

# Hierarchical and Modular Supervisory Control under Partial Observation: Normality

Jan Komenda and Tomáš Masopust

**Abstract**—Conditions preserving observability of specifications between the plant and its abstraction are fundamental for hierarchical supervisory control of discrete-event systems under partial observation. Observation consistency and local observation consistency were identified as such conditions. To preserve normality, only observation consistency is required. Although observation consistency preserves normality between the levels for normal specifications, we show that for specifications that are not normal, observation consistency does not guarantee that the supremal normal sublanguage computed on the low level and on the high level coincide. Therefore, we define modified observation consistency, under which the supremal normal sublanguages of different levels coincide. Since we show that the verification of (modified) observation consistency is PSPACE-hard for finite automata models and undecidable for systems slightly more expressive than finite automata, we further discuss two stronger conditions that are easy to verify, and hence of practical interest. We apply modified observation consistency in modular systems to guarantee that the global supervisor can be computed locally. In particular, we use the coordination control framework, where the global and local computations of supervisors coincide under the assumption that the coordinated events are all observable.

**Index Terms**—Discrete-event system, Hierarchical supervisory control, Coordination control, Modular control, Observation consistency, Normality, Decidability, Complexity.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Organizing systems into hierarchical structures is a common engineering practice used to overcome the combinatorial state-space explosion. This technique has many applications across control theory and computer science, including manufacturing, robotics, and artificial intelligence [2]–[11].

Hierarchical supervisory control of discrete-event systems (DES) viewed as a two-level system decomposition was introduced by Zhong and Wonham [12]. The low-level plant (the system to be controlled) is restricted by a specification over a high-level alphabet. Based on the high-level abstraction of the low-level plant, the aim of hierarchical supervisory control is to synthesize a nonblocking and maximally permissive high-level supervisor suitable for a low-level implementation. This requirement is known as *hierarchical consistency*.

To achieve hierarchical consistency, Zhong and Wonham provided a sufficient condition of *output control consistency*,

and extended the framework to hierarchical coordination control [13]. Wong and Wonham [14] later developed an abstract hierarchical supervisory control theory that achieves hierarchical consistency by *control consistency* and *observer property*, and applied the theory to the Brandin-Wonham timed discrete-event systems [15]; see Chao and Xi [16] for more details on control consistency conditions.

Schmidt et al. [17] extended hierarchical supervisory control to decentralized systems, and Schmidt and Breindl [18] weakened the sufficient condition to achieve maximal permissiveness of high-level supervisors in hierarchical supervisory control under complete observation.

Fekri and Hashtrudi-Zad [19] considered hierarchical supervisory control under partial observation, but they used the model of Moore automata and defined the concepts of controllable and observable events based on vocalization. Hence, they needed a specific definition of the low-level supervisor.

In this paper, we adapt the Ramadge-Wonham framework for DES where the system  $G$  is modeled as a (deterministic) finite automaton over a low-level alphabet  $\Sigma$ , and the abstraction is modeled as a projection from  $\Sigma$  to a high-level alphabet  $\Sigma_{hi} \subseteq \Sigma$ . The behavior of the high-level (abstracted) plant  $G_{hi}$  is the projection of the behavior of  $G$  to the high-level alphabet  $\Sigma_{hi}$ . Given a high-level specification  $K$  over  $\Sigma_{hi}$  describing the required behavior of  $G$  in terms of high-level events, the problem is to synthesize a nonblocking and maximally permissive supervisor  $S_{hi}$  on the high level that can be used to construct a low-level nonblocking and maximally permissive supervisor  $S$  with respect to  $K \parallel L_m(G)$ .

The above-mentioned concepts of *observer property* [14] and *output* or *local control consistency* [12], [18] were developed to achieve hierarchical consistency for DES under complete observation. Therefore, they are insufficient to achieve hierarchical consistency under partial observation. We addressed hierarchical supervisory control under partial observation and achieved hierarchical consistency under the condition that all observable events are high-level events [20]. Later, Boutin et al. [21] provided weaker and less restrictive conditions of *local observation consistency* and *observation consistency*.

While observation consistency suffices to preserve normality between the levels [21], it is insufficient to preserve the supremality of normal sublanguages of specifications that are neither observable nor normal (Example 8). To overcome this issue, we define *modified observation consistency*, which preserves the supremality of normal sublanguages of specifications between the levels (Theorem 13). Comparing observation consistency with modified observation consistency, modified observation consistency is stronger (Lemma 10).

This document is the first part of an extended and improved version of our work presented in part at WODES 2020 [1], which focuses on normality. The upcoming part will focus on relative observability.

J. Komenda and T. Masopust are with the Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czechia, and with the Faculty of Science, Palacky University in Olomouc, Olomouc, Czechia. Emails: komenda@ipm.cz, tomas.masopust@upol.cz.

Supported by the MŠMT INTER-EXCELLENCE project LTAUSA19098, by the GAČR grant GC19-06175J, and by RVO 67985840.

From the computational point of view, verifying (modified) observation consistency is a PSPACE-hard problem (Theorem 16), and decidability is an open problem.<sup>1</sup> Although we do not solve decidability for finite automata models, we solve it negatively for a slightly more expressive model of one-turn deterministic pushdown automata (one-turn DPDAs, Theorem 26). One-turn DPDAs are less expressive than pushdown automata discussed in the supervisory control literature in the context of controllability and synthesis as a generalization to systems with automatic synthesis [22]–[26].

Therefore, even if the verification of (modified) observation consistency were proved decidable for finite automata in the future, the PSPACE-hardness result means that the verification would be a computational obstacle. From the practical point of view, it is therefore meaningful to consider abstractions that satisfy stronger and computationally easily-verifiable conditions, such as (i) all observable events are high-level events, or (ii) all high-level events are observable. These conditions can be easily verified and, in a sense, ensured by a suitable choice of abstraction. In Section VII, we show that both conditions are stronger than (modified) observation consistency.

We further show that modified observation consistency is closed under parallel composition (Theorem 20), which makes it suitable for hierarchical supervisory control of modular and coordinated systems.

Modular systems have widely been investigated in the literature, because many engineering systems modeled by finite automata have a modular structure consisting of the concurrent (synchronous) composition of small components. Several approaches to control a modular system were discussed in the literature. De Queiroz and Cury [27] construct nonconflicting local supervisors for modular plants with modular local specifications. Hill and Tilbury [28] consider specifications that interact with different modules but share no events. Gaudin and Marchand [29], on the other hand, consider global specifications, which they localize by inverse projections of local modules and employ the notion of partial controllability to compute local supervisors, the parallel composition of which is maximally permissive if all shared events are controllable. Willner and Heymann [30] study global decomposable specifications and show that if all shared events are controllable, then the parallel composition of local supervisors is maximally permissive. Rohloff and Lafortune [31] look at the control of isomorphic modules.

We discuss an application of modified observation consistency in modular systems in Section VIII-C. We first show that modified observation consistency can be verified in a modular way (Theorem 20). Then we show that under some additional assumptions, modified observation consistency makes the modular computation of the global supremal normal sublanguage possible (Theorem 21). Finally, we show that the coordination control framework of Komenda et al. [32] ensures that the local languages are modified observationally consistent, and therefore, under the assumption that all coordinated events are observable, we obtain our main result showing that

the global supervisor coincides with the parallel composition of local supervisors (Theorem 24).

## II. PRELIMINARIES AND DEFINITIONS

We assume that the reader is familiar with the basic notions and concepts of supervisory control [33]. For a set  $A$ ,  $|A|$  denotes the cardinality of  $A$ . For an alphabet (finite nonempty set)  $\Sigma$ ,  $\Sigma^*$  denotes the set of all finite strings over  $\Sigma$ ; the empty string is denoted by  $\varepsilon$ . A language  $L$  is a subset of  $\Sigma^*$ . The prefix closure of  $L$  is the set  $\bar{L} = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid \text{there is } v \in \Sigma^* \text{ such that } wv \in L\}$ , and  $L$  is prefix-closed if  $L = \bar{L}$ .

A *projection*  $R: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Gamma^*$ , where  $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma$  are alphabets, is a morphism for concatenation that is defined by  $R(a) = \varepsilon$  for  $a \in \Sigma \setminus \Gamma$ , and  $R(a) = a$  for  $a \in \Gamma$ . The action of  $R$  on a string  $a_1a_2 \cdots a_n$  is to remove all events that are not in  $\Gamma$ , i. e.,  $R(a_1a_2 \cdots a_n) = R(a_1)R(a_2) \cdots R(a_n)$ . The inverse image of a  $w \in \Gamma^*$  under  $R$  is the set  $R^{-1}(w) = \{s \in \Sigma^* \mid R(s) = w\}$ . The definitions can readily be extended to languages.

A *nondeterministic finite automaton* (NFA) is a quintuple  $G = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ , where  $Q$  is a finite set of states,  $\Sigma$  is an alphabet,  $q_0 \in Q$  is the initial state,  $F \subseteq Q$  is the set of marked states, and  $\delta: Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow 2^Q$  is the transition function that can be extended to the domain  $2^Q \times \Sigma^*$  in the usual way. Automaton  $G$  is *deterministic* (DFA) if  $|\delta(q, a)| \leq 1$  for every state  $q \in Q$  and every event  $a \in \Sigma$ . The language *generated* by  $G$  is the set  $L(G) = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid \delta(q_0, w) \in Q\}$ , and the language *marked* by  $G$  is the set  $L_m(G) = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid \delta(q_0, w) \in F\}$ . By definition,  $L_m(G) \subseteq L(G)$ , and  $L(G)$  is prefix-closed. If  $\bar{L}_m(G) = L(G)$ , then  $G$  is called *nonblocking*.

A discrete-event system (DES) over  $\Sigma$  is a DFA over  $\Sigma$  together with the specification of *controllable events*  $\Sigma_c$  and *uncontrollable events*  $\Sigma_{uc} = \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_c$ , and *observable events*  $\Sigma_o$  and *unobservable events*  $\Sigma_{uo} = \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_o$ .

