

THE MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE FOR A TIME-OPTIMAL BILEVEL SWEEPING CONTROL PROBLEM*

NATHALIE T. KHALIL[†] AND FERNANDO LOBO PEREIRA[†]

Abstract. In this article, we investigate a time-optimal bilevel optimal control problem whose lower-level dynamics feature a sweeping control process involving a *truncated normal cone*. This problem instance arises in structured crowd motion control problems in a confined space. We establish the corresponding necessary optimality conditions in the Gamkrelidze's form. The analysis relies on the *smooth approximation* of the lower level sweeping control system, thereby dealing with the resulting lack of Lipschitzianity with respect to the state variable inherent to the sweeping process, and on the *flattening* of the bilevel structure via an exact penalization technique. Necessary conditions of optimality in the Gamkrelidze's form are applied to the resulting standard approximating penalized state-constrained single-level problem, and the main result of this article is obtained by passing to the limit.

Key words. optimal control theory, control of constrained systems, sweeping process, bilevel optimization, exact penalization

AMS subject classifications. 49K15, 49J52

1. Introduction. In this article, we present and derive a Maximum Principle in which the usual Pontryagin-Hamilton function (cf. [21]) is replaced by its Gamkrelidze's form (cf. [24, 3]) for a specific bilevel optimal problem featuring a sweeping process at the lower level. The first formulation of an instance of this problem is the minimum-time optimal control problem of a moving structured crowd in [28] in which existence, and well-posedness are addressed. The motivation to investigate this class of problems, goes well beyond motion control of structured crowds. Multi-level sweeping control process paradigms constitute a natural framework for operation of teams of drones or robots in a shared confined space. Similar problems can be formulated in other domains, such as, smart material, nanoferro-electric, and elasticity systems, among others.

Sweeping processes were introduced in the 1970's by Moreau in [34] to model elastoplasticity phenomena which involved a differential inclusion of the form

$$(1.1) \quad \dot{x}(t) \in -N_C(x(t)) \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T],$$

where C is a convex set, and $N_\Omega(x)$ is the normal cone to a convex set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ at x . The sequel of his research led to the so-called *catching-up algorithm*, [35]. Fuelled by a fast expansion of the range of applications, which encompasses systems with hysteresis, nonlinear electric circuits, nonsmooth mechanics, robotics, traffic equilibria, and crowd motion, no name just a few, this field expanded to very diverse sweeping processes settings - such as time-varying, and nonconvex sets, dynamics with additive nonlinear controlled drifts, distributed systems, and systems with trajectories of bounded variation, among others, - associated with a rather comprehensive body of

*Submitted August 2021.

Funding: The authors acknowledge the partial support of FCT R&D Unit SYSTEC - POCI-01-0145-FEDER-006933, and R& D Projects STRIDE - NORTE-01-0145-FEDER-000033, MAGIC - PTDC/POCI-01-0145-FEDER-032485, SNAP - NORTE-01-0145-FEDER-000085, HARMONY - NORTE-01-0145-FEDER-031411 funded by ERDF — COMPETE2020 — FCT/MEC — PT2020 — NORTE 2020, POCI and PIDDAC

[†]SYSTEC, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Porto University, and with the Institute for Systems and Robotics, 4200-465 Porto, Portugal (khalil.t.nathalie@gmail.com, flp@fe.up.pt, <http://www.nathaliekhalil.com/>, <https://paginas.fe.up.pt/~flp/>).

results in control and optimization. This has been documented in a vast literature of which [22, 31, 37, 15, 8, 1, 11, 17, 7, 2, 41, 26, 16] is a very small sample. It is worth pointing out that, by considering discrete approximations, the relevance of the developments defined in [10, 9] goes beyond contributions in dynamic optimization theory to include also computational perspectives.

In order to provide a flavor of the bilevel optimal control paradigm involving sweeping processes considered in this article, consider a population confined to a certain closed space - taken to be a closed sphere, for simplicity - and trying to exit it in the minimal possible time. The population is moving along a trajectory y prescribed by a coordinator in order to reach the exit. Moreover, the population features a certain *structure*, in the sense that it is constituted of one or more groups of individuals each one remaining in a moving set (taken also to be a closed sphere), while minimizing their effort to achieve this. In order to model the “conflict” between the goal of minimizing the time to reach the exit, and the one of minimizing the effort in order to stay inside the set moving in the direction of the exit, the problem is formulated as a bilevel problem as follows:

- Upper level control problem defining the motion direction for each group with the goal of driving the whole population to the exit in minimum time, while all groups remain constrained to the big closed sphere, and
- Lower level control problem whose dynamics define the motion of the individuals of each group modelled by a sweeping control process with its own control dependent drift term required to stay confined to their moving set while minimizing their control effort to achieve this.

Given the complexity of the optimality conditions for the general formulation of this problem, here, we consider only one population group. Thus, by considering two closed spheres Q , and Q_1 in \mathbb{R}^n with radius R , and R_1 , respectively, with $R \gg R_1$, being Q , and Q_1 centered at the initial time $t = 0$, respectively, at the points q_0 , and y_0 in \mathbb{R}^n such that $y_0 + Q_1 \subset Q$, our set-up involves the two following nested optimal control problems:

- Upper level minimum-time control problem $(P_H(x(0), u_L))$ whose control process (T, y) are such that $y(0) = y_0$ is a given point in $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $Q_1 + y(t) \subset Q \forall t \in [0, T]$ and $y(T) \in \bar{E}$, for some exit set \bar{E} (to be defined below). Thus, T is the final time, and y is a vector defining the translation of the disk Q_1 at each instant, while $(x(0), u_L)$ is a solution to the lower level problem.
- Lower level minimum control effort problem $(P_L(T, y))$ whose control process (x, u_L) , is such that $x(0) \in Q_1 + y_0$, and $x(t) \in Q_1 + y(t) \subset Q \forall t \in [0, T]$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the “representative” position of the individuals of the group that are required to stay confined to the moving sphere $Q_1 + y(t)$. (T, y) is regarded as a parameter inherited from the upper level problem.

Notice that, although y remains in the interior of the set Q , the inclusion specified in the lower level problem entails that y also has to satisfy state constraints. However, in the formulation of our problem, no sweeping control intervenes in the evolution of

y at the upper level problem. Now, we state in detail both optimal control problems.

$$\begin{aligned}
& (P_H(x(0), u_L)) \text{ Minimize } J_H(T, y; x(0), u_L) \\
& \text{subject to } \dot{y}(t) = v(t) \quad \text{a.e. in } [0, T] \\
& \quad y(0) = y_0 \in Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n, \text{ so that } y_0 + Q_1 \subset Q \\
& \quad y(T) \in \bar{E}, \bar{E} = \partial[(E + R_1 B_1(0)) \cap Q], E \subset \partial Q \\
& \quad v \in \mathcal{V} := \{v \in L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n) : v(t) \in V\} \\
(1.2) \quad & \quad Q_1 + y(t) \subset Q \quad \forall t \in [0, T] \\
(1.3) \quad & \quad \text{and } (T, y) \text{ s.t. } \exists \text{ a solution } (x(0), u_L) \text{ to } (P_L(T, y)).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, y_0 is the given center of Q_1 at the initial time $t = 0$, $J_H(T, y; x(0), u_L) := T$ (time-optimal), $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is compact, E is closed and connected, $B_1(0)$ is the closed unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n centered at the origin, ∂A denotes the boundary of the set A , and $(P_L(T, y))$ represents the parametric lower level control problem whose dynamics involve a sweeping process. Before pursuing, we remark that \bar{E} was designed as target set for y to ensure a feasible finite time solution preserving (1.2).

$$\begin{aligned}
& (P_L(T, y)) \text{ Minimize } J_L(x(0), u_L; T, y) \\
(1.4) \quad & \text{subject to } \dot{x}(t) \in f(x(t), u(t)) - N_{Q_1 + y(t)}^M(x(t)) \text{ a.e.} \\
& \quad x(0) \in Q_1 + y_0, \\
& \quad u \in \mathcal{U} := \{u \in L^\infty([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^m) : u(t) \in U\} \\
(1.5) \quad & \quad x(t) \in Q_1 + y(t) \quad \forall t \in [0, T],
\end{aligned}$$

where, for a given pair (T, y) , $J_L(x(0), u_L; T, y) := \int_0^T (|u(t)|^2 + |u_0(t)|^2) dt$ ¹ (control effort), $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is compact, the truncated cone $N_A^M(z) := N_A(z) \cap MB_1(0)$, being $N_A(z)$ the Mordukhovich (limiting) normal cone to the closed set A at point z in the sense of [33, 14], with $M > 0$ being a certain given constant, and $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}_0 := \{u_0 \in L^1([0, T]; \mathbb{R}) : u_0(t) \in [0, 1]\}$ is a control function taking nonzero values only on the set $\{t \in [0, T] : x(t) \in \partial[Q_1 + y(t)]\}$, and specified implicitly in the sweeping component of the dynamics as follows

$$(1.6) \quad -N_{Q_1 + y(t)}^M(x(t)) := \{\bar{f}(x, y)(x - y)u_0(t) : u_0(t) \in [0, 1]\}$$

$$\text{where } \bar{f}(x, y) = \begin{cases} -\frac{M}{R_1} & \text{if } x \in \partial[Q_1 + y] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is important to notice that, while $(P_L(T, y))$ is a nonstandard sweeping optimal control problem that depends on the parameter (T, y) , $(P_H(x(0), u_L))$, in turn, not only depends on the parameter $(x(0), u_L)$, but also features the constraint (1.3) whose satisfaction entails the nonemptiness of the solution set of $(P_L(T, y))$.

Remark 1.1. The reason to consider the truncated normal cone at the lower level sweeping process instead of the usual normal cone is to preserve the relevance of the bilevel structure of the problem. Note that, if the normal cone was used in the proposed problem formulation, then the upper level control could always drive arbitrarily the set Q_1 to the exit set E without forcing the lower level control system

¹Here, $|u(t)|$, and $|u_0(t)|$ are the finite dimensional norms of the values of, respectively, u and u_0 as functions considered in L^∞ , and in L^1 .

to use an extra control effort to remain feasible. In this case, the bilevel problem would collapse to two independent optimal control problems. This fact is also discussed in the related paper, [28].

Whenever the context is clear, we refer to the upper and the lower level problems as (P_H) , and (P_L) , respectively, thus, simplifying the presentation by dropping the parameters $(x(0), u_L)$ and (y, T) .

For some parameter (T, y) , a pair $(x(\cdot), u_L(\cdot))$ is a *feasible* (or *admissible*) control process to (P_L) if $u_L(\cdot)$ is feasible control to (P_L) , and $x(\cdot)$ is an arc satisfying the differential inclusion (1.4), the initial condition, together with (1.5). An *optimal solution* to (P_L) is a feasible pair of (P_L) minimizing the value of the cost functional $J_L(x(0), u_L; T, y)$ over all admissible pairs of (P_L) . A feasible quadruple of the dynamic control problem (P_H) is the collection of a feasible pair (T, y) , and an optimal pair $(x(0), u_L)$ to (P_L) . The feasible quadruple $(T, y; x(0), u_L)$ is optimal to (P_H) if $(T, y; x(0), u_L)$ if it minimizes the value of $J_H(T, y; x(0), u_L)$ among all admissible strategies of (P_H) .

Given our set-up, the state constraints (1.2), and (1.5) can be respectively expressed by inequality constraints $h_H(y(t)) \leq 0$, and $h_L(x(t), y(t)) \leq 0$, where, by denoting the Euclidean norm by $|\cdot|$,

$$(1.7) \quad h_H(y) := \frac{1}{2} (|y - q_0|^2 - (R - R_1)^2),$$

and

$$(1.8) \quad h_L(x, y) := \frac{1}{2} (|x - y|^2 - R_1^2).$$

It is important to emphasize here that the presence of state constraints is the reason why we chose the Gamkrelidze form of the Maximum Principle, [24, 3] instead of the more common Dubovitskii-Myliutin form, [21]. While, in the latter, the multipliers associated with the state constraints are measures, in the former, they are the much more regular monotonic functions of bounded variation. The price to pay for this extra regularity is that the functions specifying the inequality state constraints have to be C^2 . This assumption clearly holds for our problem. Moreover, as shown in [4] and further exploited in [27], additional controllability, and regularity assumptions may be imposed on the optimal control problem data ensuring that the measure multipliers of the Maximum Principle are continuous. This fact is very important to ensure the efficiency of numerical computational algorithms based on indirect methods using necessary conditions of optimality and was exploited in [12], and [30].

We organize the article as follows. In section 2, we set the assumptions on the data of the problem, and we establish the main theorem of the paper: necessary optimality conditions in the Gamkrelidze's form of the time-optimal bilevel sweeping control problem defined by (P_H) and (P_L) . In Section 3, we detail the proof of the main theorem which is essentially based on smoothing the sweeping dynamical system and on the flattening of the bilevel problem via a certain penalization technique. The last section 4 provides some conclusion and outlines future avenues of the presented work.

Notation. We denote by $\partial^P \varphi$, $\partial \varphi$, and $\partial^C \varphi$, respectively, the proximal, the Mordukhovich (limiting), and the Clarke subdifferentials of the function φ . If φ is locally Lipschitz, then $\partial^C \varphi = \text{co} \partial \varphi$, where “co A ” denotes the closure of the convex hull of the set A . We refer the reader to [33, 14, 38] for more details on nonsmooth analysis tools and concepts. $AC([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n)$ stands for the set of absolutely continuous functions defined on $[0, T]$ with values in \mathbb{R}^n , while $NBV([0, T]; \mathbb{R})$ is the set of scalar

functions of bounded variations defined on $[0, T]$ with nonnegative values, and $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$ is the total variation.

