_i\| \leq \epsilon_c$. Based on Algorithm 1 we are ready to state the online DSMPC algorithm, which is executed at every time instant $k \geq 0$, while the convergence properties are summarized in Theorem 19.

Algorithm 2 Online DSMPC

1: Measure local states $x_i(k)$ for all $i \in \mathcal{M}$
2: Each system $i \in \mathcal{M}$ checks feasibility of Problem 15
3: Communicate feasibility flag to neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$, $i \in \mathcal{M}$
4: if Each system is feasible with (S1) then
5: Solve Problem 13 via Algorithm 1
6: Each system $i \in \mathcal{M}$ applies control input $u_i(k) = u_i^*(0) + K_{\mathcal{N}_i}(x_{\mathcal{N}_i}(k) - z_{\mathcal{N}_i}(0))$
7: Each system $i \in \mathcal{M}$ updates the local terminal set with $\alpha_i(k+1) = \alpha_i(k) + z_{\mathcal{N}_i}^T(N(k)\Gamma_{\mathcal{N}_i}z_{\mathcal{N}_i}(N(k))$
8: Set $c = k$
9: else
10: Each system $i \in \mathcal{M}$ applies shifted control input $u_i(k) = u_i^*(k - c) + K_{\mathcal{N}_i}(x_{\mathcal{N}_i}(k) - z_{\mathcal{N}_i}(k - c|c))$
11: end if
12: $k \rightarrow k + 1$ and go to step 1

Remark 16 In Algorithm 2 we have to decide online whether the problem is feasible or not. This process can be separated into two parts. First we check if $x_i \in (8a)$, $i \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\Sigma_i(k) = 0$. Even if this condition is satisfied, the problem can still be infeasible. Therefore, we can detect infeasibility between subsequent iterates of Algorithm 1, which was similarly done in [1], [21]. In case of infeasibility, the solution process of Algorithm 1 is aborted and the backup solution is employed.

Assumption 17 Problem 13 is solved exactly via ADMM, i.e. Algorithm 1 converges for $\epsilon_p = \epsilon_c = 0$. 

Remark 18 The technical Assumption 17 is necessary to state the following convergence result. This can be relaxed if one considers inexact minimization of Problem 15, where the residual $\epsilon_p$ is utilized to derive an additional constraint tightening, e.g. as in [15].

Theorem 19 Let Assumption 7 and 17 hold. If, at time $k = 0$, Problem 13 admits a feasible solution, then Algorithm 2 is recursive feasible, $\mathbb{E}||x(k)||^2_{\mathbb{P}} \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and the chance constraints (3) are satisfied at all times $k \geq 0$.

5 Numerical example

In the following section, we demonstrate our approach on a numerical example. We consider $M = 3$ subsystems with neighbors $\mathcal{N}_i = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $i \in \mathcal{M}$. The dynamic matrices are given by $A_{ii} = [\frac{1}{i}], A_{ij} = [0.1, 0], i \in \mathcal{M}, j \neq i$, the uncertainty matrices $C_{ii} = [0.01, 0.02], C_{ij} = [0.02, 0.02], i \in \mathcal{M}, j \neq i$, and input and uncertain input matrices $B_i = [0], D_i = [0, 0.01], i \in \mathcal{M}$. The disturbance is normally distributed with $w \sim N(0, 1)$, the weighting matrices are set to $Q_i = I, R_i = 0.1, i \in \mathcal{M}$ and the prediction horizon is $N = 15$. Each subsystem has to satisfy the constraint on the second state $-0.3 \leq x_2 \leq 0.1$ with a probability of at least $p_{x_2} \geq 0.8, i \in \mathcal{M}$. For the ADMM we use $\rho = 2$, convergence thresholds $\epsilon_c = \epsilon_p = 10^{-4}$ and the constraint linearization parameter of (3) is set to $\epsilon = 0.4$. Figure 1 shows $K = 500$ closed-loop trajectories of $k = \{1, \ldots, 15\}$ time steps produced by Algorithm 2, whereas figure 2 depicts the corresponding empirical constraint satisfaction for each time step $k$. The point-
average cumulative closed-loop cost $av[J]$ and the number of constraint violations $\#[C_v]$ over $K = 500$ Monte-Carlo simulations with 15 closed-loop steps of Algorithm 2. It can be seen that the choice of suboptimality has only a marginal effect on $av[J]$ and as well as on $\#[C_v]$. Note that in all four test cases the chance constraints are satisfied with $p_x,i \geq 0.8$. The parameter $\rho = 2$ was empirically found by carrying out Monte-Carlo simulations for different $\rho$ in the range of $[0.1, 10]$ and comparing the average iterations until convergence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\epsilon_p, \epsilon_c, \rho$</th>
<th>$av[\text{iter}]$</th>
<th>$\max[\text{iter}]$</th>
<th>$av[J]$</th>
<th>$#[C_v]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10^{-2}$ 2</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>75.36</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10^{-3}$ 2</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75.03</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10^{-4}$ 2</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74.94</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10^{-5}$ 2</td>
<td>47.48</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74.86</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 1 we can see that for an increase in optimality the constraint violation increases. This implies that for $\epsilon_p \to 0$ the chance constraints are optimally utilized, i.e. operate closer to the probabilistic bounds. From a practical point of view we can conclude that the effect of conservatively tightening the constraints via (8) with additional tightening parameter $\epsilon$ exceeds the error due to inexact predicted trajectories. The authors of [13] propose to use a value for $\epsilon$ in the range of $[0.3, 0.7]$.