The parallel composition of languages  $L_i \subseteq \Sigma_i^*$  is the language  $\|_{i=1}^n L_i = \cap_{i=1}^n P_i^{-1}(L_i)$ , where  $P_i: (\cup_{i=1}^n \Sigma_i)^* \rightarrow \Sigma_i^*$  is the projection, for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . A corresponding definition of the parallel composition for automata can be found in the literature [33]. In particular, for NFAs  $G_i$ , we have that  $L(\|_{i=1}^n G_i) = \cap_{i=1}^n L(G_i)$  and that  $L_m(\|_{i=1}^n G_i) = \cap_{i=1}^n L_m(G_i)$ . The languages  $L_i$  are (*synchronously*) *nonconflicting* if  $\|_{i=1}^n L_i = \bar{\|_{i=1}^n L_i}$ .

## III. HIERARCHICAL SUPERVISORY CONTROL

Before stating the hierarchical supervisory control problem for DES under partial observation, we review and fix the notation of the necessary supervisory control theory [33].

We denote the low-level alphabet by  $\Sigma$ , the high-level alphabet by  $\Sigma_{hi} \subseteq \Sigma$ , the set of observable events by  $\Sigma_o \subseteq \Sigma$ , the system's partial observation by projection  $P: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma_o^*$ , the high-level abstraction by projection  $Q: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma_{hi}^*$ , and the corresponding restricted observations and abstractions by  $P_{hi}: \Sigma_{hi}^* \rightarrow (\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o)^*$  and  $Q_o: \Sigma_o^* \rightarrow (\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o)^*$ , cf. Figure 1.

For a DES  $G$  over  $\Sigma$ , we denote by  $\Gamma = \{\gamma \subseteq \Sigma \mid \Sigma_{uc} \subseteq \gamma\}$  the set of control patterns. A *supervisor* of  $G$  with respect to  $\Gamma$  is a map  $S: P(L(G)) \rightarrow \Gamma$ . The *closed-loop system* of  $G$  and  $S$  is the minimal language  $L(S/G)$  such that  $\varepsilon \in L(S/G)$

<sup>1</sup>Previously, we claimed decidability and PSPACE-completeness of the verification of (modified) observation consistency [1]. Unfortunately, our reasoning was incomplete.




Figure 1. Commutative diagram of abstractions and projections.

and for every  $s \in L(S/G)$ , if  $sa \in L(G)$  and  $a \in S(P(s))$ , then  $sa \in L(S/G)$ . Intuitively, the supervisor disables some of the transitions, but never an unobservable transition.

Considering the marked language of the closed-loop system, there are two approaches: (i) the marking is adopted from the plant  $G$ , i.e.,  $L_m(S/G) = L(S/G) \cap L_m(G)$ , and (ii) the supervisor marks according to a given specification  $M \subseteq L(G)$ , i.e.,  $L_m(S/G) = L(S/G) \cap M$ . In the latter case, the existence of a supervisor that achieves the specification is equivalent to controllability and observability of the specification, whereas, in the former case, an additional assumption of  $L_m(G)$ -closedness is needed [34, Section 6.3]. If the closed-loop system is nonblocking, i.e.,  $L_m(S/G) = L(S/G)$ , then the supervisor  $S$  is called *nonblocking*.

In this paper, we focus on the preservation of controllability and observability between the levels, which is equivalent to considering marking supervisors.

**Problem 1** (Hierarchical Supervisory Control). *Let  $G$  be a low-level plant over  $\Sigma$ , and let  $K$  be a high-level specification over  $\Sigma_{hi} \subseteq \Sigma$ . Define the abstracted high-level plant  $G_{hi}$  over  $\Sigma_{hi}$  by  $L(G_{hi}) = Q(L(G))$  and  $L_m(G_{hi}) = Q(L_m(G))$ . Based on  $G_{hi}$  and  $K$ , the hierarchical supervisory control problem is to determine a nonblocking low-level supervisor  $S$  such that  $L_m(S/G) = K \parallel L_m(G)$ .*  $\diamond$

Intuitively, we look for conditions on the low-level plant  $G$  under which controllability and observability of  $K \parallel L_m(G)$  with respect to  $L(G)$  is equivalent to controllability and observability of  $K$  with respect to  $L(G_{hi})$ . Such conditions are known for controllability, namely  $L_m(G)$ -observer [14] and *output or local control consistency* [12], [18], but not yet well understood for observability. Although Boutin et al. [21] identified such conditions, observation consistency and local observation consistency, their verification is PSPACE-hard and unknown to be decidable for finite automata.

We now recall the definitions of observation consistency and local observation consistency of Boutin et al. [21].

A prefix-closed language  $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$  is *observation consistent* (OC) with respect to projections  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{hi}$  if for every high-level strings  $t, t' \in Q(L)$  with  $P_{hi}(t) = P_{hi}(t')$ , there are low-level strings  $s, s' \in L$  such that  $Q(s) = t$ ,  $Q(s') = t'$ , and  $P(s) = P(s')$ . Intuitively, any two strings with the same observation in the high-level plant have corresponding strings with the same observation in the low-level plant.

A prefix-closed language  $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$  is *locally observation consistent* (LOC) with respect to  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $\Sigma_c$  if, for every  $s, s' \in L$  and every  $e \in \Sigma_c \cap \Sigma_{hi}$  such that  $Q(s)e, Q(s')e \in Q(L)$  and  $P(s) = P(s')$ , there are low-level strings  $u, u' \in (\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{hi})^*$  such that  $P(u) = P(u')$  and  $sue, s'u'e \in L$ . Intuitively, if we can extend two observationally equivalent

high-level strings by the same controllable event, we can also extend their corresponding low-level observationally equivalent strings by this same event in the original plant after (possibly empty) low-level strings with the same observations.

In this paper, we are interested only in the OC condition, because, as shown in (3) of Theorem 2, the LOC condition plays no role in preserving normality. We discuss the OC condition in detail in Section IV.

Before we summarize the main results of Boutin et al. [21] in Theorem 2, we recall the basic concepts of supervisory control that are necessary for their understanding.

A language  $K \subseteq L_m(G)$  is *normal* with respect to  $L(G)$  and  $P: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma_o^*$  if  $\bar{K} = P^{-1}[P(\bar{K})] \cap L(G)$  [35].

Projection  $Q: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma_{hi}^*$  is an  $L_m(G)$ -*observer* for a nonblocking plant  $G$  over  $\Sigma$  if, for every  $t \in Q(L_m(G))$  and  $s \in L_m(G)$ , whenever  $Q(s)$  is a prefix of  $t$ , then there is  $u \in \Sigma^*$  such that  $su \in L_m(G)$  and  $Q(su) = t$ .

We say that  $Q$  is *locally control consistent* (LCC) for  $s \in L(G)$  if, for every  $e \in \Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_{uc}$  such that  $Q(s)e \in L(G_{hi})$ , either there is no  $u \in (\Sigma \setminus \Sigma_{hi})^*$  such that  $sue \in L(G)$  or there is  $u \in (\Sigma_{uc} \setminus \Sigma_{hi})^*$  such that  $sue \in L(G)$ . We call  $Q$  LCC for a language  $M \subseteq L(G)$  if  $Q$  is LCC for every  $s \in M$ .

For a DES  $G$  over  $\Sigma$ , a language  $K \subseteq L_m(G)$  is *controllable* with respect to  $L(G)$  and uncontrollable events  $\Sigma_{uc}$  if  $\bar{K} \Sigma_{uc} \cap L(G) \subseteq \bar{K}$ .

A language  $K \subseteq L(G)$  is *observable* with respect to  $L(G)$ , the set of observable events  $\Sigma_o$  with  $P: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma_o^*$  being the corresponding projection, and the set of controllable events  $\Sigma_c$  if for every  $s, s' \in L(G)$  with  $P(s) = P(s')$  and every  $e \in \Sigma_c$ , whenever  $se \in \bar{K}$ ,  $s'e \in L(G)$ , and  $s' \in \bar{K}$ , we have  $s'e \in \bar{K}$ .

Algorithms verifying controllability and observability can be found in the literature [33].

**Theorem 2** (Boutin et al. [21]). *Let  $G$  be a nonblocking DES over  $\Sigma$ , and let  $K \subseteq Q(L_m(G))$  be a high-level specification.*

(1) *If  $L(G)$  is observation consistent with respect to  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{hi}$ ,  $K$  and  $L_m(G)$  are nonconflicting, and  $L(G)$  is locally observation consistent with respect to  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $\Sigma_c$ , then  $K$  is observable with respect to  $Q(L(G))$ ,  $\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o$ , and  $\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_c$  if and only if  $K \parallel L_m(G)$  is observable with respect to  $L(G)$ ,  $\Sigma_o$ , and  $\Sigma_c$ .*

(2) *If  $Q$  is an  $L_m(G)$ -observer and LCC for  $L(G)$ , and  $L(G)$  is observation consistent with respect to  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{hi}$ , and locally observation consistent with respect to  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $\Sigma_c$ , then  $K$  is controllable with respect to  $Q(L(G))$  and  $\Sigma_{uc} \cap \Sigma_{hi}$ , and observable with respect to  $Q(L(G))$ ,  $\Sigma_o \cap \Sigma_{hi}$ , and  $\Sigma_c \cap \Sigma_{hi}$  if and only if  $K \parallel L_m(G)$  is controllable with respect to  $L(G)$  and  $\Sigma_{uc}$ , and observable with respect to  $L(G)$ ,  $\Sigma_o$ , and  $\Sigma_c$ .*

(3) *If  $L(G)$  is observation consistent with respect to  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{hi}$ , and  $K$  and  $L_m(G)$  are nonconflicting, then  $K$  is normal with respect to  $Q(L(G))$  and  $P_{hi}$  if and only if  $K \parallel L_m(G)$  is normal with respect to  $L(G)$  and  $P$ .*  $\blacksquare$

#### IV. OBSERVATION CONSISTENCY

In this section, we express the OC condition as an inclusion of relational languages. This expression may be useful to show

that a given plant does not satisfy OC as shown in Example 5 below. To this end, we generalize the parallel composition to an arbitrary set of synchronizing events using the event pairs in a similar way as discussed, e. g., in Arnold [36].