2. Main theorem. In this section we state the key result - necessary conditions of optimality in Gamkrelidze's form for the bilevel optimal control problem formulated in the previous section - of this article. We start by stating and discussing the standing assumptions $H1 - H6$, and, then, move on to the partial calmness technical assumption without which the application of the used penalization technique would not be possible.

The data of (P_H) and of (P_L) satisfies the following standing assumptions:

- H1 $f(x, \cdot)$ is Borel measurable $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $f(\cdot, u)$ is Lipschitz continuous with constant K_f for all $u \in U$, and there exists a constant $M_1 > 0$ such that, for all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times U$, $|f(x, u)| \leq M_1$.
- H2 $f(x, U) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a closed and convex set for each x .
- H3 The control constraint sets U , and V are compact and convex.
- H4 There exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta B_1(0) \subset f(x, U)$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- H5 The constant $M > 0$ specifying the truncation level of the normal cone has to satisfy $\bar{M} > M > \bar{m}$ where, $\forall \zeta \in N_{Q_1+y(t)}(x(t))$, $\forall t \in [0, T]$ such that $x(t) \in \partial(Q_1 + y(t))$,

$$\bar{M} := \min_{|\zeta|=1} \left\{ \max_{u \in U} \{\langle \zeta, f(x(t), u) \rangle\} - \min_{v \in V} \{\langle \zeta, v \rangle\} \right\},$$

$$\bar{m} := \max_{|\zeta|=1} \left\{ \min_{u \in U} \{\langle \zeta, f(x(t), u) \rangle\} - \max_{v \in V} \{\langle \zeta, v \rangle\} \right\}.$$

- H6 The set $\Psi := \{(T, y, x, u) : (T, y) \text{ is feasible to } P_H(x, u), \text{ and } (x, u) \text{ is feasible to } P_L(T, y)\}$ is nonempty, and (T^*, y^*, x^*, u^*) is not an isolated point in Ψ .

Remark 2.1.

- a) Assumption H4, and the need to consider a truncated cone in the lower level sweeping dynamics as assumed in H5 are crucial in order to preserve the bilevel structure of the problem. For the sake of helping the reader, we provide here the key ideas of the corresponding analysis. Given the data of our problem, it is straightforward to conclude that such $M > 0$ exists since $\bar{M}(x(t), y(t)) > \bar{m}(x(t), y(t))$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover if, for some $t \in [0, T]$, $M > \bar{M}(x(t), y(t))$, then, for any $v(t) \in V$, the pair $(f, Q_1 + y(t))$ is strongly invariant, in a certain neighborhood of t and the lower level solution set would be an inactive constraint to the upper level problem in this neighborhood. On the other hand, if $M < \bar{m}(x(t), y(t))$ and $x(t) \in \partial(Q_1 + y(t))$, then there might not exist feasible solutions to the lower level problem from t onwards, and feasible control processes to (P_H) might fail to exist.
- b) The first part of assumption H6 amounts to the natural existence of compatible feasible control processes to problems at both levels. The second part is also quite natural, and it is required for technical reasons involving the used proof technique.

Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \times L^2([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the value function of (P_L) on the functional parameters of (P_H)

$$(2.1) \quad \varphi(T, v) = \min \left\{ J_L(x(0), u_L; T, y) : (x(0), u_L) \text{ feasible to } (P_L), y(t) = y_0 + \int_0^t v(s) ds \right\},$$

being (T, v) an admissible process to (P_H) .

Some considerations are in order here. Given a pair (T, y) for (P_H) , let $\Phi_L(T, y)$ be the set of feasible control processes for (P_L) . Given the particular structure of the overall problem, notably, the state constraint $h_L(x, y) \leq 0$, and the specific hypotheses imposed on its data, we have that, for all (T, y) for which $\Phi_L(T, y)$ is nonempty-valued - as mentioned above, the truncated normal cone in the dynamics of (P_L) entails that the complementary set of such (T, y) 's is not empty -, the set-valued mapping $\Phi_L(\cdot, \cdot)$ is Hausdorff Lipschitz continuous, and, thus, the finite valued map $(T, v) \rightarrow \varphi(T, v)$ is Lipschitz continuous in the topology induced by a $\mathbb{R} \times L^2([0, T], \mathbb{R}^n)$ -norm.

By using the value function φ , the articulation of (P_H) and (P_L) can be defined, and expressed in the following flattened optimal control problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.2) \quad (P_F) \text{ Minimize} \quad & J_H(T, y, x(0), u_L) := T \\
 \text{subject to} \quad & \dot{y} = v, \quad \dot{x} \in f(x, u) - N_{Q_1+y}^M(x) \quad [0, T] - \text{a.e.} \\
 & y(0) = y_0, \quad y(T) \in \bar{E}, \quad x(0) \in Q_1 + y_0 \\
 & v \in \mathcal{V}, \quad u \in \mathcal{U} \\
 & h_H(y) \leq 0, \quad h_L(x, y) \leq 0 \quad \text{on } [0, T] \\
 (2.3) \quad & \int_0^T |u_L(t)|^2 dt - \varphi(T, v) \leq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, and from now on, $|u_L(t)|^2$ stands for $|u(t)|^2 + |u_0(t)|^2$ as in the specification of the cost function of $(P_L(T, y))$.

Before pursuing, consider that for a quadruple (T, y) , and (x, u_L) jointly feasible for (P_H) , and (P_L) , we have the following result.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *Assume that H1-H6 hold. Then, there exists a solution to the problem (P_F) , i.e., the articulation of (P_L) , and (P_H) .*

This is a direct consequence of merging [28, Theorem 4.3] with [18, Theorem 1]. Indeed, while [18, Theorem 1] gives the existence of an optimal solution to the lower level problem (P_L) if it has at least one admissible process, [28, Theorem 4.3] guarantees the existence of an optimal solution to the single level problem (P_F) .

Problem (P_F) presents two key challenges: the dynamics (2.2), and, the inequality constraint (2.3). Indeed, the dynamics (2.2) are not Lipschitz continuous in x , and, therefore, the existing standard necessary optimality conditions are not applicable. The difficulty associated with the inequality (2.3) results from the fact that constraint qualifications, such as Mangasarian-Fromovitz or linear independence constraint qualifications, are too strong to hold. While the first challenge is addressed by considering a proper sequence of approximating problems with dynamics Lipschitz continuous in x , the second one requires an additional assumption. Like in [39, 40], we consider the partial calmness property (defined below) which allows to derive an equivalent problem without this constraint (2.3) but whose cost functional features the associated exact penalization term.

Now, we recall the concept of partial calmness. Let $(T^*, y^*, x^*, u_L^*, v^*)$ be a minimizer to (P_F) .

DEFINITION 2.3 (Partial Calmness). *(P_F) is called partially calm at a minimizer $(T^*, y^*, x^*, u_L^*, v^*)$ with modulus ρ if there exists $\rho \geq 0$ such that, for any feasible point (T, y, x, u_L, v) to (P_F) , the following inequality holds*

$$J_H(T, y; x(0), u_L) - J_H(T^*, y^*; x^*(0), u_L^*) + \rho \left(\int_0^T |u_L(s)|^2 ds - \varphi(T, v) \right) \geq 0.$$

Remark that partial calmness is not really a constraint qualification as it compounds properties of the lower level solution set with the properties of the upper problem cost functional. Moreover, in our particular problem, this issue is compounded by the existence of state constraints jointly on both levels. As noted in [32], and [25], the partial calmness is, in general, a very restrictive property. However, it has been shown in [39, Proposition 5.1] that the partial calmness property follows from the fact that the solution to the lower level problem is a uniformly weak sharp minimum that, now, we cast in terms of the data of our problem. Let (T^*, y^*, x^*, u_L^*) be a solution to (P_F) .

DEFINITION 2.4 (Uniform Weak Sharp Minimum). *The lower level optimal control problem of (P_F) has, a uniform weak sharp minimum around $(x^*(0), u_L^*)$ at (T^*, y^*) , if there exist positive numbers δ , and α such that*

$$J_L(x(0), u_L; T, y) - \bar{\varphi}(T, y) \geq \alpha d_{\Psi(T, y)}(x(0), u_L),$$

for all $(T, y) \in \delta B_{\mathbb{R} \times AC}(T^*, y^*)$, and for all $(x(0), u_L) \in \delta B_{\mathbb{R}^n \times L^\infty}(x^*(0), u_L^*)$, being $d_A(a) := \inf_{\bar{a} \in A} \{|a - \bar{a}|\}$ the distance of the point a to the set A .

Here, $\bar{\varphi}$ is the value function of the lower level problem φ defined above but now as a function of (T, y) instead of (T, v) with $y(t) = y_0 + \int_0^t v(\tau) d\tau$, $\Psi(T, y)$ is the solution set of the lower level problem for any pair (T, y) such that $(T, y, x, u_L) \in \Psi$ and $B_{X \times Y}(a, b)$ is the unit ball in $X \times Y$ centered in (a, b) .

It can easily be shown that, for the specific problem considered in this article, if $(T^*, y^*, x^*, u_L^*, v^*)$ is a minimizer of (P_F) , then Definition 2.4 is satisfied.

Take $(T^*, y^*, x^*, u_L^*, v^*)$ to be a minimizer of (P_F) . From H6, there are pairs $(T, y, x(0), u_L)$, and $(T, y, \bar{x}(0), \bar{u}_L)$ in a ε -neighborhood (in the appropriate spaces) of $(T^*, y^*, x^*(0), u_L^*)$ for any arbitrary small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$J_L(x(0), u_L; T, y) > J_L(\bar{x}(0), \bar{u}_L; T, y).$$

Moreover, for a given ε , we have, also from H6, that, for some $\delta > 0$, we may take the above pairs to be arbitrary such that $(T, y) \in \delta B_{\mathbb{R} \times AC}(T^*, y^*)$, and both $(x(0), u_L)$, and $(\bar{x}(0), \bar{u}_L)$ are in $\delta B_{\mathbb{R}^n \times L^\infty}(x^*(0), u_L^*)$. Note also that, from the continuity of the cost functional, and the compactness of the feasible set of $P_L(\cdot, \cdot; T, y)$, as well as the continuity of the joint state constraint on x and y , the existence of a solution is clear. Let us choose $(\bar{x}(0), \bar{u}_L)$ as above to be a solution to $P_L(\cdot, \cdot; T, y)$, i.e.,

$\bar{\varphi}(T, y) = \int_0^T |\bar{u}_L(\tau)|^2 d\tau$. On the other hand, by examining the structure of the lower level optimal control problem, it is also clear that there exists a positive constant γ such that $\|u_L - \bar{u}_L\| > \gamma \|(x(0), u_L) - (\bar{x}(0), \bar{u}_L)\|$, and, as a consequence, also some $\beta > 0$ such that $\|u_L\|^2 - \|\bar{u}_L\|^2 \geq \beta \|u_L - \bar{u}_L\|$ for all u_L satisfying the above conditions. Thus, by choosing some positive $\alpha = \beta\gamma$, we have that

$$J_L(x(0), u_L; T, y) - J_L(\bar{x}(0), \bar{u}_L; T, y) = \|u_L\|^2 - \|\bar{u}_L\|^2 \geq \beta \|u_L - \bar{u}_L\| \geq \alpha d_{\Psi(T, y)}(x(0), u_L).$$

In order to state the necessary optimality conditions in the Gamkrelidze's form for the bilevel optimal control problem (P_H) articulated with (P_L) (or equivalently the single level problem (P_F)), let us define

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} H_H(y, x, v, u, q_H, q_L, \nu_H, \nu_L, r) := & \langle q_H - \nu_H(y - q_0), v \rangle + \langle q_L - \nu_L(x - y), f(x, u) \rangle \\ & + \nu_L(x - y, v) + \sigma(y, x, q_L, \nu_L, r) - r|u|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where y, x, v, q_H, q_L take values in \mathbb{R}^n , u in \mathbb{R}^m , ν_H, ν_L in \mathbb{R} , and r is a nonnegative scalar, and, by using the alternative truncated normal cone expression in (1.6) $\sigma(y, x, q_L, \nu_L, r) = 0$ if $|x - y| < R_1$ or

$$\sigma(y, x, q_L, \nu_L, r) = \sup_{u_0 \in [0, 1]} \{ \langle q_L - \nu_L(x - y), \bar{f}(x, y)(x - y)u_0 \rangle - ru_0^2 \}.$$

Observe that, for $|x - y| = R_1$, function $\sigma(\cdot)$ is explicitly expressed by (2.5)

$$\sigma(y, x, q_L, \nu_L, r) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \bar{\sigma}(q_L, \nu_L, x, y, R_1) \leq 0 \\ \frac{1}{r} \frac{M^2}{4R_1^2} \bar{\sigma}^2(q_L, \nu_L, x, y, R_1) & \text{if } 0 < \bar{\sigma}(q_L, \nu_L, x, y, R_1) \leq r \frac{2R_1}{M} \\ \frac{M}{R_1} \bar{\sigma}^2(q_L, \nu_L, x, y, R_1) - r & \text{if } \bar{\sigma}(q_L, \nu_L, x, y, R_1) \geq r \frac{2R_1}{M}, \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{\sigma}(q_L, \nu_L, x, y, R_1) := \nu_L R_1^2 - \langle q_L, x - y \rangle$.

Now, we state our necessary conditions of optimality to (P_F) .