6 Conclusion

This paper describes a stochastic MPC algorithm for distributed systems with unbounded multiplicative uncertainty. The distributed design guarantees recursive feasibility, mean square stability and chance constraint satisfaction. Through the reformulation of the centralized control problem into a distributed SDP, we are able to solve the problem via ADMM. The properties of the controller were highlighted on a numerical example. A possible extension of this work is the consideration of coupling chance constraints and the output feedback case.
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A Proof of Lemma 5

PROOF. We show the equivalence of the inequality version of (10) and (11). For the sake of readability we neglect the time indices. From positive definiteness of $\hat{\Sigma}_{N_i}$, the substitution $K_{N_i} = U_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i}^{-1}$ can be plugged in (10). This yields

$$\begin{align*}
(A_{N_i} + B_i U_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i}^{-1}) \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i} (A_{N_i} + B_i U_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i}^{-1})^\top + (C_{N_i} + D_i U_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i}^{-1}) \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i} (C_{N_i} + D_i U_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i}^{-1})^\top + (C_{N_i, z} + D_i v_i) (C_{N_i, z} + D_i v_i)^\top - \Sigma_i^\top \leq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{M}
\end{align*}$$

After factoring out $\hat{\Sigma}_{N_i}^{-1}$, the foregoing inequality is equivalent to

$$\Sigma_i^+ \geq \begin{bmatrix}
A_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i} + B_i U_{N_i} \\
C_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i} + D_i U_{N_i} \\
C_{N_i, z} \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i} + D_i v_i
\end{bmatrix} \Theta^{-1} \begin{bmatrix}
A_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i} + B_i U_{N_i} \\
C_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i} + D_i U_{N_i} \\
C_{N_i, z} \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i} + D_i v_i
\end{bmatrix}^\top$$

where $\Theta = \text{blkdiag}(\hat{\Sigma}_{N_1}, \hat{\Sigma}_{N_2}, I)$. Application of the Schur complement yields (11). □

B Proof of Lemma 9

PROOF. We first show the equivalence of the inequality version of (20) and (22a) by setting $\Psi_{N_i} = \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i}$ and substituting $K_{N_i} = U_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{N_i}^{-1}$. This yields

$$\Sigma_{f,i} \geq \begin{bmatrix}
A_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} + B_i U_{N_i} \\
C_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} + D_i U_{N_i}
\end{bmatrix} \Omega^{-1} \begin{bmatrix}
A_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} + B_i U_{N_i} \\
C_{N_i} \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} + D_i U_{N_i}
\end{bmatrix}^\top$$

where $\Omega = \text{blkdiag}(\hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_1}, \hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_2}, I)$. Application of the Schur complement yields (22a). Condition (21) can be rewritten as $\hat{\Sigma}_{f,N_i} - I (\frac{1}{\psi_i} I)^{-1} I \geq 0$. After application of the Schur complement, (22b) follows. □

C Proof of Theorem 13

PROOF. Let Assumption 7 hold and assume that the terminal set scalings $\alpha_i, \forall i \in \mathcal{M}$ are properly initialized. Further assume that at time $k$ a feasible solution of Problem 13 exists.