**Definition 3.** Let  $L_1 \subseteq \Sigma_1^*$  and  $L_2 \subseteq \Sigma_2^*$  be the languages of the NFAs  $G_1 = (Q_1, \Sigma_1, \delta_1, q_1, F_1)$  and  $G_2 = (Q_2, \Sigma_2, \delta_2, q_2, F_2)$ , respectively. Let  $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2$  be a set of synchronizing events. The parallel composition of  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  synchronized on the events of  $\Sigma'$  is denoted by  $L_1 \parallel_{\Sigma'} L_2$  and defined as the language of the NFA

$$G_1 \parallel_{\Sigma'} G_2 = (Q_1 \times Q_2, \Gamma, \delta, (q_1, q_2), F_1 \times F_2)$$

where the alphabet  $\Gamma \subseteq (\Sigma_1 \cup \{\varepsilon\}) \times (\Sigma_2 \cup \{\varepsilon\})$  is a set of pairs of events based on the synchronization alphabet  $\Sigma'$ . There are two different categories of pairs to construct, corresponding to events in  $\Sigma'$  and events in  $(\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2) \setminus \Sigma'$ . For  $a \in \Sigma'$  we have the pair  $(a, a)$  in  $\Gamma$ , for  $a \in \Sigma_1 \setminus \Sigma'$  we have the pair  $(a, \varepsilon)$  in  $\Gamma$ , and for  $a \in \Sigma_2 \setminus \Sigma'$  we have the pair  $(\varepsilon, a)$  in  $\Gamma$ . The transition function  $\delta: (Q_1 \times Q_2) \times \Gamma \rightarrow 2^{Q_1 \times Q_2}$  is defined on these event pairs and any  $(p, q) \in Q_1 \times Q_2$  as follows:

- for  $a \in \Sigma'$ ,  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  proceed synchronously, i. e.,
  - $\delta((p, q), (a, a)) = \delta_1(p, a) \times \delta_2(q, a)$ ;
- for  $a \in \Sigma_1 \setminus \Sigma'$ ,  $G_2$  does not move, i. e.,
  - $\delta((p, q), (a, \varepsilon)) = \delta_1(p, a) \times \{q\}$ ;
- for  $a \in \Sigma_2 \setminus \Sigma'$ ,  $G_1$  does not move, i. e.,
  - $\delta((p, q), (\varepsilon, a)) = \{p\} \times \delta_2(q, a)$ ;
- undefined otherwise.  $\diamond$

For simplicity, we write a sequence of event pairs, such as  $(a_1, \varepsilon)(a_2, a_2)(\varepsilon, a_3)$ , as a pair of concatenated components, that is,  $(a_1 a_2, a_2 a_3)$ . In accordance with Definition 3, the language of  $G_1 \parallel_{\Sigma'} G_2$  consists of all pairs of strings  $(w, w') \in L_1 \times L_2$ , where  $w$  and  $w'$  coincide on the events of  $\Sigma'$ , that is,  $P'(w) = P'(w')$  for the projection  $P': (\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2)^* \rightarrow \Sigma'^*$ . We call such languages *relational languages*.

We now use this structure to express the OC condition as an inclusion of two relational languages.

**Theorem 4.** Let  $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$  be a prefix-closed language, and let  $\Sigma_o$  and  $\Sigma_{hi}$  be resp. the observable and high-level alphabets. Then,  $L$  is OC with respect to  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{hi}$  if and only if

$$Q(L) \parallel_{\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o} Q(L) \subseteq Q(L \parallel_{\Sigma_o} L) \quad (1)$$

where, for an event  $(a, b)$ ,  $Q(a, b) = (Q(a), Q(b))$ .

*Proof:* Recall that OC states that for all  $t, t' \in Q(L)$  with  $P_{hi}(t) = P_{hi}(t')$ , there are  $s, s' \in L$  such that  $Q(s) = t$ ,  $Q(s') = t'$ , and  $P(s) = P(s')$ . The intuition behind (1) is to couple all strings  $t, t' \in Q(L)$  with the same high-level observations—the pairs  $(t, t') \in Q(L) \parallel_{\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o} Q(L)$ —and to verify that for every such pair there are strings  $s, s' \in L$  with the same observations—the pairs  $(s, s') \in L \parallel_{\Sigma_o} L$ —that are abstracted to the pair  $(t, t')$ , i. e.,  $(Q(s), Q(s')) = (t, t')$ .

Formally, we first show that if  $L$  is OC, then (1) holds. To this end, assume that  $(t, t') \in Q(L) \parallel_{\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o} Q(L)$ . By the definition of  $\parallel_{\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o}$ , we have that  $t, t' \in Q(L)$  and  $t, t'$




Figure 2. Plant  $G$  with language  $L$  and the plant of its abstraction  $Q(L)$ .




Figure 3. The languages  $Q(L) \parallel_{\{b\}} Q(L)$ ,  $L \parallel_{\{b,c\}} L$ , and  $Q(L) \parallel_{\{b,c\}} L$ , respectively.

coincide on the events of  $\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o$ , i. e.,  $P_{hi}(t) = P_{hi}(t')$ . Since  $L$  is OC, there are  $s, s' \in L$  such that  $Q(s) = t$ ,  $Q(s') = t'$ , and  $P(s) = P(s')$ . However,  $P(s) = P(s')$  implies that  $(s, s') \in L \parallel_{\Sigma_o} L$ , and  $Q(s) = t$  and  $Q(s') = t'$  imply that  $(Q(s), Q(s')) = (t, t')$ , which shows inclusion (1).

On the other hand, assume that (1) holds. We show that  $L$  is OC. To do this, consider  $t, t' \in Q(L)$  such that  $P_{hi}(t) = P_{hi}(t')$ . By the definition of  $\parallel_{\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o}$ , we obtain that  $(t, t') \in Q(L) \parallel_{\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o} Q(L)$ . Since (1) holds,  $(t, t') \in Q(L \parallel_{\Sigma_o} L)$ , which means that there is a pair  $(s, s') \in L \parallel_{\Sigma_o} L$  such that  $(Q(s), Q(s')) = (t, t')$ . However,  $(s, s') \in L \parallel_{\Sigma_o} L$  implies that the strings  $s$  and  $s'$  belong to  $L$  and coincide on the events from  $\Sigma_o$ , i. e.,  $P(s) = P(s')$ . Therefore,  $L$  is OC.  $\blacksquare$

In the following examples, we illustrate the previous construction and its application for finding counterexamples violating the OC condition.

**Example 5.** Consider the plant over  $\Sigma = \{a, b, c\}$  defined by the automaton  $G$  depicted in Figure 2 (left), and denote its language by  $L$ . Let  $\Sigma_{hi} = \{a, b\}$  be the high-level events, and let  $\Sigma_o = \{b, c\}$  be the observable events. The abstracted plant with the language  $Q(L)$  is depicted in Figure 2 (right). The compositions  $Q(L) \parallel_{\{b\}} Q(L)$ ,  $L \parallel_{\{b,c\}} L$ ,  $Q(L) \parallel_{\{b,c\}} L$  are depicted in Figure 3. Notice that the pair of strings  $(ab, b)$  belongs to  $Q(L) \parallel_{\{b\}} Q(L)$  but not to  $Q(L) \parallel_{\{b,c\}} L$ , and hence the strings  $ab$  and  $b$  violate the OC condition, showing thus that  $L$  is not OC.  $\diamond$

Since both sides of inclusion (1) are represented by finite automata, it could seem that we can verify the OC condition by checking the inclusion by the classical algorithms verifying the inclusion of the languages of two NFAs. However, it is not the case because the languages are not classical languages, but rather relational languages.

The following example illustrates this issue.



Figure 4. Plant  $G$  with the language  $L$  and its abstraction  $Q(L)$ .




Figure 5. The languages  $Q(L) \parallel_{\emptyset} Q(L)$ ,  $L \parallel_{\{b\}} L$ , and  $Q(L \parallel_{\{b\}} L)$ , respectively.

**Example 6.** Consider the plant defined by the DES  $G$  depicted in Figure 4 (left), and denote its language by  $L$ . Let  $\Sigma_{hi} = \{a, c\}$  be the high-level alphabet, and let  $\Sigma_o = \{b\}$  be the single observable event. The languages  $Q(L) \parallel_{\emptyset} Q(L)$ ,  $L \parallel_{\{b\}} L$ , and  $Q(L \parallel_{\{b\}} L)$  are shown in Figure 5. The reader may see that the string  $(a, \varepsilon)(c, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, a)(\varepsilon, c) \in Q(L) \parallel_{\emptyset} Q(L)$  but not in  $Q(L \parallel_{\{b\}} L)$ , which seems to suggest that inclusion (1) does not hold. However,  $(a, \varepsilon)(c, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, a)(\varepsilon, c) = (ac, ac) = (a, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, a)(c, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, c)$ , and the string  $(a, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, a)(c, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, c) \in Q(L \parallel_{\{b\}} L)$ . Therefore, the pair of strings  $(ac, ac)$  belongs to both sides of inclusion (1) and, in fact, the inclusion holds.  $\diamond$

Considering the previous example, the reader may notice that for every string from the language  $Q(L) \parallel_{\emptyset} Q(L)$  that is suspected of violating the OC condition, such as the string  $(a, \varepsilon)(c, \varepsilon)(\varepsilon, a)(\varepsilon, c)$ , we can check whether at least one of its permutations is present in the language  $Q(L \parallel_{\{b\}} L)$ . If none of the permutations belongs to  $Q(L \parallel_{\{b\}} L)$ , the OC condition does not hold. Specifically, we may notice that the plant  $G$  preserves the order of  $a$  and  $c$ , and hence we only need to consider permutations that preserve the order of  $a$  and  $c$ . This means that the pairs of events  $((a, \varepsilon), (\varepsilon, c))$  and  $((\varepsilon, a), (c, \varepsilon))$  may be interchanged in the strings. Adding all strings constructed this way to  $Q(L \parallel_{\{b\}} L)$  results in the commutative closure of  $Q(L \parallel_{\{b\}} L)$ , which, in the previous example, coincides with  $Q(L) \parallel_{\emptyset} Q(L)$ , and hence the inclusion  $Q(L) \parallel_{\emptyset} Q(L) \subseteq Q(L \parallel_{\{b\}} L)$  holds.