THEOREM 2.5. *Let H1-H6 hold, and $(T^*, y^*, x^*, v^*, u^*)$ be a solution to (P_F) .*

Then, there exists a set of multipliers $(q_H, q_L, \nu_H, \nu_L, \lambda, r)$ with q_H , and q_L in $AC([0, T^]; \mathbb{R}^n)$, non-increasing ν_H , and ν_L in $NBV([0, T^*]; \mathbb{R})$, being ν_H constant on $\{t \in [0, T^*] : |y - z| > R_1 \forall z \in \partial Q\}$, and ν_L constant on $\{t \in [0, T^*] : |y - x| < R_1\}$, and non-negative numbers λ, r , with $r = \lambda\rho$, satisfying the following conditions:*

1. *Nontriviality.* $\|(q_H, q_L)\|_{L^\infty} + \|(\nu_H, \nu_L)\|_{TV} + \lambda + r \neq 0$.
2. *Adjoint equations.*

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} -\dot{q}_H(t) &\in \partial_y H_H(y^*, x^*, v^*, u^*, q_H, q_L, \nu_H, \nu_L, r) \\ &= -(\nu_H(t) + \nu_L(t))v^*(t) + \nu_L(t)f(x^*(t), u^*(t)) \\ &\quad + \partial_y \sigma(y^*(t), x^*(t), q_L(t), \nu_L(t), r) \quad [0, T^*] - a.e. \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} -\dot{q}_L(t) &\in \partial_x H_H(y^*, x^*, v^*, u^*, q_H, q_L, \nu_H, \nu_L, r) \\ &= \partial_x \langle q_L(t) - \nu_L(t)(x^*(t) - y^*(t)), f(x^*(t), u^*(t)) \rangle \\ &\quad + \nu_L(t)v^*(t) + \partial_x \sigma(y^*(t), x^*(t), q_L(t), \nu_L(t), r) \quad [0, T^*] - a.e. \end{aligned}$$

3. *Boundary conditions.*

$$\begin{aligned} q_H(0) &\in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad q_L(0) \in N_{Q_1 + y_0}(x^*(0)) + \nu_L(0)(x^*(0) - y_0) \\ q_H(T^*) &\in -N_E(y^*(T^*)) + \nu_H(T^*)(y^*(T^*) - q_0) - \nu_L(T^*)(x^*(T^*) - y^*(T^*)) \\ q_L(T^*) &\in \nu_L(T^*)(x^*(T^*) - y^*(T^*)). \end{aligned}$$

4. *Time-transversality condition.*

$$(2.8) \quad H_H(y^*, x^*, v^*, u^*, q_H, q_L, \nu_H, \nu_L, r)(t) = \lambda, \quad \forall t \in [0, T^*].$$

5. *Maximum condition on the lower level control.*
 $u^*(t)$ maximizes on U , $[0, T^*]$ -a.e., the mapping

$$(2.9) \quad u \rightarrow \langle q_L(t) - \nu_L(t)(x^*(t) - y^*(t)), f(x^*(t), u) \rangle - r|u|^2.$$

6. *Maximum condition on the upper level control.*

$$(2.10) \quad -q_H + \nu_H(y^* - q_0) - \nu_L(x^* - y^*) \in -r\partial_v^C \varphi(T^*, v^*) + N_V(v^*).$$

We shall explicit also the expression of the subdifferential $\partial_v^C \varphi(T^*, v^*)$ appearing in condition 6. above. We denote by $\Psi(T, y)$ the set of solutions to the lower level problem (P_L) for a given feasible pair (T, y) , and by H_L its Pontryagin-Hamilton function given by

$$H_L(y, x, v, u, \bar{p}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\lambda}) := \langle p_H - \mu_H(y - q_0), v \rangle + \mu_L \langle x - y, v \rangle \\ + \langle p_L - \mu_L(x - y), f(x, u) \rangle - \bar{\lambda} |u|^2 + \bar{\sigma}(y, x, p_L, \mu_L, \bar{\lambda})$$

where y, x, v, p_H , and p_L take values in \mathbb{R}^n , u_L in \mathbb{R}^m , μ_H , and μ_L in \mathbb{R} , and $\bar{\lambda}$ is a nonnegative scalar, $\bar{p} := (p_H, p_L)$, $\bar{\mu} := (\mu_H, \mu_L)$, $\bar{\sigma}(y, x, p_L, \mu_L, \bar{\lambda})$ either takes the value 0 if $|x - y| < R_1$, or $\sup_{u_0 \in [0, 1]} \{ \langle p_L - \mu_L(x - y), \bar{f}(x, y)(x - y)u_0 \rangle - \bar{\lambda}u_0^2 \}$ if $|x - y| = R_1$ (in

this case, $\bar{\sigma}(\cdot)$ takes an explicit form analogue to (2.5)), and the set valued mapping $\partial_v^C \varphi(\cdot, \cdot)$ is given by

$$\partial_v^C \varphi(T^*, v^*) := \text{co} \bigcup_{x^* \in \Psi(T^*, v^*)} \{ \zeta_2 \in L^2([0, T^*]; \mathbb{R}^n) : \exists (\bar{p}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\lambda}) \in AC \times NBV \times \mathbb{R}^+ \text{ such that} \\ \|\bar{p}\|_{L^\infty} + \bar{\lambda} + \|\bar{\mu}\|_{TV} \neq 0, \\ \bar{\mu} \text{ monotonically non-increasing, with } \mu_L \text{ and } \mu_H \\ \text{constant, respectively, on} \\ \{t \in [0, T^*] : |y - x| < R_1\} \text{ and } \{t \in [0, T^*] : |y - z| > R_1 \forall z \in \partial Q\}, \\ (-\dot{\bar{p}}, \dot{y}^*, \dot{x}^*) \in \partial_{(y, x, \bar{p})}^C H_L(y^*, x^*, v^*, u^*, \bar{p}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\lambda}) \quad [0, T^*] - \text{a.e.}, \\ (\bar{p}(0), \bar{p}(T^*)) \in \bar{P}_L, \\ -\bar{\lambda}\zeta_2 \in p_H - \mu_H(y^* - q_0) + \mu_L(x^* - y^*) + N_V(v^*) \}.$$

Here,

$$\bar{P}_L := \{ (\bar{p}(0), \bar{p}(T^*)) : p_H(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad p_L(0) \in N_{Q_1 + y_0^*}(x^*(0)) + \mu_L(0)(x^*(0) - y_0^*), \\ p_H(T^*) \in -N_{\bar{E}}(y^*(T^*)) + \mu_H(T^*)(y^*(T^*) - q_0) - \mu_L(T^*)(x^*(T^*) - y^*(T^*)), \\ \text{and } p_L(T^*) = \mu_L(T^*)(x^*(T^*) - y^*(T^*)) \}.$$

The proof of Theorem 2.5, and the computation of the expression for $\partial_v^C \varphi(T^*, v^*)$ are given in the next section.

3. Proof of the Main Theorem.

The proof is organized into five steps:
Step 1. Here, the key challenge of the sweeping process at the lower level problem is addressed. Indeed, the main difficulty is the lack of Lipschitz continuity of the right-hand side of the dynamics of (P_L) with respect to the state variable. In order to overcome this difficulty, we construct a sequence of auxiliary problems $\{(P_L^k)\}$ approximating (P_L) , being the truncated normal cone in the dynamics of each (P_L^k) replaced by a mapping depending on the parameter k and Lipschitz continuous w.r.t. the state variable. It is important to mention that our construction differs from the one in [18, 41] where the usual normal cone is considered. Moreover, in our approximation to the lower level problem, the state constraint condition cannot be discarded from the formulation, in opposition to work in [18, Lemma 1], or [41, Lemma 4.2].

In this step, we also provide an explicit expression of the subdifferential of the value function, denoted $\partial_v \varphi^k$, representing the lower level approximated

problem (P_L^k) . (This expression - that in the limit in k yields $\partial_v \varphi$ - is required in order to state the maximum condition of the upper level problem, cf. Condition 6. of Theorem 2.5).

- Step 2. Now, two substeps are combined: (a) the flattening of the approximating bilevel problem, and (b) the application of the Ekeland's variational principle. Substep (a) allows to obtain a standard "single-level" approximating optimal control problem. The flattening consists in replacing the original pair of coupled optimal control problems (P_H) , and (P_L^k) by another one constructed by adding to (P_H) the constraints of (P_L^k) , and an additional constraint involving the value function of (P_L^k) whose arguments are the upper level parameters (T, y) . Since the solution to each (P_L^k) is not known, Substep (b) is required. It consists in the application of Ekeland's variational principle to ensure the existence of a solution to a suitably perturbed version of the approximating flattened problem (P_F^k) . By suitably perturbed version, we mean that the solutions of the approximating sequence of problems converge in a proper sense (to be defined below) to the ones of the original reference optimal control process.
- Step 3. Here, the degeneracy caused by the constraint (2.3) involving the value function associated with the lower level problem as detailed in Step 2 (a) is handled, by using the partial calmness property which holds from the fact that the solution is a local uniform weak sharp minimum. Due to the partial calmness property, an exact penalization technique allows the construction of a related optimal control problem where this additional constraint is absorbed in the cost functional as an exact penalty term.
- Step 4. Now, the maximum principle of Pontryagin in the Gamkrelidze's form of [3] with nonsmooth data, [29], is applied to the perturbed approximating single-level problem. Besides the reasons pointed out in Section 1 for choosing the Gamkrelidze's form, there are important technical advantages inherent to the fact that, in this form, the multipliers associated with the state constraints are monotonic functions of bounded variation instead of mere Borel measures as it is the case of the Dubovitskii-Miliutyn form.
- Step 5. This last step consists in passing to the limit in the necessary conditions of optimality established in Step 4. By using standard compactness results, we recover the necessary optimality conditions of our main result, Theorem 2.5.

As we go through these five steps, most of the relevant intermediate results will be only stated in order to simplify the presentation, being the corresponding proofs presented in the Appendix.

3.1. Lower level dynamics approximation, and computation of $\partial^C \varphi^k$.

a) Lipschitz continuous approximation of the lower level dynamics.

We construct a sequence of conventional control processes, in the sense that the dynamics depend Lipschitz continuously on the state variable, approximating the feasible sweeping control process in (P_L) . Approximations of this type have been considered in [18, 41]. However, we have to construct a different scheme since our context differs significantly from the previous ones. Now, we have a

- i) bounded truncated normal cone instead of the usual normal cone; and a
- ii) time varying set $Q_1 + y(t)$ instead of a constant one.

By recalling the alternative representation of the lower level dynamics given by

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u) + \bar{f}(x, y)u_0(x - y),$$

where $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}_0 := L^1([0, T]; [0, 1])$ is an additional scalar control, and $\bar{f} : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, is defined by $\bar{f}(x, y) = \begin{cases} -\frac{M}{R_1} & \text{if } |x - y| = R_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$, we shall now consider at the lower level the control system $(D^k(T, y))$ - that we will refer to simply by (D^k) - approximating the original one.

$$(D^k) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x} = f^k(x, y, u, u_0) & [0, T] - \text{a.e.} \\ h_L(x, y) \leq 0, & \forall t \in [0, T] \\ x(0) \in Q_1 + y_0, \\ u \in \mathcal{U}, & u_0 \in \mathcal{U}_0 \end{cases}$$

where

$$(3.1) \quad f^k(x, y, u, u_0) := f(x, u) - u_0 c(\gamma_k, x, y)(x - y)$$

being $c(\gamma_k, x, y) := \min \left\{ \frac{M}{R_1}, \gamma_k e^{\gamma_k h_L(x, y)} \right\}$, $h_L(x, y)$ as in (1.8), and $\{\gamma_k\}$ is a sequence such that

$$(3.2) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_k = \infty, \text{ and, for all } k, \quad \gamma_k > \frac{M}{R_1}.$$

Denote by (P_L^k) the k -approximate lower level problem defined by

$$(P_L^k) \text{ Minimize } J_L(x(0), u_L; T, y) := \int_0^T |u_L(t)|^2 dt$$

subject to (D^k) .

Let (T, y, x, u) be feasible for the coupled optimal control problems (P_H) , and (P_L) , and let $\mathcal{F}_L^k(T, y) := \{(x, u, u_0) \in AC([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}_0 : (x, u, u_0) \text{ is feasible for } (D^k)\}$.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *For γ_k satisfying (3.2), and a pair $(T, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathcal{F}_L(T, y) \neq \emptyset$, the set $\mathcal{F}_L^k(T, y)$ is not empty.*

Proof. Take a pair $(T, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathcal{F}_L(T, y) \neq \emptyset$. Standard ordinary differential equation result for dynamics Lipschitz continuous with respect to the state variable x asserts the existence of solution for any given feasible control pair (u, u_0) .

Moreover, due to the fact that $\gamma_k > \frac{M}{R_1}$, and, by construction, we have that, for any given (T, y, x) , the velocity set associated with the dynamics of (D^k) contains the one of the dynamics of (P_L) ². Thus, it is always possible to assert the existence of a control process $(x_k, u_k, u_{0,k})$ feasible to (D^k) that satisfies the constraints of (P_L^k) . \square

Let \bar{T} be some positive number, and $\Delta(\cdot, \cdot) : (\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}_0) \times (\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}_0) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{U}$, and \mathcal{U}_0 specified on $[0, \bar{T}]$) be defined by

$$(3.3) \quad \Delta(\bar{\theta}_1, \bar{\theta}_2) := \|\bar{\theta}_1 - \bar{\theta}_2\|_{L_1}$$

and let $\mathcal{S} := \mathbb{R}^+ \times AC([0, \bar{T}]; \mathbb{R}^n) \times AC([0, \bar{T}]; \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}_0$. In what follows, let $\bar{T} = \max_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \{T, T_i\}$, and, put $\bar{\theta}_i = 0$ if $\bar{\theta}_i$ is not defined in some final subinterval $[T_i, \bar{T}]$.