Recursive feasibility and chance constraint satisfaction

In the first part of the proof we show recursive feasibility and chance constraint satisfaction under usage of the alternative strategy as mentioned in Remark 14. This fundamental property is just of theoretical nature, since in our approach we do not aim for recursively solving problem 13. Let Assumption 17 hold. Now, at time step $k + 1$, we show that a feasible solution to problem 13 exists. We have to distinguish between the following two cases:

(1) Problem 13 is feasible with $z_i(0|k + 1) = x(k + 1)$ and $\Sigma_i(0|k + 1) = 0$. This is trivially satisfied.

(2) Problem 13 is infeasible with (1). Hence, initialize Problem 13 with $z_i(0|k + 1) = z_i^*(1|k)$ and $\Sigma_i(0|k + 1) = \Sigma_i^*(1|k)$.

In the following we analyze case 2. Consider the shifted optimal solutions

$$\hat{v}_i(t|k + 1) = [v_i^*(1|k), ..., v_i^*(N - 1|k), K_{N_i} z_{N_i}^*(N|k)]$$
$$\hat{z}_i(t|k + 1) = [z_i^*(1|k), ..., z_i^*(N|k), z_i(N + 1|k)]$$
$$\hat{\Sigma}_i(t|k + 1) = [\Sigma_i^*(1|k), ..., \Sigma_i^*(N|k), \Sigma_i(N + 1|k)]$$

where $z_i(N + 1|k) = A_{N_i, K} z_{N_i}^*(N|k)$ and $\Sigma_i(N + 1|k) \leq \Sigma_{f,i}$ as in (20). From feasibility at time $k$ follows that at
time $k + 1$ the constraints (8) are verified for any pair $(\tilde{u}_i(t(k + 1)), \tilde{z}_i(t(k + 1)))$ and $(\hat{z}_i(t(k + 1)), \hat{z}_i(t(k + 1)))$ for $t = 0, \ldots, N - 1$. The state satisfies $\tilde{z}_i(N - 1|k + 1) = \tilde{z}_i^*(N|k) \in \mathcal{Z}_{f,i}(\alpha_i), \forall i \in \mathcal{M}$, whereas the covariance $\Sigma_i(N - 1|k + 1) = \Sigma_i^*(N|k) \leq \Sigma_{f,i}$. The latter condition is satisfied by design of the terminal sets via (22a) - (22b) and the containment of $z_i^*(N|k) \in \mathcal{Z}_{f,i}(\alpha_i)$. Assumption 7 ensures that there exist terminal controllers $v_i = K_N^i z_N^i$, terminal regions $\mathcal{Z}_{f,i}(\alpha_i)$ and set scalings $\alpha_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{M}$, such that the global terminal set (18) is invariant under the set dynamics (19). Furthermore, constraints (8) are verified $\forall z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_{f,i}(\alpha_i)$.

From Lemma 12 follows constraint satisfaction and recursive feasibility for any $k \geq 0$. These properties remain unchanged for our backup strategy, as already mentioned in Remark 14.

Mean square convergence

Next we want to prove mean square convergence of the state trajectories. Consider the closed-loop cost associated to Problem 13,

$$J = \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} ||x_i(t(k))||_Q^2 + ||u_i(t(k))||_{P_t}^2 + ||x_i(N|k)||_R^2 \right)$$

which can be separated into its mean and variance components

$$J_m = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} ||z_i(t(k))||_{Q_i}^2 + ||v_i(t(k))||_{P_t}^2 + ||z_i(N|k)||_R^2$$

$$J_v = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \text{tr}(Q_i \Sigma_i(t(k))) + \text{tr}(K_N^i R_i K_N^i \Sigma_i(t(k))) + \text{tr}(P_i \Sigma_i(N|k)),$$

such that $J = J_m + J_v$. Now, at time step $k + 1$ we have to consider the shifted optimal solution. The optimal cost is given by $J^*(k + 1) = J_m^*(k + 1) + J_v^*(k + 1)$ and from optimality follows that $J^*(k + 1) \leq J_m^*(1|k) + J_v^*(1|k)$ with the suboptimal mean cost

$$J_m^*(1|k) = J_m^*(k) - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \{ ||z_i(0|k)||_Q^2 + ||v_i(0|k)||_{P_t}^2,$$