To generalize this observation, let  $\Sigma$  be an alphabet, and let  $I \subseteq \Sigma \times \Sigma$  be a symmetric relation. The closure of a language  $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$  with respect to the partial commutation relation  $I$  is denoted by  $[L]_I$ . The language  $[L]_I$  is defined as the least language over  $\Sigma$  that contains  $L$  and satisfies that  $uabv \in [L]_I$  if and only if  $ubav \in [L]_I$  for every  $u, v \in \Sigma^*$  and  $(a, b) \in I$ . It is known that regular languages are not closed under partial commutation, and that the question whether the closure of a regular language remains regular or not is decidable if and

only if the partial commutative relation  $I$  is transitive [37].<sup>2</sup> For the previous example, the partial commutative relation  $I = \{((a, \varepsilon), (\varepsilon, c)), ((\varepsilon, c), (a, \varepsilon)), ((\varepsilon, a), (c, \varepsilon)), ((c, \varepsilon), (\varepsilon, a))\}$  is transitive in the considered sense. More details can be found in the literature [38], [39]. Consequently, in these cases, if the closure is regular and can be algorithmically constructed, the OC condition is decidable by the classical NFA inclusion algorithms. In general, however, the decidability status of the verification of OC is open, as well as the complexity of the decidable cases. We discuss some lower-bound complexity results in Section VI.

## V. PRESERVING SUPREMACY OF NORMAL SUBLANGUAGES

The hierarchical supervisory control problem requires that the specification is exactly achieved by a supervisor. In other words, the specification is observable. What if the specification is not observable? A common approach is to find a suitable observable sublanguage of the specification and to construct a supervisor to achieve this sublanguage. Since there are no supremal observable sublanguages in general, the supremal normal sublanguages are considered instead.

**Problem 7** (Maximally Permissive Hierarchical Supervisory Control). Let  $G$  be a low-level plant over  $\Sigma$ , and let  $K$  be a high-level specification over  $\Sigma_{hi} \subseteq \Sigma$ . Define the abstracted high-level plant  $G_{hi}$  over  $\Sigma_{hi}$  by  $L(G_{hi}) = Q(L(G))$  and  $L_m(G_{hi}) = Q(L_m(G))$ . The maximally permissive hierarchical supervisory control problem is to determine, based on the high-level plant  $G_{hi}$  and the high-level specification  $K$ , without using the low-level plant  $G$ , a maximally permissive nonblocking low-level supervisor  $S$  such that  $L_m(S/G) \subseteq K \parallel L_m(G)$ .<sup>3</sup>  $\diamond$

Intuitively, a maximally permissive nonblocking supervisor  $S_{hi}$  such that  $L_m(S_{hi}/G_{hi}) \subseteq K$  can be used to construct a maximally permissive nonblocking supervisor  $S$  such that  $L_m(S/G) \subseteq K \parallel L_m(G)$ .

Compared with (3) of Theorem 2, which states that, under the OC condition, the high-level specification  $K$  is normal if and only if the low-level language  $K \parallel L_m(G)$  is normal, the following example shows that OC is insufficient to preserve normality if the supremal normal sublanguage of  $K$  is a strict subset of  $K$ . The problem is that the supremal normal sublanguage of  $K \parallel L_m(G)$  is in general not of the form  $X \parallel L_m(G)$  for a convenient language  $X \subseteq K$  that would be the supremal normal sublanguage of  $K$  at the low level.

For a prefix-closed language  $L$  and a specification  $K \subseteq L$ , we denote by  $\text{supN}(K, L, P)$  the supremal normal sublanguage of  $K$  with respect to the plant language  $L$  and the projection  $P$  to observable events.

**Example 8.** Consider the alphabet  $\Sigma = \{a, b, c\}$  with observable events  $\Sigma_o = \{a, c\}$  and high-level events  $\Sigma_{hi} = \{b, c\}$ , and the language  $L = \{\varepsilon, a, b, c, ba, ac, bac\}$ . To show that  $L$

<sup>2</sup>Here the notion of transitivity has the meaning that for every three different events  $a, b, c \in \Sigma$ , if  $(a, b), (b, c) \in I$ , then also  $(a, c) \in I$ .

<sup>3</sup>A supervisor  $S$  is maximally permissive if the closed-loop  $L_m(S/G)$  exactly achieves the supremal normal sublanguage of  $K \parallel L_m(G)$ .

is OC, notice that  $P_{hi}(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon = P_{hi}(b)$  and  $P_{hi}(c) = c = P_{hi}(bc)$ . There are two cases: (i)  $t = \varepsilon$  and  $t' = b$ , which is trivial because we can choose  $s = t = \varepsilon$  and  $s' = t' = b$  to satisfy OC, and (ii)  $t = c$  and  $t' = bc$ , where we choose  $s = ac$  and  $s' = bac$ , since then  $Q(s) = c = t$ ,  $Q(s') = bc = t'$ , and  $P(s) = ac = P(s')$ . Thus,  $L$  is OC.

To compute the supremal normal sublanguage of  $K = \{\varepsilon, b, c\} \subseteq Q(L) = \{\varepsilon, b, c, bc\}$ , we use the formula

$$\text{supN}(B, M, P) = B - P^{-1}P(M - B)\Sigma^*$$

for prefix-closed languages  $B \subseteq M \subseteq \Sigma^*$  [40], and obtain that  $K\|L = a^*ba^* \cup a^*ca^* \cup a^* \cap L = \{\varepsilon, a, b, c, ba, ac\}$ ,  $L - K\|L = \{bac\}$ , and  $P^{-1}P(bac) = P^{-1}(ac) = b^*ab^*cb^*$ , i. e.,  $c \in \text{supN}(K\|L, L, P) = K\|L - P^{-1}P(L - K\|L)\Sigma^* = \{\varepsilon, a, b, c, ba\}$ . On the other hand,  $Q(L) - K = \{\varepsilon, b, c, bc\} - \{\varepsilon, b, c\} = \{bc\}$ ,  $P_{hi}(bc) = c$ , and  $P_{hi}^{-1}(c) = b^*cb^*$ , and hence  $c \notin \text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi})\|L = Q^{-1}(K - P_{hi}^{-1}P_{hi}(Q(L) - K))\Sigma_{hi}^* \cap L = Q^{-1}(\{\varepsilon, b\}) \cap L = \{\varepsilon, a, b, ba\}$ . Therefore, OC is not sufficient to preserve supremal normal sublanguages.  $\diamond$

To guarantee the preservation of the supremal normal sublanguages, we modify the OC condition by fixing one of the low-level strings.

**Definition 9.** A prefix-closed language  $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$  is modified observation consistent (MOC) with respect to projections  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{hi}$  if for every  $s \in L$  and every  $t' \in Q(L)$  with  $P_{hi}(Q(s)) = P_{hi}(t')$ , there is  $s' \in L$  such that  $P(s) = P(s')$  and  $Q(s') = t'$ .  $\square$

Comparing the notions of OC and MOC, MOC is stronger.

**Lemma 10.** MOC implies OC.

*Proof:* If  $L$  is MOC, then for any  $t, t' \in Q(L)$  with  $P_{hi}(t) = P_{hi}(t')$ , there is  $s \in L$  such that  $t = Q(s)$ . Hence, by MOC, there is  $s' \in L$  such that  $P(s) = P(s')$  and  $Q(s') = t'$ , which shows that  $L$  is OC.  $\blacksquare$

The expression of MOC in terms of an inclusion of relational languages is similar to that of OC.

**Theorem 11.** Let  $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$  be a prefix-closed language, and let  $\Sigma_o$  and  $\Sigma_{hi}$  be the respective observation and high-level alphabets. Then  $L$  is MOC with respect to  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{hi}$  if and only if

$$L\|\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o Q(L) \subseteq Q_2(L\|\Sigma_o L)$$

where  $Q_2(a, b) = (a, Q(b))$  for every event pair  $(a, b)$ .

*Proof:* We first show that if  $L$  is MOC, then the inclusion holds. To this end, assume that  $(s, t') \in L\|\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o Q(L)$ . By the definition of  $\|\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o$ , we have that  $s \in L$ ,  $t' \in Q(L)$ , and  $P_{hi}(Q(s)) = P_{hi}(t')$ . Since  $L$  is MOC, there is  $s' \in L$  such that  $Q(s') = t'$  and  $P(s) = P(s')$ . However,  $P(s) = P(s')$  implies that  $(s, s') \in L\|\Sigma_o L$ , and hence  $Q(s') = t'$  implies that  $(s, Q(s')) = (s, t')$ , which shows the inclusion.

On the other hand, we show that the inclusion implies that  $L$  is MOC. For  $s \in L$  and  $t' \in Q(L)$  with  $P_{hi}(Q(s)) = P_{hi}(t')$ , the definition of  $\|\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o$  implies that  $(s, t') \in L\|\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o Q(L)$ . Since  $L\|\Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o Q(L) \subseteq Q_2(L\|\Sigma_o L)$ , we have that  $(s, t') \in Q_2(L\|\Sigma_o L)$ , and hence there is a pair

$(s, s') \in L\|\Sigma_o L$  such that  $(s, Q(s')) = (s, t')$ . Since  $(s, s') \in L\|\Sigma_o L$ , strings  $s$  and  $s'$  belong to  $L$  and coincide on  $\Sigma_o$ , i. e.,  $P(s) = P(s')$ .  $\blacksquare$

We now show that the MOC condition guarantees that abstractions preserve normality of specification languages.