From the proposed approximation scheme, and due to Proposition 3.1, the following result holds.

²More generally, we have that for, any given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, if $\bar{k} > \bar{k} > \frac{M}{r_1}$, the velocity set associated with $(D^{\bar{k}})$ is contained in the one of $(D^{\bar{k}})$

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Let $(T, y, x, v, u, u_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ be such that $(x, u, u_0) \in \mathcal{F}_L(T, y)$.*

Then, there exists a sequence $\{(T_k, y_k, x_k, v_k, u_k, u_{0,k})\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ with elements in \mathcal{S}^k , being \mathcal{S}^k the space \mathcal{S} defined on $[0, T_k]$, satisfying the following properties:

- 1) $|T - T_k| + |x_k(0) - x(0)| + \Delta((v_k, u_k, u_{0,k}), (v, u, u_0)) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$,
- 2) $y_k(0) = y_0$, and $\dot{y}_k = v_k$ \mathcal{L} -a.e. on $[0, T_k]$, and
- 3) $(x_k, u_k, u_{0,k}) \in \mathcal{F}_L^k(T_k, y_k)$, with (D^k) defined now on $[0, T_k]$.

Moreover, there exists a subsequence (we do not relabel) of $\{x_k\}$ converging uniformly to an arc x which is the unique solution to

$$(D) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x} = f(x, u) - N_{Q_1+y}^M(x) & [0, T] - \text{a.e.} \\ h_L(x, y) \leq 0, & \forall t \in [0, T] \\ u \in \mathcal{U} \\ x(0) \in Q_1 + y_0 \end{cases} .$$

Although making use of standard arguments, the proof of proposition 3.2 is somewhat long. To make the presentation easier to follow, we include this proof in the Appendix.

b) Computation of $\partial^C \varphi^k$. Denote by φ^k the value function for (P_L^k) given in (2.1). Since it is needed to establish the necessary conditions of optimality, we shall compute its limiting subdifferential, denoted by $\partial \varphi^k$ (whose limit, $\partial \varphi$, appears in the maximum condition on the upper level problem in Condition 6. of Theorem 2.5). For this purpose, we apply the idea in [40, Theorem 2.3], albeit in the context of the Pontryagin-Hamilton function in the Gamkrelidze's form given by (3.7) (cf. [29]). Following the idea in [40], we notice that the arguments of the value function inherited from the upper level problem are given in terms of control functions. For this reason, it is convenient to cast our problem in an equivalent one on a fixed time interval $[0, T^*]$ by a standard transformation involving a time variable change, giving rise to additional scalar nonnegative control and state component, i.e., $t \in AC([0, T^*]; \mathbb{R}^+)$, with $t(0) = 0$, and $\omega \in L^2([0, T^*]; \mathbb{R}^+)$, related by

$$(3.4) \quad t(\tau) = \int_0^\tau \omega(s) ds.$$

This allows the value function given in (2.1) to be expressed as in the context of [40], that is, the value function of (P_L^k) on the functional parameters of (P_H) can now be written down as $\varphi^k : L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^+) \times L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where

$$(3.5) \quad \varphi^k(\omega, v) = \min\{J_L(x(0), u_L; T, y) : (x(0), u_L) \text{ feasible for } (P_L^k(T, y))\},$$

being $v \in \mathcal{V}$ the control associated with the arc y , and ω the additional "control" yielding the final time T , on the fixed time interval $[0, T^*]$.

Now, problem (P_L^k) , or equivalently $(P_L^k(t(T^*), y))$, can be written (without relabeling) as follows.

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & (P_L^k) \text{ Minimize } J_L(x(0), u_L; t(T^*), y) := \int_0^{T^*} |u_L(s)|^2 \omega(s) ds \\ & \text{subject to} \\ & (\overline{D}^k) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x} = f^k(x, y, u, u_0)\omega, & \dot{t} = \omega, & [0, T^*] - \text{a.e.} \\ x(0) \in Q_1 + y_0, & t(0) = 0 \\ u \in \mathcal{U}, & u_0 \in \mathcal{U}_0, & \omega \in L^2([0, T^*]; \mathbb{R}^+) \\ h_L(x, y) \leq 0 & \forall t \in [0, T^*] \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $f^k(x, y, u, u_0)$ is as in (3.1), and (t, y) (or, equivalently, the associated control pair (ω, v)) is a solution to $(P_H^k(x(0), u_L))$ on the fixed time interval $[0, T^*]$ stated below.

$$\begin{aligned} (P_H^k) \text{ Minimize } & J_H(t(T^*), y, x(0), u_L) := t(T^*) \\ \text{subject to } & \dot{y} = v\omega, \quad \dot{t} = \omega \quad [0, T^*] - \text{ a.e.} \\ & y(0) = y_0 \in Q, \quad y(T^*) \in \bar{E}, \quad t(0) = 0 \\ & v \in \mathcal{V}, \quad \omega \in L^2([0, T^*]; \mathbb{R}^+), \quad h_H(y) \leq 0 \quad \forall t \in [0, T^*] \\ \text{and } & (t(T^*), y) \text{ is s.t. there exists a solution } (x(0), u_L) \text{ to } P_L^k(t(T^*), y). \end{aligned}$$

The new time parametrization enables to express the functional interdependence between (P_H^k) and (P_L^k) in the variables $(t(T^*), y)$, through the value function φ^k as a function of the controls (ω, v) .

Let $\bar{p} = (p_H, p_L)$, $\bar{\mu} = (\mu_H, \mu_L)$, $(\dot{y}, \dot{x}) = (v, f(x, u) - u_0 c(\gamma_k, y, x)(x - y))\omega$, and ω is as in (3.4). As there is no danger of confusion, and in order to unburden the notation, we omit the index k in the specification of the multipliers, the state, and control variables in the next result.

The Pontryagin-Hamilton function in the Gamkrelidze's form associated with the lower level problem (P_L^k) , is expressed by $H_L^k(\cdot, \omega) = \bar{H}_L^k(\cdot)\omega$, where

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{H}_L^k(y, x, v, u, \bar{p}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\lambda}) := & \langle p_H - \mu_H(y - q_0), v \rangle + \mu_L \langle x - y, v \rangle \\ & + \langle p_L - \mu_L(x - y), f(x, u) \rangle - \bar{\lambda}|u|^2 + \bar{\sigma}^k(y, x, p_L, \mu_L, \bar{\lambda}). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\bar{\lambda} \geq 0$, and $\bar{\sigma}^k(y, x, p_L, \mu_L, \bar{\lambda}) = 0$ if $|x - y| < R_1$ and given by

$$\begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \geq \bar{\sigma}^k(p_L, \mu_L, x, y, R_1) \\ \frac{1}{4\bar{\lambda}} (c(\gamma_k, x, y) \bar{\sigma}^k(p_L, \mu_L, x, y, R_1))^2 & \text{if } 0 \leq \bar{\sigma}^k(p_L, \mu_L, x, y, R_1) \leq \frac{2\bar{\lambda}}{c(\gamma_k, x, y)} \\ c(\gamma_k, x, y) \bar{\sigma}^k(p_L, \mu_L, x, y, R_1) - \bar{\lambda} & \text{if } \bar{\sigma}^k(p_L, \mu_L, x, y, R_1) \geq \frac{2\bar{\lambda}}{c(\gamma_k, x, y)}, \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{\sigma}^k(p_L, \mu_L, x, y, R_1) = \mu_L R_1^2 - \langle p_L, x - y \rangle$, if $|x - y| = R_1$.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *Let $\Psi^k(\omega, v)$ be the set of optimal solutions to $(P_L^k(T, y))$ and let (x, u) be one of such optimal control processes. Assume that H1-H6 are in force. Then, φ^k is Lipschitz continuous in its domain, and*

$$(3.8) \quad \partial^C \varphi^k(\omega, v) := \text{co} \bigcup_{x \in \Psi^k(\omega, v)} \{(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in L^2([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^{n+1}) : \exists (\bar{p}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\lambda}) \in AC \times NBV \times \mathbb{R}^+ \text{ such that}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\bar{p}\|_{L^\infty} + \bar{\lambda} + \|\bar{\mu}\|_{TV} \neq 0, \\ & \bar{\mu} \text{ is non-increasing, being } \mu_L \text{ and } \mu_H \text{ constant, respectively, on} \\ & \{t \in [0, T^*]; |y - x| < R_1\}, \text{ and } \{t \in [0, T^*]; |y - z| > R_1 \forall z \in \partial Q\}, \\ (3.9) \quad & (-\dot{\bar{p}}, \dot{y}, \dot{x}) \in \partial_{(y, x, \bar{p})}^C H_L^k(y, x, v, u, \bar{p}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\lambda}, \omega) \quad [0, T^*] - \text{ a.e.}, \\ & (\bar{p}(0), \bar{p}(T^*)) \in \bar{P}_L^k, \\ & -\bar{\lambda}\zeta_1 = \bar{H}_L^k(y, x, v, u, \bar{p}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\lambda}), \text{ and} \\ & -\bar{\lambda}\zeta_2 \in (p_H - \mu_H(y - q_0) + \mu_L(x - y))\omega + N_{\mathcal{V}}(v). \end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}_L^k = \{(\bar{p}(0), \bar{p}(T^*)): & p_H(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n, p_L(0) \in N_{Q_1}(x(0) - y_0) + \mu_L(0)(x(0) - y_0), \\ & p_H(T^*) \in -N_{\bar{E}}(y(T^*) + \mu_H(T^*)(y(T^*) - q_0) - \mu_L(T^*)(x(T^*) - y(T^*)), \\ & p_L(T^*) = \mu_L(T^*)(x(T^*) - y(T^*))\}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to unburden the presentation, the proof of this result is included in the Appendix.

3.2. Flattening the bilevel approximation problem and application of Ekeland's variational principle. In this stage of the proof, we construct an approximate flattened single-level problem to which the necessary conditions of optimality in the form of a Maximum Principle of Pontryagin can be applied.

By considering the change of time variable described in the previous subsection, and an additional state variable component defined by $\dot{z} = |u_L|^2$, and $z(0) = 0$, we state the flattened single-level approximated problem as an equivalent optimal control problem on a fixed time interval $[0, T^*]$ (once again, we do not relabel)

(P_F^k) Minimize $t(T^*)$

subject to

$$(D_F^k) \begin{cases} \dot{y} = v\omega, \quad \dot{x} = f^k(y, x, u, u_0)\omega, \quad \dot{z} = |u_L|^2\omega, \quad \dot{t} = \omega \quad [0, T^*] - \text{a.e.} \\ y(0) = y_0, \quad x(0) \in Q_1 + y_0, \quad z(0) = 0, \quad t(0) = 0, \quad y(T^*) \in \bar{E} \\ v \in \mathcal{V}, \quad u \in \mathcal{U}, \quad u_0 \in \mathcal{U}_0, \quad \omega \in L^2([0, T^*]; \mathbb{R}^+) \\ h_H(y) \leq 0, \quad h_L(x, y) \leq 0 \quad \forall t \in [0, T^*] \\ z(T^*) - \varphi^k(\omega, v) \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

where $\varphi^k(\omega, v)$ is as defined in (3.5).

The solution to this problem is not known, and, thus, in order to pursue with the derivation of the necessary conditions of optimality, we shall use Ekeland's variational principle, (cf. [23],[38, Theorem 3.3.1]). Since the approximate family of problems is only considered at the lower level, the extension of Propositions 3.1, and 3.2 to the current flattened control system control required to construct an appropriate sequence of auxiliary optimal control problems is straightforward. By "appropriate" it is meant that the assumptions underlying the application of Ekeland's variational principle hold.

PROPOSITION 3.4. *Let H1-H6 be in force and let $(y^*, x^*, z^*, t^*, v^*, u^*, u_0^*, \omega^*)$, with $t^*(T^*) = T^*$, be an optimal process to problem (P_F) . Then, for each k , and some positive sequence $\{\varepsilon_k\}$, with $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$, there exists a solution $(y_k^*, x_k^*, z_k^*, t_k^*, v_k^*, u_k^*, u_{0,k}^*, \omega_k^*)$ to the following perturbed version of (P_F^k) :*

$$(\tilde{P}_F^k) \text{ Minimize } t_k(T^*) + \varepsilon_k (|x_k^*(0) - x_k(0)| + \Delta((v_k^*, u_k^*, u_{0,k}^*, \omega_k^*), (v_k, u_k, u_{0,k}, \omega_k))) \\ \text{subject to } (D_F^k), \text{ and } |x_k^*(0) - x_k(0)| + \Delta((v_k^*, u_k^*, u_{0,k}^*, \omega_k^*), (v_k, u_k, u_{0,k}, \omega_k)) < \varepsilon_k,$$

where, here, $\Delta(\cdot, \cdot) : (\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}_0 \times L^2) \times (\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}_0 \times L^2) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is an extension of (3.3) to encompass the additional control in L^2 . Thus, for a subsequence (we do not relabel)

$$(y_k^*, x_k^*, z_k^*, t_k^*) \rightarrow (y^*, x^*, z^*, t^*) \text{ uniformly}$$

with $t^*(T^*) = T^*$, and

$$(v_k^*, u_k^*, u_{0,k}^*, \omega_k^*) \rightarrow (v^*, u^*, u_0^*, \omega^*) \text{ a.e. on } [0, T^*].$$

A detailed proof of this proposition can be found in the Appendix.