$$- ||z_i^*(N|k)||_Q^2 - ||K_N z_N^*(N|k)||_{P_t}^2 + ||z_i^*(N|k)||_{P_t}^2 - ||(A_N^i + B_i K_N) z_N^*(N|k)||_{P_t}^2 \} \leq J_m^*(k) - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \{ ||z_i(0|k)||_Q^2,$$

$$+ ||v_i(0|k)||_{P_t}^2 + ||z_N^*(N|k)||_{W}^2 \} , \quad (C.1)$$

where $W = C_N^T K_N P C_{N_i}$. Note that $||z_i^*(N|k)||_Q^2 = ||z_N^*(N|k)||_{Q_i}^2$, and $||z_i^*(N|k)||_{P_t}^2 = ||z_N^*(N|k)||_{P_t}^2$. The inequality follows from (15a) and (15b), since $\sum_{i=1}^{M} ||z_N^*(N|k)||_{W}^2 \leq 0$. The suboptimal variance cost $J_v(1|k)$ is given by

$$J_v(1|k) = J_v^*(k) - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \{ \text{tr}(Q_i \Sigma_i(0|k)) + \text{tr}(K_N^T R_i K_N \Sigma_i(0|k)) - \text{tr}(Q_i \Sigma_i(N|k)) - \text{tr}(K_N^T R_i K_N \Sigma_i(N|k)) + \text{tr}(P_i \Sigma_i(N|k) - P_i A_{N_i,K} \Sigma_i(N|k) A_{N_i,K}^T - P_i (C_{N_i} \Sigma_i(N|k) C_{N_i}^T),$$

$$- \text{tr}(P_i (C_{N_i} \Sigma_i(N|k) z_N^*(N|k) z_N^* (N|k) C_{N_i}^T))] \} . \quad (D.1)$$

Now we emphasize the equivalence of $\text{tr}(Q_i \Sigma_i(N|k)) = \text{tr}(Q_i \Sigma_i(N|k))$ and $\text{tr}(P_i \Sigma_i(N|k)) = \text{tr}(P_i \Sigma_i(N|k))$ and substitute this in the foregoing equation. By application of the cyclic invariance property of the trace, $\Sigma_{N_i}(N|k)$ can be factored out and the last term can be rewritten as $||z_N^*(N|k)||_{W}^2$, which yields

$$J_v(1|k) \leq J_v^*(k) - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \left\{ \text{tr}(Q_i \Sigma_i(0|k)) + \text{tr}(K_N^T R_i K_N \Sigma_i(0|k)) - ||z_N^*(N|k)||_{W}^2 \right\} \quad (C.2)$$

After combining (C.1) and (C.2), we obtain from optimality that

$$J^*(k + 1) \leq J^*(k) - \sum_{i=1}^{M} \{ \mathbb{E}(||x_i(k)||_Q^2 + ||u_i(k)||_{P_t}^2) \}

= J^*(k) - \mathbb{E}(||x(k)||_Q^2 + ||u(k)||_{P_t}^2) \leq J^*(k) - \mathbb{E}(||x(k)||_Q^2),$$

where $x_i(k) = x_i(0|k)$ and $u_i(k) = u_i(0|k)$. Using standard arguments we conclude that $\mathbb{E}(||x(k)||_Q^2) \to 0$, as $k \to \infty$. □

D Proof of Lemma 12

**PROOF.** Let Assumption 7 hold, then there exist local terminal sets (17), such that $z \in \mathcal{Z}_{f,i}(\alpha_i) \Rightarrow z_i(z_i | P_z \leq \alpha_i)$. If $\alpha_i$ is updated with (19), then [8, Lemma 8] states that $z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_{f,i}(\alpha_i) \Rightarrow z_i(z_i + 1) \in \mathcal{Z}_{f,i}(\alpha_i + 1)$ (D.1) where $z_i(z_i + 1) = A_{N_i,K} z_N^i$. From [8, Lemma 9] follows $\mathcal{Z}_{f,i}(\alpha_i(k)) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{Z}_{f,M}(\alpha_M(k)) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_f, \forall k \geq 0$ (D.2) is a global invariant set. Asymptotic stability follows from [8, Theorem 5], which is the first requirement for mean square stability. The second condition is the feasibility of LMI (22a) - (22b) for $\Sigma_f, N_i > 0 [10, \text{Sec. 2}]$. This follows directly from Assumption 7 and (22b), since $\Sigma_f, N_i \geq \psi I > 0$. □