**Lemma 12.** For a DFA  $G$ , let  $L = L(G)$  and  $L_m = L_m(G)$ . If  $L$  is MOC with respect to  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{hi}$ , then normality of  $S \subseteq L_m$  with respect to  $L$  and  $P$  implies normality of  $Q(S)$  with respect to  $Q(L)$  and  $P_{hi}$ .

*Proof:* Since  $Q(\bar{S}) \subseteq P_{hi}^{-1}P_{hi}(Q(\bar{S})) \cap Q(L)$ , we need to show the other inclusion. Let  $t' \in P_{hi}^{-1}P_{hi}(Q(\bar{S})) \cap Q(L)$ . Then, there is  $s \in \bar{S}$  such that  $P_{hi}(Q(s)) = P_{hi}(t')$ . By MOC, there is  $s' \in L$  such that  $Q(s') = t'$  and  $P(s) = P(s')$ , i. e.,  $s' \in P^{-1}P(s) \cap L \subseteq P^{-1}P(\bar{S}) \cap L = \bar{S}$ . Hence,  $t' = Q(s') \in Q(\bar{S})$ .  $\blacksquare$

We now show that the MOC condition preserves normality.

**Theorem 13.** For a nonblocking DFA  $G$ , let  $L = L(G)$  and  $L_m = L_m(G)$ . If  $L$  is MOC with respect to  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{hi}$ , then for every high-level specification  $K \subseteq Q(L_m)$ ,

$$\text{supN}(K\|L_m, L, P) = \text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi})\|L_m$$

whenever  $\text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi})$  and  $L_m$  are nonconflicting.

*Proof:* Since it can be shown that  $\text{supN}(K\|L_m, L, P) \subseteq Q^{-1}(\text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi}))$  holds if and only if the inclusion  $Q(\text{supN}(K\|L_m, L, P)) \subseteq \text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi})$  holds, we consider a language  $S \subseteq K\|L_m$  that is normal with respect to  $L$  and  $P$ . Then, by Lemma 12,  $Q(S) \subseteq K \cap Q(L_m) = K$  is normal with respect to  $Q(L)$  and  $P_{hi}$ , which shows the left-to-right inclusion.

For the other inclusion, we show that  $\text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi})\|L_m$  is normal with respect to  $L$  and  $P$ . For brevity, we set  $\text{supN} = \text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi})$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{supN}\|L_m} &\subseteq P^{-1}P(\overline{\text{supN}\|L_m})\|\overline{L_m} \\ &\subseteq P_{hi}^{-1}P_{hi}(\overline{\text{supN}})\|\overline{P^{-1}P(\overline{L_m})}\|\overline{L_m} \\ &= P_{hi}^{-1}P_{hi}(\overline{\text{supN}})\|\overline{L_m} \\ &= P_{hi}^{-1}P_{hi}(\overline{\text{supN}})\|\overline{L_m}\|\overline{Q(L_m)} \\ &= P_{hi}^{-1}P_{hi}(\overline{\text{supN}})\|\overline{L_m}\|\overline{Q(\overline{L_m})} \\ &= P_{hi}^{-1}P_{hi}(\overline{\text{supN}})\|\overline{L_m}\|\overline{Q(L)} \\ &= [P_{hi}^{-1}P_{hi}(\overline{\text{supN}}) \cap Q(L)]\|\overline{L_m} \\ &= \overline{\text{supN}}\|\overline{L_m} = \overline{\text{supN}\|L_m} \end{aligned}$$

where the last but one equality is from normality of  $\text{supN}$  and the last one as well as the second one are from nonconflictingness of the languages. Therefore,  $\text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi})\|L_m \subseteq \text{supN}(K\|L_m, L, P)$ .  $\blacksquare$

For prefix-closed specifications, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 14.** If  $G$  is a DFA such that its language  $L = L(G)$  is MOC with respect to  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{hi}$ , then

$$\text{supN}(K\|L, L, P) = \text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi})\|L$$

for every prefix-closed high-level specification  $K \subseteq Q(L)$ .  $\blacksquare$

To illustrate Theorem 13, we consider a railway example with several crossings to be controlled.





Figure 6. A railway crossroad

Figure 7. Generators  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ 




**Example 15.** The railway traffic is controlled by traffic lights. For simplicity, we consider only two one-way tracks that cross, cf. Figure 6. There are two traffic lights,  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , and two entry points  $x_1, x_3$  and two exit points  $x_2, x_4$ . Each traffic light has values  $g_i$  (green) and  $r_i$  (red),  $i = 1, 2$ .

The low-level plant  $G$  is given as a parallel composition of two systems  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  depicted in Figure 7. For safety reasons, each system is able to set the traffic light to red at any moment. It can set the light to green and detect the trains entering ( $x_1$  or  $x_3$ ) and leaving ( $x_2$  or  $x_4$ ) the crossroad.

We consider the following requirements on the traffic. First, a train may enter the crossroad only if its traffic light is green. The light can turn red at any moment, but the other traffic light can be set to green only if all trains have left the crossroad area. This is already ensured by the plants  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ .

However, the subsystems do not care about the synchronization of traffic lights. Namely, to set the traffic light of  $G_1$  to green, the traffic light of  $G_2$  has to be red, and vice versa. For this reason, we define a specification that takes care not only about this issue, but also ensures a kind of fairness, cf. Figure 8. In particular, both lights must be red before one of the traffic lights may be set to green. It then stays green for a while, and is set back to red. The traffic lights should take turns, so that no train is waiting for ever. For simplicity, we do not model the mechanism (such as a clock) that sets the traffic lights to green for a specific amount of time units.

Since our aim is to illustrate Theorem 13, we consider all events controllable. We set events  $\Sigma_{uo} = \{x_2, x_4\}$  unobservable and events  $\Sigma_{hi} = \{r_1, r_2, g_1, g_2\}$  high level. The high-level plant  $G_{hi}$  is depicted in Figure 9. To simplify the

Figure 8. The traffic lights' fairness specification  $K$ Figure 9. The high-level plant  $G_{hi}$ .Figure 10. The language  $\text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi}) \parallel L_m$ .

notation, we set  $L = L(G)$  and  $L_m = L_m(G)$ . The supremal normal sublanguage  $\text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi}) \parallel L_m$  is depicted in Figure 10. Since  $\Sigma_{hi} \subseteq \Sigma_o$ , Lemma 18 below implies that  $L(G)$  satisfies MOC, and therefore Theorem 13 ensures that  $\text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi}) \parallel L_m = \text{supN}(K \parallel L_m, L, P)$ .  $\diamond$

## VI. DECIDABILITY AND COMPLEXITY OF (M)OC

A decision problem is a yes-no question. A decision problem is *decidable* if there is an algorithm solving it. Complexity theory classifies decidable problems into classes based on time or space an algorithm needs to solve the problem. The complexity class we consider is PSPACE, denoting all problems solvable by a deterministic polynomial-space algorithm. A decision problem is PSPACE-hard if every problem from PSPACE can be reduced to it by a polynomial-time algorithm. If the problem also belongs to PSPACE, it is PSPACE-complete. It is a longstanding open problem whether PSPACE-complete problems can be solved in polynomial time.

We show that verifying (M)OC is PSPACE-hard for systems modeled by finite automata.

**Theorem 16.** *Verifying (M)OC for DFAs is PSPACE-hard.*

*Proof:* We reduce the PSPACE-complete problem of deciding universality for NFAs with all states marked [41]. The problem asks whether, given an NFA  $A$  over  $\Sigma$  with all states marked, the language  $L(A) = \Sigma^*$ . These NFAs recognize prefix-closed languages, i. e.,  $L(A) = L_m(A)$ .

Let  $A = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, Q)$  be an NFA with all states marked. We first modify  $A$  to a DFA by adding additional transitions. Namely, for every transition  $p \xrightarrow{a} q$  of  $A$ , we add a new marked state  $x_{p,a,q}$  and a new event  $a_{p,a,q}$ , and replace the transition  $p \xrightarrow{a} q$  with two transitions  $p \xrightarrow{a_{p,a,q}} x_{p,a,q} \xrightarrow{a} q$ . We denote the resulting automaton by  $A'$  and the set of newly added events by  $\Sigma'$ . Obviously,  $A'$  is deterministic with all states marked, i. e.,  $L(A') = L_m(A')$ . Further, a string  $w$  belongs




Figure 11. Construction of the DFA  $B$  from the DFA  $A'$ .

to  $L(A)$  if and only if there is a path in  $A'$  where the events on odd positions belong to  $\Sigma'$ , and the sequence of events on even positions forms  $w$ ; i. e.,  $a_1 \dots a_n \in L(A)$  if and only if  $\Sigma' a_1 \Sigma' \dots \Sigma' a_n \cap L(A') \neq \emptyset$ .

In the second step, we construct a DFA  $B$  such that

$$L_m(B) = @\#L(A') \cup @(\Sigma'\Sigma)^* \cup \#(\Sigma'\Sigma)^* \cup L(A')$$

where  $@$  and  $\#$  are new events. It is not difficult to construct  $B$  from  $A'$  in polynomial time. In particular, to ensure that  $L_m(B)$  accepts everything from  $L(A')$ , we add the transition  $n_1 \xrightarrow{a} q$ , where  $n_1$  is the initial state of  $B$ , whenever there is a transition  $q_0 \xrightarrow{a} q$  for some state  $q$  in  $A'$ . Figure 11 illustrates the construction for two transitions from  $q_0$  under  $a$  and  $b$ .

Let the abstraction  $Q$  remove  $\Sigma' \cup \{@\}$ , and the observation  $P$  remove  $\Sigma' \cup \{\#\}$ , i. e.,  $\Sigma_{hi} = \Sigma \cup \{\#\}$  and  $\Sigma_o = \Sigma \cup \{@\}$ . Then  $Q(L(B)) = \Sigma^* \cup \#\Sigma^*$ . We now show that  $L(B) = \overline{L_m(B)}$  is (M)OC if and only if  $A$  is universal.