3.3. Partial calmness of the approximate bilevel problem (\tilde{P}_F^k) . From Proposition 3.3, the value function to the lower level problem, φ^k , is Lipschitz continuous. This Lipschitzianity is a complementary property crucial for handling the degeneracy resulting from the functional inequality constraint $z(T^*) - \varphi^k(\omega, v) \leq 0$ in (D_F^k) , as it will be shown next. This degeneracy is due to the fact that, in the presence of this inequality, the standard constraint qualifications, such as Mangasarian-Fromovitz or linear independence constraint, do not hold.

In this stage, we eliminate the pathological situation of the degeneracy caused by the functional inequality constraint $z(T^*) - \varphi^k(\omega, v) \leq 0$ in (D_F^k) , by imposing the so-called *partial calmness condition* on (P_F) , and we use an approach based on an exact penalization technique. This consists in replacing the original problem by an equivalent one (i.e., with same solution) where the inequality $z(T^*) - \varphi^k(\omega, v) \leq 0$ is eliminated as a constraint, and a related penalty term is added to the cost functional. This idea has been used in [39, 40] to obtain necessary conditions of optimality, and later in [20, 19, 6, 5] in a wide variety of instances.

In what follows, we give results on the partial calmness of the approximate problem (\tilde{P}_F^k) , by using the notation of the previous subsection.

PROPOSITION 3.5. *The partial calmness of (P_F) implies the partial calmness of (\tilde{P}_F^k) for any positive sequence $\{\varepsilon_k\}$ with $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$.*

PROPOSITION 3.6. *Let $(\chi_k^*, \bar{\theta}_k^*)$ be a solution to (\tilde{P}_F^k) . If (\tilde{P}_F^k) is partially calm at $(\chi_k^*, \bar{\theta}_k^*)$ with modulus ρ_k , then $(\chi_k^*, \bar{\theta}_k^*)$ solves the auxiliary optimal control problem*

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{P}_F^k) \text{ Minimize } & t_k(T^*) + \varepsilon_k (|x_k(0) - x_k^*(0)| + \Delta(\bar{\theta}_k, \bar{\theta}_k^*)) + \rho_k (z_k(T^*) - \varphi_k(\omega_k, v_k)) \\ \text{subject to } & (D_F^k), \text{ and } |x_k(0) - x^*(0)| + \Delta(\bar{\theta}_k, \bar{\theta}^*) < \varepsilon_k, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\theta}_k^* := (v_k^*, u_k^*, u_{0,k}^*, \omega_k^*)$, $\bar{\theta}^* := (v^*, u^*, u_0^*, \omega^*)$, $\bar{\theta}_k := (v_k, u_k, u_{0,k}, \omega_k)$, and $\Delta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is as in (3.3) expanded to encompass the additional control.

Proof. The proof goes along the lines of [5, Proposition 3.4], by following directly the definition of partial calmness (cf. Definition 2.3), the Lipschitz continuity of the value function φ_k , and by noting that $z_k^*(T^*) - \varphi^k(\omega_k^*, v_k^*) = 0$. \square

3.4. Necessary conditions of optimality for (\mathbf{P}_F^k) . We first note the following: from the Lipschitz continuity of φ^k , as discussed in the previous step, we can write

$$\partial^C \varphi^k(\omega, v) = \text{co } \partial \varphi^k(\omega, v)$$

where $\partial^C \varphi^k(\omega, v)$ is the Clarke subdifferential of φ^k at (ω, v) , and $\text{co } \partial \varphi^k(\omega, v)$ stands for the closure of the convex hull of the Mordukhovich (limiting) subdifferential of φ^k at (ω, v) .

Moreover the Clarke subdifferential is homogeneous in the sense that

$$\partial^C (-\varphi^k)(\omega, v) = -\partial^C \varphi^k(\omega, v)$$

while this property fails for the Mordukhovich (limiting) subdifferential. This property will be crucial in the derivation of necessary conditions of optimality presented below.

Now, we are ready to establish the necessary conditions of optimality to (\mathbf{P}_F^k) . We adopt the approach used in the proof of Theorem 3.2 in [40]. Clearly, the cost functional of (\mathbf{P}_F^k) makes it a nonstandard optimal control problem. Thus, in order to derive the necessary conditions of optimality, the problem is seen as a nonlinear programming problem in appropriate infinite dimensional spaces. Then, we apply

the Fermat principle to the associated Lagrangian (the required assumptions hold) and decode the obtained conditions in terms of the data of (\mathbf{P}_F^k) . Albeit rather technical, these steps are straightforward, and, thus, we omit them, and jump directly to the resulting conditions which we choose to cast in the Gamkrelidze's form of the Pontryagin-Hamilton function.

Recall $c(\gamma_k, y, x)$ defined in subsection 3.1, and denote any function $l(a, b)$ by either l_k^* or by $l_k^*(a)$ if its arguments are, respectively, either (a_k^*, b_k^*) or (a, b_k^*) . Recall also $f^k(y, x, u, u_0) = f(x, u) - u_0 c(\gamma_k, y, x)(x - y)$ and let $r^k = \lambda^k \rho^k$.

The Pontryagin-Hamilton function in Gamkrelidze's form of (\mathbf{P}_F^k) is given by

$$H_F^k(\chi, \bar{\theta}, q_H^k, q_L^k, \nu_H^k, \nu_L^k, \lambda^k, r^k; \bar{\theta}_k^*) = \tilde{H}_F^k(y, x, v, u, u_0, q_H^k, q_L^k, \nu_H^k, \nu_L^k, \lambda^k, r^k) \omega - \lambda^k \varepsilon_k |\bar{\theta} - \bar{\theta}_k^*|$$

where $\chi = (y, x, z, t)$, $\bar{\theta} = (v, u, u_0, \omega)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_F^k(y, x, v, u, u_0, q_H^k, q_L^k, \nu_H^k, \nu_L^k, \lambda^k, r^k) &= \langle q_H^k - \nu_H^k(y - q_0) + \nu_L^k(x - y), v \rangle \\ &+ \langle q_L^k - \nu_L^k(x - y), f(x, u) - c(\gamma_k, y, x)(x - y)u_0 \rangle - r^k(|u|^2 + |u_0|^2) - \lambda^k. \end{aligned}$$

Let $(\chi_k^*, \bar{\theta}_k^*)$ be a minimizer for (\mathbf{P}_F^k) , then there exists a multiplier

$$(q_H^k, q_L^k, \nu_H^k, \nu_L^k, \lambda^k, r^k) \in AC \times AC \times NBV \times NBV \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$$

not all zero, where ν_H^k, ν_L^k are non-increasing, being ν_H^k , and ν_L^k constant on the subsets of $[0, T^*]$ in which the inequalities $|y_k^* - \tilde{y}| > R_1$, $\forall \tilde{y} \in \partial Q$, and $|y_k^* - x_k^*| < R_1$ respectively hold, satisfying:

1. Adjoint equations. ($[0, T^*]$ -a.e.)

$$\begin{aligned} -\dot{q}_H^k &\in (-\nu_H^k v_k^* + \partial_y \langle q_L^k - \nu_L^k(x_k^* - y_k^*), f^{k,*} \rangle - \nu_L^k v_k^*) \omega_k^* \\ -\dot{q}_L^k &\in (\partial_x \langle q_L^k - \nu_L^k(x_k^* - y_k^*), f^{k,*} \rangle + \nu_L^k v_k^*) \omega_k^*. \end{aligned}$$

2. Boundary conditions.

$$\begin{aligned} q_H^k(0) &\in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad q_L^k(0) \in N_{Q_1 + y_0}(x_k^*(0)) + \nu_L^k(0)(x_k^*(0) - y_k^*(0)) - \lambda^k \varepsilon_k \xi_{x,k} \\ q_H^k(T^*) &\in -N_{\bar{E}}(y_k^*(T^*)) + \nu_H^k(T^*)(y_k^*(T^*) - q_0) - \nu_L^k(T^*)(x_k^*(T^*) - y_k^*(T^*)) \\ q_L^k(T^*) &= \nu_L^k(T^*)(x_k^*(T^*) - y_k^*(T^*)). \end{aligned}$$

3. Maximum condition. $(u_k^*, v_k^*, \omega_k^*, u_{0,k}^*)$ maximizes on $U \times V \times [0, 1] \times U_0$, $[0, T^*]$ -a.e., the mapping

$$(3.10) \quad (u, v, \omega, u_0) \mapsto H_F^k(\chi^*, \bar{\theta}, q_H^k, q_L^k, \nu_H^k, \nu_L^k, \lambda^k, r^k; \bar{\theta}_k^*).$$

The additive structure of (\mathbf{P}_B^k) , and the fact that $\omega \geq 0$ allows to write the maximum condition above for each one of the controls separately. Thus, we may write:

- Maximum condition on u . u_k^* maximizes on U , $[0, T^*]$ -a.e., the mapping

$$(3.11) \quad u \mapsto \langle q_L^k - \nu_L^k(x^k - y_k^*), f(x_k^*, u) \rangle - r^k |u|^2 - \lambda^k \varepsilon_k |u - u_k^*|$$

- Maximum condition on v .

$$(3.12) \quad 0 \in (q_H^k - \nu_H^k(y_k^* - q_0) + \nu_L^k(x_k^* - y_k^*) - \lambda^k \varepsilon_k \xi_{v,k}) \omega_k^* - r^k \partial_v^C \varphi^k(\omega_k^*, v_k^*) + N_V(v_k^*)$$

- Maximum condition on ω .

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \in \tilde{H}_F^{k,*} - \lambda^k \varepsilon_k (|u_k^*| + |v_k^*| + |u_{0,k}^*| + 1) \xi_{\omega,k} \\ - r^k \partial_\omega^C \varphi^k(\omega_k^*, v_k^*) + N_{L^2([0, T^*], \mathbb{R}^+)}(\omega_k^*) \end{aligned}$$

- Maximum condition on u_0 . $u_{0,k}^*$ maximizes on $[0, 1]$, $[0, T^*]$ -a.e., the mapping

$$(3.14) \quad u_0 \rightarrow -c(\gamma_k, y_k^*, x_k^*) \langle q_L^k - \nu_L^k(x_k^* - y_k^*), x_k^* - y_k^* \rangle u_0 - \lambda^k \varepsilon_k |u_0 - u_{0,k}^*|.$$

In the above $\xi_{a,k} \in \partial|a - a_k^*|_{a=a_k^*}$. Note that $|\xi_{a,k}|=1$, being the quantities $\partial_v^C \varphi^k(\omega_k^*, v_k^*)$ and $\partial_\omega^C \varphi^k(\omega_k^*, v_k^*)$ in (3.12)-(3.13), defined in Proposition 3.3 in terms of the corresponding set of multipliers $(p_H^k, p_L^k, \mu_H^k, \mu_L^k, \lambda^k)$.

3.5. Limit taking. In this last step, we show how our main result, Theorem 2.5, follows from the necessary conditions of optimality for (\mathbf{P}_F^k) by taking the appropriate limits as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The proof uses also Proposition 3.4, which asserts the existence of a subsequence $(\chi_k^*, \bar{\theta}_k^*)$ converging in an appropriate sense to $(y^*, x^*, z^*, t^*, v^*, u^*, u_0^*, \omega^*)$, with $\int_0^{T^*} \omega^*(\tau) d\tau = T^*$, the solution to the original bilevel problem (P_F) .

From the boundary conditions, the sequence of functions $\{(q_H^k(T^*), q_L^k(T^*))\}$ is uniformly bounded. Then, by Gronwall's Lemma, the q_L^k 's and q_H^k 's are uniformly bounded and \dot{q}_H^k 's, \dot{q}_L^k 's are uniformly bounded in L^1 . Thus, along a subsequence (we do not relabel), and by Dunford-Pettis theorem, $\{(q_H^k, q_L^k)\}$ converges uniformly to (q_H, q_L) , and $\{(\dot{q}_H^k, \dot{q}_L^k)\}$ converges weakly to (\dot{q}_H, \dot{q}_L) in L^1 for some q_H , and q_L in $AC([0, T^*]; \mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, since $\{(\nu_H^k, \nu_L^k)\}$ and $\{(\lambda^k, r^k)\}$ are uniformly bounded, then, again, by standard arguments, there exist subsequences such that $\{(\nu_H^k, \nu_L^k)\}$ converges point-wisely to (ν_H, ν_L) and $\{(\lambda^k, r^k)\}$ to (λ, r) , for some nonincreasing functions ν_L , and ν_H , and numbers $\lambda \geq 0$, and $r \geq 0$. Furthermore, ν_H is constant on $\{t \in [0, T^*] : |y^* - \tilde{y}| > R_1 \forall \tilde{y} \in \partial Q\}$, and ν_L is constant on $\{t \in [0, T^*] : |y^* - x^*| < R_1\}$.

Note also that, by taking the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ in (3.14) and using a result in the proof of Proposition 3.2, we obtain the function σ defined in section 2.

Now by the compactness of trajectories theorem [38, Theorem 2.5.3] and Proposition 3.4, the pair (q_H, q_L) satisfies the respective adjoint equations and boundary conditions of our main result. Moreover, passing to the limit in (3.11), and (3.14) leads to (2.9).

By taking the limits in (3.12), and (3.13) along the reference subsequence, and since $\partial^C \varphi^k(\omega_k^*, v_k^*)$ converges (in the Kuratowski sense) to $\partial^C \varphi(\omega^*, v^*)$, we obtain, respectively,

$$-q_H + \nu_H(y^* - q_0) - \nu_L(x^* - y^*) \in -r \partial_v^C \varphi(\omega^*, v^*) + N_{\mathcal{V}}(v^*)$$

which is (2.10), and

$$-H_H^*(t) + \lambda \in -r \partial_\omega^C \varphi(\omega^*, v^*) + N_{L^2([0, T^*], \mathbb{R}^+)}(\omega^*),$$

where H_H is defined in (2.4).

In order to establish the time-transversality condition (2.8), we shall fix $(u, v, u_0) = (u_k^*, v_k^*, u_{0,k}^*)$ in (3.10). By deriving (3.10) with respect to ω , we conclude that

$$\tilde{H}_F^k(y_k^*, x_k^*, v_k^*, u_k^*, u_{0,k}^*, q_H^k, q_L^k, \nu_H^k, \nu_L^k, \lambda^k, r^k) = 0.$$

By passing to the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that

$$H_H(y^*, x^*, v^*, u^*, q_H, q_L, \nu_H, \nu_L, r)(t) = \lambda, \quad \forall t \in [0, T^*]$$

which concludes the proof of Theorem 2.5.

4. Conclusion. This article deals with an instance of a bilevel optimal control problem with the dynamics at the lower level given by a sweeping process. We formulate and prove a theorem on the necessary conditions of optimality for a simple instance of this problem, i.e., the cost functional of the lower level is scalar valued. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that a problem of this type is addressed. The main techniques used in the main theorem's proof are the approximation of the sweeping process at the lower level by a smooth Lipschitz function in the state variable and the flattening of the bilevel structure to a single-level problem with an objective function involving a penalty term representing the value function of the lower level problem.

There are several possible avenues to extend this work. One might investigate problems with multi-objective functions at the lower level. In these circumstances, a new solution concept is required, for instance in the sense of Pareto-like solution, among other possibilities. Moreover, one might consider problems with nonsmooth data and more complicated state constraint sets, leading to several challenges in handling the passing to the limit. These open questions will be the subject of subsequent related articles.

Acknowledgments. The authors acknowledge the partial support of FCT R&D Unit SYSTEC - POCI-01-0145-FEDER-006933, and R& D Projects STRIDE - NORTE-01-0145-FEDER-000033, MAGIC - PTDC/POCI-01-0145-FEDER-032485, SNAP - NORTE-01-0145-FEDER-000085, HARMONY - NORTE-01-0145-FEDER-031411 funded by ERDF — COMPETE2020 — FCT/MEC — PT2020 — NORTE 2020, POCI and PIDDAC

REFERENCES

- [1] S. ADLY, T. HADDAD, AND L. THIBAUT, *Convex sweeping process in the framework of measure differential inclusions and evolution variational inequalities*, 148 (2014), pp. 5–47.
- [2] C. E. ARROUD AND G. COLOMBO, *A maximum principle for the controlled sweeping process*, Set-Valued and Variational Analysis, 26 (2018), pp. 607–629.
- [3] A. V. ARUTYUNOV, D. Y. KARAMZIN, AND F. LOBO PEREIRA, *The maximum principle for optimal control problems with state constraints by R.V. Gamkrelidze: revisited*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 149 (2011), pp. 474–493.
- [4] A. V. ARUTYUNOV, D. Y. KARAMZIN, AND F. LOBO PEREIRA, *Investigation of controllability and regularity conditions for state constrained problems*, IFAC-PapersOnLine, 50 (2017), pp. 6295–6302.
- [5] F. BENITA, S. DEMPE, AND P. MEHLITZ, *Bilevel optimal control problems with pure state constraints and finite-dimensional lower level*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 26 (2016), pp. 564–588.
- [6] F. BENITA AND P. MEHLITZ, *Bilevel optimal control with final-state-dependent finite-dimensional lower level*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 26 (2016), pp. 718–752.
- [7] B. BROGLIATO, *Extended euler-lagrange and hamiltonian formalisms in optimal control of sweeping processes with controlled sweeping sets*, European Journal of Applied Mathematics, 29 (2018), pp. 941–968.
- [8] M. BROKATE AND P. KREJČÍ, *Optimal control of ODE systems involving a rate independent variational inequality*, Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems-Series B, 18 (2013).
- [9] T. H. CAO AND B. MORDUKHOVICH, *Optimal control of a nonconvex perturbed sweeping process*, Journal of Differential Equations, 266 (2019), pp. 1003–1050.
- [10] T. H. CAO AND B. S. MORDUKHOVICH, *Optimal control of a perturbed sweeping process via discrete discrete approximations*, Disc. Cont. Dyn. Syst., Ser B, 21 (2016), pp. 3331–3358.
- [11] C. CASTAING, M. M. MARQUES, AND P. R. DE FITTE, *Some problems in optimal control governed by the sweeping process*, J. Nonlinear Convex Anal, 15 (2014), pp. 1043–1070.
- [12] R. CHERTOVSKIH, D. Y. KARAMZIN, N. T. KHALIL, AND F. LOBO PEREIRA, *Regular path-constrained time-optimal control problems in three-dimensional flow fields*, European Journal of Control, 56 (2021), pp. 98–106.
- [13] F. CLARKE, R. STERN, AND R. WOLENSKI, P, *Subgradient criteria for monotonicity, the Lipschitz condition, and convexity*, Canadian Journal of Mathematics, 45 (1993), pp. 1167–

- 1183.
- [14] F. H. CLARKE, *Optimization and nonsmooth analysis*, vol. 5, SIAM, 1990.
 - [15] G. COLOMBO, R. HENRION, N. D. HOANG, AND B. S. MORDUKHOVICH, *Optimal control of the sweeping process*, (2012).
 - [16] G. COLOMBO, B. S. MORDUKHOVICH, AND D. NGUYEN, *Optimization of a perturbed sweeping process by constrained discontinuous controls*, SIAM J. Control and Optimization, 58 (2020), pp. 2678–2709.
 - [17] G. COLOMBO AND M. PALLADINO, *The minimum time function for the controlled Moreau's sweeping process*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 54 (2016), pp. 2036–2062.
 - [18] M. D. R. DE PINHO, M. FERREIRA, AND G. SMIRNOV, *Optimal control involving sweeping processes*, Set-Valued and Variational Analysis, 27 (2019), pp. 523–548.
 - [19] S. DEMPE, J. DUTTA, AND B. MORDUKHOVICH, *New necessary optimality conditions in optimistic bilevel programming*, Optimization, 56 (2007), pp. 577–604.
 - [20] S. DEMPE, B. S. MORDUKHOVICH, AND A. B. ZEMKOHO, *Necessary optimality conditions in pessimistic bilevel programming*, Optimization, 63 (2014), pp. 505–533.
 - [21] A. Y. DUBOVITSKII AND A. A. MILYUTIN, *Extremum problems in the presence of restrictions*, USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics, 5 (1965), pp. 1–80.
 - [22] J. F. EDMOND AND L. THIBAUT, *Relaxation of an optimal control problem involving a perturbed sweeping process*, Mathematical programming, 104 (2005), pp. 347–373.
 - [23] I. EKELAND, *On the variational principle*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, 47 (1974), pp. 324–353.
 - [24] R. V. GAMKRELIDZE, *Time-optimal control processes in constrained state coordinates*, in Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, vol. 125, 1959, pp. 475–478.
 - [25] R. HENRION AND T. SUROWIEC, *On calmness conditions in convex bilevel programming*, Applicable Analysis, 90 (2011), pp. 951–970.
 - [26] N. HOANG AND B. MORDUKHOVICH, *Extended euler-lagrange and hamiltonian formalisms in optimal control of sweeping processes with controlled sweeping sets*, J. Optim. Theory Appl, 180 (2019), pp. 256–289.
 - [27] D. Y. KARAMZIN AND F. LOBO PEREIRA, *On a few questions regarding the study of state-constrained problems in optimal control*, Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications, 180 (2019), pp. 235–255.
 - [28] N. T. KHALIL AND F. LOBO PEREIRA, *A framework for the control of bilevel sweeping processes*, in Proceedings of the 58th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, IEEE, 2019.
 - [29] N. T. KHALIL AND F. LOBO PEREIRA, *Necessary conditions of optimality in the Gamkrelidze's form for state constrained problems with differential inclusion*, IEEE Control Systems Letters, 4 (2020), pp. 958–963.
 - [30] F. LOBO PEREIRA, R. CHERTOVSKIIH, A. DARYINA, A. DIVEEV, D. Y. KARAMZIN, AND E. SOFRONOVA, *A regularization approach to analyze the time-optimal motion of a mobile robot under state constraints using Pontryagin's maximum principle*, Procedia Computer Science, 186 (2021), pp. 11–20.
 - [31] B. MAURY AND J. VENEL, *A mathematical framework for a crowd motion model*, Comptes Rendus Mathematique, 346 (2008), pp. 1245–1250.
 - [32] P. MEHLITZ, L. MINCHENKO, AND A. ZEMKOHO, *A note on partial calmness for bilevel optimization problems with linearly structured lower level*, Optimization Letters, 15 (2021), pp. 1277–1291.
 - [33] B. S. MORDUKHOVICH, *Variational analysis and generalized differentiation I: Basic theory*, vol. 330, Springer Science and Business Media., 2006.
 - [34] J.-J. MOREAU, *Application of convex analysis to the treatment of elastoplastic systems*, in Applications of methods of functional analysis to problems in mechanics, Springer, 1976, pp. 56–89.
 - [35] J. J. MOREAU, *Numerical aspects of the sweeping process*, Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering, 177 (1999), pp. 329–349.
 - [36] R. POLIQUIN, R. ROCKAFELLAR, AND L. THIBAUT, *Local differentiability of distance functions*, Transactions of the American mathematical Society, 352 (2000), pp. 5231–5249.
 - [37] J. VENEL, *A numerical scheme for a class of sweeping processes*, Numerische Mathematik, 118 (2011), pp. 367–400.
 - [38] R. VINTER, *Optimal Control*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
 - [39] J. YE AND D. ZHU, *Optimality conditions for bilevel programming problems*, Optimization, 33 (1995), pp. 9–27.
 - [40] J. J. YE, *Optimal strategies for bilevel dynamic problems*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 35 (1997), pp. 512–531.
 - [41] V. ZEIDAN, C. NOUR, AND H. SAOUD, *A nonsmooth maximum principle for a controlled non-*

convex sweeping process, preprint, (2019).

Appendix. We provide here the proofs of the propositions 3.2-3.5 stated in Section 3.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Fix some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. From Proposition 3.1, let (T_k, y_k) be a pair such that $\mathcal{F}_L^k(T_k, y_k) \neq \emptyset$, with $y_k(0) = y_0$, and such that $\dot{y}_k = v_k \in \mathcal{V}$. Then, there exists a triple $(x_k, u_k, u_{0,k}) \in AC([0, T_k]; \mathbb{R}^n) \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}_0$, satisfying (D^k) . Here, and in what follows, the sets \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{U}_0 are defined on the time interval $[0, T_k]$.

The fact that the set of sequences $\{(T_k, y_k, x_k, v_k, u_k, u_{0,k})\}_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfying 1), 2), and 3) is nonempty follows again from the observation in the proof of Proposition 3.1 (i.e. that the velocity set associated with the dynamics of (D^k) is larger than the one of the dynamics of (P_L)), and the obvious fact that the sequence with the same process $\{(T, y, x, v, u, u_0)\}$, which is feasible for (D^k) , satisfies $(x, u, u_0) \in \mathcal{F}_L(T, y)$. By inspection of the data of (P_L) and (P_H) , it is possible to construct a sequence with the stated properties, and such that

$$\Delta((v_k, u_k, u_{0,k}), (v_{k+1}, u_{k+1}, u_{0,k+1})) \leq \widetilde{M}2^{-k}$$

on $[0, \max\{T_k, T_{k+1}\}]$ for some constant $\widetilde{M} \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

The boundedness of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ (by assumption H1), and of the approximation to the truncated normal cone defined by (3.1) implies that $\{\dot{x}_k\}$ is a bounded sequence in L^1 . Let us see now that $\{x_k\}$ is an equicontinuous and uniformly bounded sequence. Indeed, take any $\epsilon > 0$, and consider τ_1 , and τ_2 such that $T_k > \tau_2 > \tau_1$, and $\tau_2 - \tau_1 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{M_1 + M}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |x_k(\tau_2) - x_k(\tau_1)| &\leq \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} |\dot{x}_k(s)| ds \\ &\leq \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} (|f(x_k(s), u_k(s))| + |u_{0,k}(s)c(\gamma_k, x_k(s), y_k(s))(x_k(s) - y_k(s))|) ds \\ &\leq (M_1 + M)(\tau_2 - \tau_1) \leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since the $x_k(0)$'s are bounded, the uniform boundedness of $\{x_k\}$ is obtained from the fact that, for all $t \in [0, \bar{T}]$, where $\bar{T} = \max_{i \in \mathbb{N}}\{T, T_i\}$,

$$|x_k(t)| \leq |x_k(0)| + |x_k(t) - x_k(0)| \leq |x_k(0)| + (M_1 + M)t \leq |x_k(0)| + (M_1 + M)\bar{T}.$$

Due to the uniform boundedness, and the equicontinuity of $\{x_k\}$, we conclude, from the application of Arzela-Ascoli theorem, the existence of a subsequence (without relabeling) such that x_k converges uniformly to an absolutely continuous function x .