Assume that  $A$  is universal, i. e.,  $L(A) = \Sigma^*$ . Let  $s \in L(B)$  and  $Q(s) \neq t' \in Q(L(B))$  with  $P_{hi}(Q(s)) = P_{hi}(t')$ . By the construction of  $B$ , we have two cases:

First,  $Q(s) \in \Sigma^*$  and  $t' = \#Q(s)$  for  $s \in \overline{@(\Sigma'\Sigma)^*} \cup L(A')$ . If  $s \in @(\Sigma'\Sigma)^*$ , then  $s = @x_1s_1x_2 \dots x_k s_k x_{k+1}$ , where  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \Sigma'$ ,  $x_{k+1} \in \Sigma' \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ , and  $s_1 \dots s_k \in L(A) = \Sigma^*$ . Then, taking  $s' = @\#x_1s_1x_2 \dots x_k s_k x_{k+1} \in @\#\Sigma' s_1 \Sigma' \dots \Sigma' s_k (\Sigma' \cup \{\varepsilon\}) \subseteq @\#L(A') \subseteq L(B)$  is such that  $Q(s') = \#Q(s) = t'$  and  $P(s) = @s_1 \dots s_k = P(s')$ . If  $s \in L(A')$ , then  $s = x_1s_1x_2 \dots x_k s_k x_{k+1}$ , where  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \Sigma'$ ,  $x_{k+1} \in \Sigma' \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ , and  $s_1 \dots s_k \in L(A)$ . Then,  $s' = \#x_1s_1x_2 \dots x_k s_k x_{k+1} \in \#\Sigma' s_1 \Sigma' \dots \Sigma' s_k (\Sigma' \cup \{\varepsilon\}) \subseteq L(B)$  satisfies  $Q(s') = \#Q(s) = t'$  and  $P(s) = P(s')$ .

Second,  $t' \in \Sigma^*$  and  $Q(s) = \#t'$  for  $s \in @\#L(A') \cup \#(\Sigma'\Sigma)^*$ . If  $s \in @\#L(A')$ , then we have that  $s = @\#x_1t'_1x_2 \dots x_k t'_k x_{k+1}$ , where  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \Sigma'$ ,  $x_{k+1} \in \Sigma' \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ , and  $t' = t'_1 \dots t'_k$ . Therefore, taking  $s' = @x_1t'_1x_2 \dots x_k t'_k x_{k+1} \in L(B)$  satisfies  $Q(s') = t'$  and  $P(s) = @t' = P(s')$ . If  $s \in \#(\Sigma'\Sigma)^*$ , then we have that  $s = \#x_1t'_1x_2 \dots x_k t'_k x_{k+1}$ , where  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \Sigma'$ ,  $x_{k+1} \in \Sigma' \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ , and  $t' = t'_1 \dots t'_k$ . Then,  $s' = x_1t'_1x_2 \dots x_k t'_k x_{k+1} \in L(A') \subseteq L(B)$  is such that  $Q(s') = t'$  and  $P(s) = t' = P(s')$ . Thus,  $B$  is MOC, and hence OC by Lemma 10.

On the other hand, if  $A$  is not universal, then there exists  $w = a_1 a_2 \dots a_k \notin L(A)$ . Then, for any  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k \in \Sigma'$ , we have that  $@w' = @x_1 a_1 x_2 a_2 \dots x_k a_k \in @(\Sigma'\Sigma)^*$  and that  $\#w' = \#x_1 a_1 x_2 a_2 \dots x_k a_k \in \#(\Sigma'\Sigma)^*$ . Therefore, the strings  $@w', \#w' \in L(B)$ ,  $Q(\#w') = \#w \in Q(L(B))$ , and

$P_{hi}(Q(@w')) = P_{hi}(w) = w = P_{hi}(\#w)$ . We now show that there are no  $s, s' \in L(B)$  such that  $Q(s) = Q(@w') = w$ ,  $Q(s') = \#w$ , and  $P(s) = P(s')$ , which means that  $L(B)$  is not OC. By Lemma 10,  $L(B)$  is then neither MOC. To this end, because  $w = a_1 a_2 \dots a_k \notin L(A)$ , we may observe that  $Q^{-1}(w) \cap L(B) \subseteq @\Sigma' a_1 \Sigma' a_2 \dots \Sigma' a_k (\Sigma' \cup \{\varepsilon\})$  and  $Q^{-1}(\#w) \cap L(B) \subseteq \#\Sigma' a_1 \Sigma' a_2 \dots \Sigma' a_k (\Sigma' \cup \{\varepsilon\})$ . But then, for any  $s \in Q^{-1}(w) \cap L(B)$  and  $s' \in Q^{-1}(\#w) \cap L(B)$ , we obtain that  $P(s) = P(@\Sigma' a_1 \dots \Sigma' a_k (\Sigma' \cup \{\varepsilon\})) = @w \neq w = P(\#\Sigma' a_1 \dots \Sigma' a_k (\Sigma' \cup \{\varepsilon\})) = P(s')$ , which completes the proof. ■

In Appendix A, we show that if the conditions are decidable, then the regularity of the system is essential. Namely, for non-regular systems modeled by one-turn deterministic pushdown automata that are slightly more expressive than finite automata, the conditions are undecidable.

## VII. PRACTICAL CONDITIONS

As shown above, verifying (M)OC is a hard and maybe even undecidable problem. Therefore, from the practical point of view, it is reasonable to consider stronger and easily-verifiable conditions. One of such conditions is often considered in the literature. Namely, all observable events are high-level events, that is,  $\Sigma_o \subseteq \Sigma_{hi}$ .

In this section, we consider two such conditions:

- 1)  $\Sigma_o \subseteq \Sigma_{hi}$  where all observable events are high-level events, and
- 2)  $\Sigma_{hi} \subseteq \Sigma_o$  where all high-level events are observable.

We show that both these conditions imply (M)OC.

**Lemma 17.** *If  $G$  is a DES over  $\Sigma$  satisfying  $\Sigma_o \subseteq \Sigma_{hi}$ , then  $L = L(G)$  is (M)OC.*

*Proof:* If  $\Sigma_o \subseteq \Sigma_{hi}$ , then we have that  $P = P_{hi}Q$ , because  $Q_o$  is an identity, cf. Figure 1. Let  $s \in L$  and  $t' \in Q(L)$  be strings such that  $P_{hi}(Q(s)) = P_{hi}(t')$ , and consider any  $s' \in L$  such that  $Q(s') = t'$ . Such a string  $s'$  exists, because  $t' \in Q(L)$ , and hence the following equalities  $P(s) = P_{hi}(Q(s)) = P_{hi}(t') = P_{hi}(Q(s')) = P(s')$  prove that  $L$  satisfies MOC. That the language  $L$  also satisfies OC then follows from Lemma 10. ■

**Lemma 18.** *If  $G$  is a DES over  $\Sigma$  satisfying  $\Sigma_{hi} \subseteq \Sigma_o$ , then  $L = L(G)$  is (M)OC.*

*Proof:* If  $\Sigma_{hi} \subseteq \Sigma_o$ , then  $P_{hi}$  is an identity. Hence, for any  $s \in L$  and  $t' \in Q(L)$  with  $P_{hi}(Q(s)) = P_{hi}(t')$ , we have that  $Q(s) = P_{hi}(Q(s)) = P_{hi}(t') = t'$ , that is, we can chose  $s' = s$  to satisfy MOC; the OC condition then follows by Lemma 10. ■

As an immediate result, Theorem 13 strengthens the claim of Komenda and Masopust [20] showing that for any prefix-closed languages  $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$  and  $K \subseteq Q(L)$ , if  $\Sigma_o \subseteq \Sigma_{hi}$ , then  $\text{supN}(K, Q(L), P_{hi}) \parallel L = \text{supN}(K \parallel L, L, P)$ .

Notice that Lemma 18 has already been applied in Example 15, which illustrates its applicability.

Another practically interesting case is to find a condition weaker than both (i) and (ii) that would imply (M)OC. The existence of such a condition is, however, an open problem.






Figure 12. Our notation for the used projections.

### VIII. MODULAR AND COORDINATED DES

In this section, we investigate the MOC condition in the setting of a modular DES

$$G = G_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel G_n$$

consisting of the parallel composition of  $n$  systems  $G_i$  over  $\Sigma_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Then, in addition to the high-level events  $\Sigma_{hi}$  and observable events  $\Sigma_o$ , we have the local events  $\Sigma_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . For simplicity, we denote the intersection of two alphabets by the corresponding subscripts separated by commas, e.g.,

$$\Sigma_{i,o} = \Sigma_i \cap \Sigma_o \text{ and } \Sigma_{hi,o} = \Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o.$$

The corresponding projections are summarized in Figure 12.

We present two different types of results. First, we deal with hierarchical supervisory control of modular systems with no assumptions on the abstraction, where the problem is to find out whether or when the MOC condition can be checked in a modular way. Second, we present new results on modular supervisory control under partial observation by showing that the MOC condition is a sufficient condition for the maximal permissiveness of modular supervisory control based on local supremal normal sublanguages. Therefore, modular supervisory control benefits from hierarchical supervisory control, where the abstractions are modeled by projections of the global plant to the local alphabets. We emphasize that the same reasoning can be used to obtain the results of hierarchical supervisory control under complete observation available in the literature, and hence the results can be unified in a natural way. This observation explains why the literature on modular supervisory control under complete observation employs the conditions from hierarchical supervisory control, such as the observer and OCC/LCC conditions [12], [14], [18].

#### A. Modular Verification of MOC

For hierarchical supervisory control of modular systems, we show that if all shared events, denoted by

$$\Sigma_s = \cup_{i \neq j} (\Sigma_i \cap \Sigma_j), \quad (2)$$

are high-level and observable, and the modular components agree on the observability status of shared events, then the MOC condition is preserved by parallel composition. Notice that our assumption is similar to that of  $\Sigma_s \subseteq \Sigma_c$  where all shared events are required to be controllable [29], [30],

We make use of the following generalization of the well-known result [34].