From the boundedness of $\{\dot{x}_k\}$ in L^1 , and from the Dunford-Pettis theorem, there exists a subsequence (we do not relabel) $\{\dot{x}_k\}$ converging weakly in L^1 to some L^1 function, denoted by ξ . Moreover, since $\{x_k(0)\}$ is a bounded sequence, we arrange by further subsequence extraction that $x_k(0) \rightarrow x(0)$ for some $x(0) \in Q_1 + y_0$. Hence,

$$x_k(t) = x_k(0) + \int_0^t \dot{x}_k(s) ds \rightarrow x(t) := x(0) + \int_0^t \xi(s) ds \quad \text{uniformly,}$$

and $\dot{x}(t) = \xi(t)$.

Next, we prove that $\dot{x}(t) \in f(x(t), u(t)) - N_{Q_1 + y(t)}^M(x(t))$ a.e.. From the convexity of Q_1 , and from the definition of the normal cone to a convex set, this amounts to show the following inequality

$$(4.1) \quad \langle f(x(t), u(t)) - \dot{x}(t), \tilde{x} - x(t) \rangle \leq 0 \quad \forall \tilde{x} \in Q_1 + y(t).$$

For this purpose, let us examine the quantity

$$\langle f(x_k(t), u_k(t)) - \dot{x}_k(t), \tilde{x} - x_k(t) \rangle$$

for the control u_k , and the pair (T_k, y_k) , for which we recall that $\mathcal{F}_L^k(T_k, y_k) \neq \emptyset$. We consider two cases: $\tilde{x} \in \text{int}(Q_1 + y_k(t))$, and $\tilde{x} \in \partial(Q_1 + y_k(t))$.

We start by taking an arbitrary $\tilde{x} \in \text{int}(Q_1 + y_k(t))$. From the a.e. equality

$$f(x_k(t), u_k(t)) - \dot{x}_k(t) = u_{0,k}(t)c(\gamma_k, x_k(t), y_k(t))(x_k(t) - y_k(t)),$$

the convexity of h_L , and the expression of its gradient, $\nabla_x h_L(x_k(t), y_k(t)) = x_k(t) - y_k(t)$, (there is no loss of generality in assuming $x_k(t) \neq y_k(t)$), we conclude that

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle f(x_k(t), u_k(t)) - \dot{x}_k(t), \tilde{x} - x_k(t) \rangle \\ & \leq u_{0,k}(t)c(\gamma_k, x_k(t), y_k(t))(h_L(\tilde{x}, y_k(t)) - h_L(x_k(t), y_k(t))). \end{aligned}$$

Define $Z_k(t, \tilde{x}) := u_{0,k}(t)c(\gamma_k, x_k(t), y_k(t))(h_L(\tilde{x}, y_k(t)) - h_L(x_k(t), y_k(t)))$. From (3.2), we clearly have that, either $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z_k(t, \tilde{x}) = 0$, if $x_k(t) \in \text{int}(Q_1 + y_k(t))$, or $Z_k(t, \tilde{x}) \leq 0$ if $x_k(t) \in \partial(Q_1 + y_k(t))$.

Now, we pass to the limit in (4.2). As already proved, the sequence $\{\dot{x}_k\}$ weakly converges in L^1 to some ξ , such that $\dot{x}(t) = \xi(t)$ a.e.. By Mazur's theorem, there exists a sequence $\{\chi_n\}$, such that $\chi_n = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k \dot{x}_k$, where $\beta_k \geq 0$ and $\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k = 1$, and χ_n converges in the L^1 -norm to ξ . This also implies that, up to a subsequence (we do not relabel), $\{\chi_n\}$ converges to ξ a.e..

Now, let us take a Lebesgue point $t \in [0, T_k]$, and some $\tau > 0$ such that $t + \tau \leq T_k$. Then, we may write

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k \int_t^{t+\tau} Z_k(s, \tilde{x}) ds \\ & \geq \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k \int_t^{t+\tau} \langle f(x_k(s), u_k(s)) - \dot{x}_k(s), \tilde{x} - x(s) \rangle ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k \int_t^{t+\tau} \langle f(x_k(s), u_k(s)) - \dot{x}_k(s), x(s) - x_k(s) \rangle ds \\ (4.4) \quad & \geq \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k \int_t^{t+\tau} \langle f(x_k(s), u_k(s)) - \dot{x}_k(s), \tilde{x} - x(s) \rangle ds \\ & \quad - M \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k \int_t^{t+\tau} |x(s) - x_k(s)| ds \end{aligned}$$

being inequality (4.4) due to the boundedness of $|f(x_k(s), u_k(s)) - \dot{x}_k(s)|$. From the uniform convergence of x_k to x , we have that $M \frac{1}{\tau} \int_t^{t+\tau} |x(s) - x_k(s)| ds \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k \int_t^{t+\tau} \langle f(x_k(s), u_k(s)) - \dot{x}_k(s), \tilde{x} - x(s) \rangle ds \\ & = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_t^{t+\tau} \langle f(x(s), u(s)) - \xi(s), \tilde{x} - x(s) \rangle ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\tau} \int_t^{t+\tau} \left\langle \xi(s) - \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k \dot{x}_k(s), \tilde{x} - x(s) \right\rangle ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\tau} \int_t^{t+\tau} \left\langle \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k [f(x_k(s), u_k(s)) - f(x(s), u_k(s))], \tilde{x} - x(s) \right\rangle ds \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\tau} \int_t^{t+\tau} \left\langle \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k [f(x(s), u_k(s)) - f(x(s), u(s))], \tilde{x} - x(s) \right\rangle ds. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that each one of the last three terms converges to zero. The second term is due to the fact that $\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k \dot{x}_k(t) \rightarrow \xi(t)$, the third one follows from the Lipschitz continuity of f w.r.t. x , and the uniform convergence of x_k to x , and the last one is a consequence of Mazur's theorem, by taking into account that $\{u_k\}$ weakly converges in L^1 to u , which entails that, on $[t, t + \tau)$, when $k \rightarrow \infty$, $\sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k f(x(s), u_k(s))$ converges to $f(x(s), u(s))$.

By passing the relation (4.3) to the limit in n , we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \int_t^{t+\tau} \langle f(x(s), u(s)) - \xi(s), \tilde{x} - x(s) \rangle ds \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \beta_k \int_t^{t+\tau} Z_k(s, \tilde{x}) ds \leq 0.$$

Now, by taking the limit $\tau \rightarrow 0$, and, since t is a Lebesgue point, then, for all $\tilde{x} \in \text{int}(Q_1 + y(t))$, we conclude

$$(4.5) \quad \langle f(x(t), u(t)) - \dot{x}(t), \tilde{x} - x(t) \rangle \leq 0.$$

Let us consider now, any point $\tilde{x} \in \partial(Q_1 + y)$. Take some $\lambda \in [0, 1)$. Clearly,

$$h_L(\lambda(\tilde{x} - y) + y, y) = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda^2 - 1)R_1^2 < 0.$$

We are, therefore, reduced to the previous case replacing \tilde{x} in (4.5) by $y + \lambda(\tilde{x} - y)$. By taking the limit $\lambda \rightarrow 1$, and by using the continuity of $h_L(\cdot, y)$, we have that, for all t , $h_L(x(t), y(t)) \leq 0$. Thus, we conclude that $x(\cdot)$ is a solution to (D).

It remains to show the uniqueness of the solution to (D). This is a consequence of the hypomonotonicity of the truncated normal cone to a convex set (cf. [36]), and of the application of the Gronwall's inequality. Indeed, let (T, y) be a given parameter and take a measurable function u such that $u(t) \in U$, $[0, T]$ -a.e. We use a contradiction argument. Let $x_1(\cdot)$, and $x_2(\cdot)$ be distinct solutions to (D), such that $x_1(0) = x_2(0)$, and let $\tilde{v}(x_1, y)$, and $\tilde{v}(x_2, y)$ be the velocity components of x_1 , and x_2 , respectively, in $N_{Q_1 + y}^M(x_1)$, and $N_{Q_1 + y}^M(x_2)$. Thus, we may write

$$\langle \dot{x}_1 - \dot{x}_2, x_1 - x_2 \rangle = \langle f(x_1, u) - \tilde{v}(x_1, y) - f(x_2, u) + \tilde{v}(x_2, y), x_1 - x_2 \rangle.$$

The Lipschitz continuity of $f(\cdot, u)$ (assumption H1) implies that

$$(4.6) \quad \langle \dot{x}_1 - \dot{x}_2, x_1 - x_2 \rangle \leq K_f |x_1 - x_2|^2 - \langle \tilde{v}(x_1, y) - \tilde{v}(x_2, y), x_1 - x_2 \rangle.$$

From the hypomonotonicity of the truncated normal cone, we may write the inequality

$$(4.7) \quad \langle \tilde{v}(x_1, y) - \tilde{v}(x_2, y), x_1 - x_2 \rangle \geq -|x_1 - x_2|^2.$$

By replacing (4.7) in (4.6), we obtain

$$(4.8) \quad \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} (|x_1 - x_2|^2) \leq (K_f + 1) |x_1 - x_2|^2.$$

By applying Gronwall's lemma, and using the fact that $x_1(0) = x_2(0)$, we obtain $x_1(\cdot) = x_2(\cdot)$, thus confirming the uniqueness of the solution to (D).

Proof of Proposition 3.3. In this proof, for the sake of simplicity, we omit the index k in the specification of the multipliers, the state, and control variables. Let (T, y) be a parameter inherited from (P_H) such that $\mathcal{F}_L^k(T, y) \neq \emptyset$, and denote by (x, u_L) a feasible control process to the approximate lower level problem $(P_L^k(T, y))$ whose existence is asserted by Proposition 3.1. Then, $\varphi^k(\omega, v)$ is finite where (ω, v) corresponds to (T, y) .

Standard compactness arguments (see [40, Lemma 2.4]) allow us to conclude that, for a sequence $\{(T_j, y_j)\}$ converging in L^2 to (T, y) , and a sequence of control processes $\{(x_j, u_j)\}$ with (x_j, u_j) feasible for $(P_L^k(T_j, y_j))$, there is a subsequence of arcs $\{x_j\}$ converging uniformly to an arc x for which there is a feasible control u_L such that (x, u_L) is feasible for $(P_L^k(T, y))$ and $J_L(x(0), u_L; T, y) \leq \liminf_j J_L(x(0)_j, u_j; T_j, y_j)$. This, together with the finiteness of φ^k in its domain, entails its lower semicontinuity.

Moreover, let (T, y) be such that $\partial^P \varphi^k(\omega, v) \neq \emptyset$.

Assume that such (x, u_L) is an optimal solution to (P_L^k) , i.e. $(x, u_L) \in \Psi^k(\omega, v)$, being the latter the set of optimal solutions to (P_L^k) , and that the proximal subdifferential of φ^k at (ω, v) , $\partial^P \varphi^k(\omega, v)$ is nonempty. Remark that by [40, Lemma 2.4] applied to φ^k this property holds a.e.. Let $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \partial^P \varphi^k(\omega, v)$. Here, (ω, v) are the controls associated with (T, y) as defined in (3.4). By definition of the proximal subdifferential in the Hilbert space L^2 , for some $\bar{c} > 0$, and for all (ω', v') sufficiently near (ω, v) in the L^2 -norm, i.e., $\exists \varepsilon > 0$ such that $\|(\omega', v') - (\omega, v)\|_2^2 < \varepsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{T^*} \langle \zeta_1, \omega' - \omega \rangle dt + \int_0^{T^*} \langle \zeta_2, v' - v \rangle dt \\ \leq \varphi^k(\omega', v') - \varphi^k(\omega, v) + \bar{c} \|\omega - \omega'\|_2^2 + \bar{c} \|v - v'\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\|\cdot\|_2$ represents the L^2 -norm. Equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^k(\omega', v') - \int_0^{T^*} \langle (\zeta_1(t), \zeta_2(t)), (\omega'(t), v'(t)) \rangle dt + \bar{c} \|\omega - \omega'\|_2^2 + \bar{c} \|v - v'\|_2^2 \\ \geq \int_0^{T^*} |u_L(t)|^2 \omega(t) dt - \int_0^{T^*} \langle (\zeta_1(t), \zeta_2(t)), (\omega(t), v(t)) \rangle dt. \end{aligned}$$

Denote by (x', u'_L) an admissible solution to the approximate lower level problem corresponding to (ω', v') (or equivalently (T', y')). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{T^*} |u'_L(t)|^2 \omega'(t) dt - \int_0^{T^*} \langle (\zeta_1(t), \zeta_2(t)), (\omega'(t), v'(t)) \rangle dt + \bar{c} \|\omega - \omega'\|_2^2 + \bar{c} \|v - v'\|_2^2 \\ \geq \int_0^{T^*} |u_L(t)|^2 \omega(t) dt - \int_0^{T^*} \langle (\zeta_1(t), \zeta_2(t)), (\omega(t), v(t)) \rangle dt \end{aligned}$$

This means that $(x, u, u_0; \omega, v)$ is an optimal solution to

$$\begin{aligned} (P_{aux}) \text{ Minimize } \int_0^{T^*} [|u'_L(t)|^2 \omega'(t) - \langle (\zeta_1(t), \zeta_2(t)), (\omega'(t), v'(t)) \rangle] dt \\ + \bar{c} \|\omega - \omega'\|_2^2 + \bar{c} \|v - v'\|_2^2 \\ \text{subject to } \dot{x}' = \left(f(x', u') - u'_0 \min \left\{ \frac{M}{r_1}, \gamma_k e^{\gamma_k h_L(x', y')} \right\} (x' - y') \right) \omega' \\ \dot{y}' = v' \omega', \quad \dot{t} = \omega' \\ x'(0) \in Q_1 + y'_0, \quad y'(0) = y'_0, \quad y'(T^*) \in \bar{E}, \quad t(0) = 0 \\ v' \in \mathcal{V}, \quad u' \in \mathcal{U}, \quad u'_0 \in \mathcal{U}_0, \quad \omega' \in L^2([0, T^*], \mathbb{R}^+) \\ h_L(x', y') \leq 0, \quad h_H(y') \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The Pontryagin-Hamilton function for (P_{aux}) in the Gamkrelidze's form is

$$H_L^k(y', x', v', u', \bar{p}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\lambda}, \omega'; v, u, w) := \left(\bar{H}_L^k + \bar{\lambda} \zeta_1 \right) \omega' + \bar{\lambda} \langle \zeta_2, v \rangle - \bar{\lambda} c (|\omega' - \omega|^2 + |u' - u|^2 + |v' - v|^2),$$

where \bar{H}_L^k is as defined in (3.7).