**Lemma 19.** *Let  $R: (\cup_{i=1}^n \Sigma_i)^* \rightarrow \Gamma^*$  be a projection, and let  $R_i: \Sigma_i^* \rightarrow (\Gamma \cap \Sigma_i)^*$  be its restriction to local modules. If all shared events of the languages  $L_i$  over  $\Sigma_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , are in  $\Gamma$ , that is,  $\Sigma_s \subseteq \Gamma$ , then  $R(\parallel_{i=1}^n L_i) = \parallel_{i=1}^n R_i(L_i)$ . ■*

To simplify the exposition in the sequel, we denote the languages  $L(G_i)$  of local plants by  $L_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

**Theorem 20.** *Consider a modular DES  $G = \parallel_{i=1}^n G_i$ . If every local language  $L_i = L(G_i)$  is MOC with respect to  $Q_i$ ,  $P_{loc}^i$ , and  $P_{loc|hi}^i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , and all shared events are high level and observable, i.e.,  $\Sigma_s \subseteq \Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o$ , then the global language  $\parallel_{i=1}^n L_i$  is MOC with respect to  $Q$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{hi}$ .*

*Proof:* Let  $L = \parallel_{i=1}^n L_i$ , and let  $s \in L$  and  $t' \in Q(L)$  be two strings such that  $P_{hi}(Q(s)) = P_{hi}(t')$ . We show that there is  $s''' \in L$  such that  $Q(s''') = t'$  and  $P(s) = P(s''')$ . The idea of the proof is as follows. First, we project both  $s$  and  $t'$  to the local modules and make use of the assumption that the local modules are MOC. Thereby we obtain local strings  $s'_i \in L_i$  such that their parallel composition contains two strings  $s', s'' \in \parallel_{i=1}^n s'_i$  such that the order of high-level events in  $s'$  and  $t'$  coincides, that is,  $Q(s') = t'$ , and such that the order of observable events in  $s''$  and  $s$  coincides, that is,  $P(s'') = P(s)$ . Finally, we use the strings  $s'$  and  $s''$  to construct a string  $s'''$  as the parallel composition of  $Q(s')$  and  $P(s'')$  such that  $s'''$  belongs to  $L$ , which ensures that  $Q(s''') = Q(s') = t'$  and  $P(s''') = P(s'') = P(s)$ , and finishes thus the proof.

To this end, we define  $s_i := P_i(s) \in P_i(L) \subseteq L_i$  and  $t'_i := P_{i|hi}(t') \in Q_i(L_i)$ . Then, by the commutative diagram of Figure 12 and by the assumption that  $P_{hi}(Q(s)) = P_{hi}(t')$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{loc|hi}^i Q_i(s_i) &= P_{loc|hi}^i Q_i P_i(s) = P_{loc|hi}^i P_{i|hi}(Q(s)) \\ &= P_{i|hi,o}(P_{hi}(Q(s))) = P_{i|hi,o}(P_{hi}(t')) \\ &= P_{loc|hi}^i P_{i|hi}(t') = P_{loc|hi}^i(t'_i) \end{aligned}$$

and hence the MOC condition of  $L_i$  with respect to  $Q_i$ ,  $P_{loc}^i$ , and  $P_{loc|hi}^i$  implies that there is

$$s'_i \in L_i \text{ such that } Q_i(s'_i) = t'_i \text{ and } P_{loc}^i(s_i) = P_{loc}^i(s'_i)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Then, since  $t' \in \parallel_{i=1}^n P_{i|hi}(t') = \parallel_{i=1}^n t'_i = \parallel_{i=1}^n Q_i(s'_i) = Q(\parallel_{i=1}^n s'_i)$ , where the last equality is by Lemma 19, which is applicable because  $\Sigma_s \subseteq \Sigma_{hi}$ , there is

$$s' \in \parallel_{i=1}^n s'_i \subseteq \parallel_{i=1}^n L_i = L \text{ such that } Q(s') = t'.$$

Using the equality  $P_{loc}^i(s_i) = P_{loc}^i(s'_i)$  and Lemma 19 on  $P$  with  $\Sigma_s \subseteq \Sigma_o$ , we obtain that  $P(s) \in P(\parallel_{i=1}^n P_i(s)) = P(\parallel_{i=1}^n s_i) = \parallel_{i=1}^n P_{loc}^i(s_i) = \parallel_{i=1}^n P_{loc}^i(s'_i) = P(\parallel_{i=1}^n s'_i)$ . Therefore, there is

$$s'' \in \parallel_{i=1}^n s'_i \subseteq \parallel_{i=1}^n L_i = L \text{ such that } P(s) = P(s'').$$

Let  $P_{o+hi}: \Sigma^* \rightarrow (\Sigma_{hi} \cup \Sigma_o)^*$  denote the projection that removes all events that are neither high-level nor observable, and let  $P_{i,o+hi}^i: \Sigma_i^* \rightarrow ((\Sigma_{hi} \cup \Sigma_o) \cap \Sigma_i)^*$  denote its restriction to local modules. Let  $P_{i|o+hi}^i: (\Sigma_{hi} \cup \Sigma_o)^* \rightarrow ((\Sigma_{hi} \cup \Sigma_o) \cap$

$\Sigma_i$ )\* denote the restriction of  $P_i$  to the alphabet  $\Sigma_o \cup \Sigma_{hi}$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} P_{o+hi}(\|_{i=1}^n s'_i \| Q(s') \| P(s'')) \\ &= P_{o+hi}(\|_{i=1}^n s'_i \| Q(s') \| P(s'')) \\ &= \|_{i=1}^n P_{i,o+hi}^i(s'_i) \cap Q(s') \| P(s'') \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 19, we have that  $\|_{i=1}^n s'_i \| Q(s') \| P(s'') \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $\|_{i=1}^n P_{i,o+hi}^i(s'_i) \cap Q(s') \| P(s'') \neq \emptyset$ .

We now show that  $\|_{i=1}^n P_{i,o+hi}^i(s'_i) \cap Q(s') \| P(s'') \neq \emptyset$ . To this end, we first notice that  $P_{hi}Q(s') = P_{hi}(t') = P_{hi}Q(s) = Q_oP(s) = Q_oP(s'') = P_{hi}Q(s'')$ . Thus, the strings  $s'$  and  $s''$  coincide on the observable high-level events  $\Sigma_o \cap \Sigma_{hi}$ , and hence also on all shared events  $\Sigma_s \subseteq \Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o$ . Therefore, we can write  $s'$  and  $s''$  as

- $s' = w_1x_1w_2x_2 \cdots x_nw_{n+1}$
- $s'' = v_1x_1v_2x_2 \cdots x_nv_{n+1}$

where  $x_i \in \Sigma_s \subseteq \Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o$  are shared events.

By Lemma 19,  $P_{o+hi}(s'), P_{o+hi}(s'') \in P_{o+hi}(\|_{i=1}^n s'_i) = \|_{i=1}^n P_{i,o+hi}^i(s'_i)$ , and hence we have that  $P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(s') = P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(s'') = P_{i,o+hi}^i(s'_i)$ , that is, the strings  $s'$  and  $s''$  coincide on the local alphabets  $\Sigma_i \cap (\Sigma_{hi} \cup \Sigma_o)$ . Therefore, if the strings  $s'$  and  $s''$  are different, they differ in the order of events from different local alphabets. Moreover, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{i,o+hi}^i(s'_i) &= P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(s') \\ &= P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(w_1) P_{i|o+hi}(x_1) P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(w_2) \cdots \\ &\quad \cdots P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(w_{n+1}) \\ &= P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(v_1) P_{i|o+hi}(x_1) P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(v_2) \cdots \\ &\quad \cdots P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(v_{n+1}) \\ &= P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(s'') \end{aligned}$$

where  $P_{i|o+hi}(x_j) = x_j$  if  $x_j \in \Sigma_i$ , otherwise  $P_{i|o+hi}(x_j) = \varepsilon$ , and that

- $Q(s') = Q(w_1)x_1Q(w_2)x_2 \cdots x_nQ(w_{n+1})$
- $P(s'') = P(v_1)x_1P(v_2)x_2 \cdots x_nP(v_{n+1})$

Since  $P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(w_1) = P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(v_1)$ , we have that the strings  $Q(w_1), P(v_1) \in \|_{i=1}^n P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(w_1) = \|_{i=1}^n P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(v_1)$ . Therefore, changing the interleaving of events from different local alphabets, but preserving the order of events of particular local alphabets, gives us that there is a string  $r_1 \in \|_{i=1}^n P_{i,o+hi}^i(s'_i)$  such that  $Q(r_1) = Q(w_1)$  and  $P(r_1) = P(v_1)$ . Continuing inductively along the decomposition of the strings  $s'$  and  $s''$ , we obtain a string  $r \in \|_{i=1}^n P_{i,o+hi}^i(s'_i) \cap Q(s') \| P(s'')$ .

For instance, if  $o_i$  are the private observable events and  $h_i$  are the private high-level events of  $\Sigma_i$ , then for

- $s' = h_1o_2h_2o_1h_3x_1$  with  $Q(s') = h_1h_2h_3x_1$  and
- $s'' = h_3h_1o_1o_2h_2x_1$  with  $P(s'') = o_1o_2x_1$ ,

we have that

- $P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(s') = h_1o_1x_1$
- $P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(s') = o_2h_2x_1$
- $P_{i|o+hi}P_{o+hi}(s') = h_3$

and hence  $r = h_1o_1o_2h_2h_3x_1$ .