The application of the necessary conditions of optimality to the reference control process to (P_{aux}) in the Gamkrelidze's form of [3] with nonsmooth data, [29], asserts the existence of

a multiplier composed by an adjoint arc $\bar{p} = (p_H, p_L) \in AC([0, T^*]; \mathbb{R}^{2n})$, nonincreasing scalar functions $\bar{\mu} = (\mu_H, \mu_L) \in NBV([0, T^*]; \mathbb{R}^2)$, with μ_H constant on $\{t \in [0, T^*] : |y - z| > R_1 \forall z \in \partial Q\}$, and μ_L constant on $\{t \in [0, T^*] : |y - x| < R_1\}$, and a scalar $\bar{\lambda} \geq 0$, not all zero, satisfying:

i) Adjoint and primal system

$$(-\dot{\bar{p}}, \dot{y}, \dot{x}) \in \partial_{(y', x', \bar{p})}^C H_L^k(y, x, v, u, \bar{p}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\lambda}, \omega). \quad [0, T^*] - \text{a.e.}$$

Here, $\partial^C H_L^k(\cdot)$ designates the Clarke subdifferential of $H_L^k(\cdot)$.

ii) Transversality conditions

$$\begin{aligned} p_H(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad p_H(T) \in -N_{\bar{E}}(y(T)) + \mu_H(T)(y(T) - q_0) - \mu_L(T)(x(T) - y(T)), \\ (p_L(0), p_L(T)) \in N_{Q_1}(x(0) - y_0) \times \{0\} + (\mu_L(0)(x(0) - y_0), \mu_L(T)(x(T) - y(T))). \end{aligned}$$

iii) Maximum condition on (ω', v')

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\omega', v'} \left\{ \bar{H}_L^k(v')\omega' + \bar{\lambda}\zeta_1\omega' + \bar{\lambda}\langle \zeta_2, v' \rangle - \bar{\lambda}\bar{c}|\omega - \omega'|^2 - \bar{\lambda}\bar{c}|v - v'|^2 \right\} \\ = (\bar{H}_L^k(v) + \bar{\lambda}\zeta_1)\omega + \bar{\lambda}\langle \zeta_2, v \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By applying the Lagrange multiplier rule, the maximum condition with respect to ω' , and v' , yields

$$(4.9) \quad -\bar{\lambda}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \{\bar{H}_L^k(v)\} \times \partial_v \bar{H}_L^k(v)\omega + \{0\} \times N_{\mathcal{V}}(v).$$

Clearly, this inclusion corresponds to the last two conclusions of Proposition 3.3.

These conclusions are extended to pairs (ω, v) for which $\partial^P \varphi^k(\omega, v)$ might be an empty set. Take any $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \partial \varphi^k(\omega, v)$, where $\dot{t} = \omega$ and $\dot{y} = v$ a.e., such that $v \in \mathcal{V}$, and $\omega \in L^2([0, T^*], \mathbb{R}^+)$, and satisfying the corresponding endpoint and state constraints (i.e., $y(0) = y_0$, $y(T^*) \in \bar{E}$, $t(0) = 0$, and $h_H(y) \leq 0$). From the definition of limiting subdifferential, there exists a sequence $\{(\omega_i, v_i)\}$ converging in L^2 to (ω, v) with $\varphi^k(\omega_i, v_i)$ converging to $\varphi^k(\omega, v)$ by continuity of φ^k , and $\{(\zeta_1^i, \zeta_2^i)\}$ satisfying $(\zeta_1^i, \zeta_2^i) \in \partial^P \varphi^k(\omega_i, v_i)$, such that, for a fixed k , and, for all i , (ζ_1^i, ζ_2^i) converges weakly in L^2 to (ζ_1, ζ_2) .

By compactness arguments, the sequence $\{(\omega_i, v_i)\}$ with $(\omega_i, v_i) \in L^2([0, T^*], \mathbb{R}^+) \times \mathcal{V}$ can be chosen so that $\dot{t}_i = \omega_i$, and $\dot{y}_i = v_i$ a.e., and the corresponding endpoint and state constraints are satisfied. The analysis above implies that, for each one of such (ω_i, v_i) 's, there exists $(p_H^i, p_L^i, \mu_H^i, \mu_L^i, \bar{\lambda}^i)$ associated with the pair (x_i, u_i) such that conditions (i)-(iii) above hold, and that (x_i, u_i) is an optimal solution to (P_L^k) , i.e., $(x_i, u_i) \in \Psi^k(\omega_i, v_i)$.

The sequences $\{p_H^i\}, \{p_L^i\}$ are bounded, hence $\{\dot{p}_H^i\}, \{\dot{p}_L^i\}$ are uniformly integrably bounded (as follows from the adjoint system). Then, there exist subsequences (we do not relabel) $\{p_H^i\}, \{p_L^i\}$, uniformly converging to some absolutely continuous arcs respectively, p_H , and p_L . Moreover, we can extract (without relabeling) subsequences $\{\bar{\lambda}^i\}$, $\{\mu_H^i\}$ and $\{\mu_L^i\}$ converging, respectively, to some $\bar{\lambda} \geq 0$, and to some nonincreasing functions of bounded variation μ_H and μ_L such that μ_H is constant on $\{t \in [0, T^*] : |y - z| > R_1 \forall z \in \partial Q\}$, and μ_L is constant on $\{t \in [0, T^*] : |y - x| < R_1\}$.

Therefore, from the compactness of the feasible set of (P_L^k) , we have that $x_i \rightarrow x$ uniformly and $u_i \rightarrow u$ a.e., where (x, u_L) is a feasible process to (P_L^k) associated with (T, y) (or equivalently (ω, v)). Moreover, $(x, u_L) \in \Psi^k(\omega, v)$, since the graph of $\Psi^k(\cdot, \cdot)$ is closed (as a result of the closure of the graph of $\mathcal{F}^k(T, y)$, and $(x_i, u_i) \in \Psi^k(\omega_i, v_i)$). Then, by passing to the limit $i \rightarrow \infty$ in the necessary conditions of optimality and by compactness arguments, the statement of Proposition 3.3 regarding the expression of $\partial \varphi^k(\omega, v)$ holds.

Now, it remains to show that φ^k is Lipschitz continuous in its domain. By [13, Theorem 3.6], φ^k is Lipschitz continuous near (w, v) with rank \mathbf{L} if all the proximal subgradients in $\partial^P \varphi^k(w', v')$ for all (w', v') of the domain of φ^k near (w, v) are bounded in L^2 by the constant \mathbf{L} . This can be easily concluded from the necessary conditions obtained above and the boundedness of the adjoint variable with simple arguments.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Let $\bar{\theta} = (v, u, u_0, \omega) \in \Theta := \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}_0 \times L^2([0, T^*]; \mathbb{R}^+)$. Under assumptions H1-H6, Proposition 2.2 entails the existence of a solution to (P_F) denoted by $(y^*, x^*, z^*, t^*, v^*, u^*, u_0^*, \omega^*)$.

Proposition 3.2 applied to (D^k) cast in the new time parametrization (i.e., on the fixed time interval $[0, T^*]$), yields the existence of a sequence $\{(x_k(0), \bar{\theta}_k)\}$, with $(x_k, u_k, u_{0,k}, \omega_k) \in \mathcal{F}_L^k(t_k(T^*), y_k)$, such that $\bar{\theta}_k \rightarrow \bar{\theta}^*$, a.e. on $[0, T^*]$, and $\{x_k\}$ is such that $x_k \rightarrow x^*$ uniformly, being x^* the unique solution to (P_L) with data $(x^*(0), y^*, t^*, z^*, \bar{\theta}^*)$.

By observing that the construction of the approximating problem (\tilde{P}_F^k) involves only the approximation to (P_L) (i.e., (P_H) remains intact), it is clear that Proposition 3.2 can be readily applied to (P_F) in the reparameterized time by choosing a control process so that $z^k(T^*) - \varphi^k(\omega_k, v_k) \leq 0$. This is always possible due to the fact that $\mathcal{F}_L^k(t_k(T^*), y_k)$, with, $t_k(T^*) = \int_0^{T^*} \omega_k(s) ds$, is compact and, thus, the existence of solution to (P_L^k) is guaranteed.

Since, it is straightforward to conclude that the cost functional of (P_F^k) is lower semi-continuous, and that $\mathbb{R}^n \times \Theta$ with $|\cdot| + \Delta(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a complete metric space, we just need to show that there is a sequence of positive numbers $\{\varepsilon_k\}$ satisfying $\varepsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ so that $(y^*, x^*, z^*, t^*, \bar{\theta}^*)$ is a ε_k^2 -minimizer to (P_F^k) .

Let $\varepsilon_k^2 := |x^*(0) - x_k(0)| + \Delta(\bar{\theta}^*, \bar{\theta}_k)$. From Proposition 3.2, it is clear that the sequence $\{\varepsilon_k\}$ satisfies the needed requirements. Thus, Proposition 3.4 follows immediately (for k sufficiently large, $\varepsilon_k < 1$), from the application of the Ekeland's Variational Principle.

Proof of Proposition 3.5. Let $(T^*, y^*, x^*, u^*, z^*, u_0^*)$ be a minimizer to (P_F) . Then, the partial calmness, cf. Definition 2.3, implies that there exists a scalar $\rho \geq 0$, such that, for any feasible control process $(y, x, z, t, \bar{\theta})$ of (P_F) , the following inequality holds

$$(4.10) \quad J_H(t^*(T^*), y^*; x^*(0), u_L^*) \leq J_H(t(T^*), y; x(0), u_L) + \rho(z(t(T^*)) - \varphi(\omega, v)).$$

Consider now (\tilde{P}_F^k) , having $\chi_k = (y_k, x_k, z_k, t_k)$, and $\bar{\theta}_k = (v_k, u_k, u_{0,k}, \omega_k)$ as its state and control variables, respectively. We preserve the notation in the limit by dropping the subscript k and refer to the solution by adding superscript “*” to either these variables or their components.

Let us assume that (\tilde{P}_F^k) is not partially calm. Then, for its minimizer (see Proposition 3.4), $(\chi_k^*, \bar{\theta}_k^*)$, there exists a nonnegative sequence $\{\beta_k\}$ converging to some $\beta \geq 0$, and a control process $(\chi_k, \bar{\theta}_k)$ feasible to (\tilde{P}_F^k) , such that $|x^*(0) - x_k(0)| + \Delta(\bar{\theta}^*, \bar{\theta}_k) < \varepsilon_k$, and satisfying

$$(4.11) \quad t_k^*(T^*) > t_k(T^*) + \varepsilon_k (|x_k^*(0) - x_k(0)| + \Delta(\bar{\theta}_k^*, \bar{\theta}_k)) + \beta_k (z_k(t_k(T^*)) - \varphi(\omega_k, v_k)).$$

Moreover, from Proposition 3.4, we have that the sequence of approximating control processes $\{(\chi_k^*, \bar{\theta}_k^*)\}$ satisfies

$$(4.12) \quad \chi_k^* \rightarrow \chi^* \text{ uniformly, and}$$

$$(4.13) \quad \bar{\theta}_k^* \rightarrow \bar{\theta}^* \text{ a.e.}$$

Since, Proposition 3.4 holds for all $(\chi_k, \bar{\theta}_k)$ feasible for (\tilde{P}_F^k) such that

$$|x^*(0) - x_k(0)| + \Delta(\bar{\theta}^*, \bar{\theta}_k) < \varepsilon_k,$$

we have that (4.13) asserted for $\{\bar{\theta}_k^*\}$ also holds for $\{\bar{\theta}_k\}$. Furthermore, since $x_k(0) \rightarrow x^*(0)$, and, in the light of the convergence $[0, T^*]$ -a.e. of $\{\theta_k\}$ to $\bar{\theta}^*$, straightforward arguments lead us to conclude that (4.12) also holds for $\{\chi_k\}$.

Now, since $|x_k^*(0) - x_k(0)| \leq |x_k^*(0) - x^*(0)| + |x^*(0) - x_k(0)|$, $\Delta(\bar{\theta}_k^*, \bar{\theta}_k) < \Delta(\bar{\theta}_k^*, \bar{\theta}^*) + \Delta(\bar{\theta}^*, \bar{\theta}_k)$, and that, by definition $z_k(t_k(T^*)) \geq \varphi(\omega_k, v_k)$, we conclude, by passing to the limit, while choosing $\beta \geq \rho$ without any loss of generality, that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k^*(T^*) > \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k(T^*)$. This is an obvious contradiction since $t_k^*(T^*) \leq t_k(T^*)$ for all k . Thus, (\tilde{P}_F^k) has to be partially calm.