Thus, we have shown that  $\|_{i=1}^n s'_i \| Q(s') \| P(s'') \neq \emptyset$ , which means that there is  $s''' \in \|_{i=1}^n s'_i \| Q(s') \| P(s'')$ . For any such

$s'''$ , we have that  $Q(s''') = Q(s') = t'$  and that  $P(s''') = P(s'') = P(s)$ , which shows that  $L$  is MOC with respect to  $Q, P$ , and  $P_{hi}$ . ■

In particular, if the alphabets of the local modules are pairwise disjoint, then the set of shared events  $\Sigma_s$  is empty, and Theorem 20 states that if the local languages satisfy MOC, then so does the global language.

### B. Maximally Permissive Modular Supervisory Control under Partial Observation

The key problem in modular supervisory control is to decide whether the parallel composition of the closed-loop languages computed locally for every pair  $(K_i, L_i)$  of a specification and a local plant coincides with the closed-loop language computed on the global specification  $\|_{i=1}^n K_i$  and the global plant  $\|_{i=1}^n L_i$ . We show that MOC guarantees maximal permissiveness in modular supervisory control under partial observation.

Before stating this result, we briefly review the basic principles and concepts of modular supervisory control. Consider a modular plant modeled as a parallel composition of languages

$$L_1 \parallel \cdots \parallel L_n = L(G_1) \parallel \cdots \parallel L(G_n)$$

and a specification  $K$  given either (i) as a parallel composition of local specifications  $K_i \subseteq L_i$ , or (ii) as a global specification  $K \subseteq \|_{i=1}^n L_i$ . Since there are approaches transforming a global specification to local specifications [32], [42], we assume that

$$K = \|_{i=1}^n K_i.$$

We discuss the case of global specifications in Section VIII-C.

Furthermore, to avoid the well-known conflicting issues<sup>4</sup> and to focus on the role of MOC in maximal permissiveness, we mostly consider only prefix-closed languages or assume that the languages are nonconflicting.

The considered modular supervisory control problem consists of a system modeled by  $n$  automata  $G_1, \dots, G_n$  generating languages  $L_1, \dots, L_n$ , respectively, with the overall behavior  $L = \|_{i=1}^n L_i$ , and  $n$  specifications  $K_i \subseteq L_i$ . The aim is to synthesize maximally permissive local controllers  $S_i$  such that, if  $S$  denotes the maximally permissive supervisor for the specification  $K = \|_{i=1}^n K_i$  and the plant  $L$ , then

$$\|_{i=1}^n L(S_i/G_i) = L(S/\|_{i=1}^n G_i).$$

In particular, the fundamental question is under which conditions this equality holds.

This problem is well understood for modular systems under complete observation, where we essentially have two types of conditions:

- 1) those adopted from hierarchical supervisory control (the observer property and the OCC/LCC conditions) and
- 2) mutual controllability and its variants.

For partially observed DES, however, only the second type of conditions are known [45].

<sup>4</sup>The case of non-prefix-closed languages can be handled by abstractions or coordinators for nonblocking [43], [44].

The possibilities of a local computation of supremal normal sublanguages were investigated by Komenda and Van Schuppen [46], but their sufficient condition for the local computation to equal the global computation (namely, mutual normality) is too restrictive. Another approach, based on an architecture where a coordinator is added to the plant to take care of the global part of the specification, was discussed by Komenda et al. [47]. This approach is less restrictive, but maximal permissiveness is guaranteed only under some additional conditions.

We now show that MOC is a sufficient condition guaranteeing that the local control synthesis is as permissive as the global control synthesis. In particular, the MOC condition implies that the supremal normal sublanguage can be computed locally without loss of permissiveness.

**Theorem 21.** *Consider the languages  $K_i \subseteq L_i$  over  $\Sigma_i$ , where the language  $L_i$  is prefix-closed, for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , and define the global languages  $K = \prod_{i=1}^n K_i$  and  $L = \prod_{i=1}^n L_i$ .*

1) *If the languages  $\text{supN}(K_i, L_i, P_{loc}^i)$  are nonconflicting,*

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \text{supN}(K_i, L_i, P_{loc}^i) \subseteq \text{supN}(K, L, P).$$

2) *If, in addition, (i)  $P_i(L) = L_i$  and (ii)  $L = \prod_{i=1}^n L_i$  is MOC with respect to  $P_i, P$ , and  $P_{loc}^i$ , then*

$$\text{supN}(K, L, P) \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^n \text{supN}(K_i, L_i, P_{loc}^i).$$

*Proof:* For brevity, we set  $\text{supN}_i = \text{supN}(K_i, L_i, P_{loc}^i)$ .

To prove (1), we show that  $\prod_{i=1}^n \text{supN}_i$  is normal with respect to  $L$  and  $P$ , and hence included in  $\text{supN}(K, L, P)$ . Since  $\overline{\prod_{i=1}^n \text{supN}_i} = \prod_{i=1}^n \overline{\text{supN}_i}$  by the nonconflictingness of  $\text{supN}_i$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\prod_{i=1}^n \text{supN}_i} &\subseteq P^{-1}P(\overline{\prod_{i=1}^n \text{supN}_i}) \cap L \\ &= P^{-1}P(\overline{\prod_{i=1}^n \text{supN}_i}) \cap L \\ &\subseteq P^{-1}(\prod_{i=1}^n P_{loc}^i(\overline{\text{supN}_i})) \cap L \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n (P_{loc}^i)^{-1}P_{loc}^i(\overline{\text{supN}_i}) \cap \prod_{i=1}^n L_i \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n [(P_{loc}^i)^{-1}P_{loc}^i(\overline{\text{supN}_i}) \cap L_i] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \overline{\text{supN}_i} = \overline{\prod_{i=1}^n \text{supN}_i} \end{aligned}$$

which shows normality of  $\prod_{i=1}^n \text{supN}_i$ , and proves (1).

To prove (2), the assumptions that  $P_i(L) = L_i$  and  $L$  is MOC with respect to  $P_i, P$ , and  $P_{loc}^i$  together with Lemma 12, where projection  $P_i$  plays the role of abstraction  $Q$  and projection  $P_{loc}^i$  plays the role of the high-level partial observation  $P_{hi}$ , imply that  $P_i(\text{supN}(K, L, P))$  is normal with respect to  $P_i(L) = L_i$  and  $P_{loc}^i$ . Consequently,  $P_i(\text{supN}(K, L, P)) \subseteq \text{supN}_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , which proves the claim. ■

The problem with the previous result is that verifying MOC is a hard problem, and it is even harder for modular systems. However, there are cases where the conditions always hold.

In particular, if the alphabets of local modules are pairwise disjoint, then  $P_i(L) = L_i$  and  $L$  satisfies the MOC condition. Indeed,  $P_i(L) = P_i(\prod_{j=1}^n L_j) = \prod_{j=1}^n P_i(L_j) = L_i$ , where the second equality is by Lemma 19, because  $\Sigma_s = \emptyset \subseteq \Sigma_i$ . To show that  $L$  is MOC with respect to projections  $P_i, P$ , and  $P_{loc}^i$ , let  $s \in L$  and  $t' \in P_i(L) = L_i$  be any two strings such that  $P_{loc}^i P_i(s) = P_{loc}^i(t')$ . We need to show

that there is a string  $s' \in L$  such that  $P(s) = P(s')$  and  $P_i(s') = t'$ . However, every string  $s' \in P(\{s\}) \parallel \{t'\}$  satisfies  $P(s') = P(s)$  and  $P_i(s') = t'$ , and hence it remains to show that the composition  $P(\{s\}) \parallel \{t'\}$  is nonempty. For the sake of contradiction, we may assume that it is empty. But then we have that  $\emptyset = P_{loc}^i P_i(\emptyset) = P_{loc}^i P_i(P(\{s\}) \parallel \{t'\}) = P_{loc}^i P_i P(\{s\}) \cap P_{loc}^i P_i(\{t'\}) = P_{i|o} P(\{s\}) \cap P_{loc}^i(\{t'\}) = P_{loc}^i P_i(\{s\}) \cap P_{loc}^i(\{t'\})$ , which is nonempty, because by the assumption that  $P_{loc}^i P_i(s) = P_{loc}^i(t')$ , we have that the string  $P_{loc}^i(t') \in P_{loc}^i P_i(\{s\}) \cap P_{loc}^i(\{t'\})$ . Since we arrived at a contradiction, the proof showing that  $L$  is MOC is complete.

Hence, Theorem 5.13 of Komenda and Van Schuppen [48] showing that  $\text{supN}(K, L, P) = \prod_{i=1}^n \text{supN}(K_i, L_i, P_{loc}^i)$  for prefix-closed local modules over disjoint alphabets is an immediate corollary of Theorem 21.

To illustrate Theorem 21, we continue our railway example.

**Example 22.** *Considering Example 15, where the low-level plant consists of a parallel composition of local modules  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  depicted in Figure 7. The reader may notice that the alphabets of the modules are disjoint. Therefore, denoting the language of the global plant by  $L$  and the languages of the local modules by  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ , respectively, we have that the assumptions of (2) of Theorem 21 are satisfied, namely  $P_i(L) = L_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $L$  is MOC with respect to  $P_i, P$ , and  $P_{loc}^i$ . Consequently, to apply Theorem 21 for any given specification  $K = K_1 \parallel K_2$ , we only need to verify whether the languages  $\text{supN}(K_i, L_i, P_{loc}^i)$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ , are nonconflicting. Since the specification in our railway example is global, cf. Figure 8, we postpone this discussion to Section VIII-C, where we show how to handle the case of global specifications. ◊*

We now briefly discuss conditions ensuring MOC of  $L$  that are equivalent to the two conditions of Section VII, namely  $\Sigma_o \subseteq \Sigma_{hi}$  and  $\Sigma_{hi} \subseteq \Sigma_o$ . These conditions can be naturally translated into the modular framework, where  $P_j: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma_j^*$  plays the role of the abstraction  $Q: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma_{hi}^*$ , as follows:

- (i)  $\Sigma_j \subseteq \Sigma_o$ , for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , and
- (ii)  $\Sigma_o \subseteq \Sigma_j$ , for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

The first condition is, however, not interesting, because it requires that all events are observable, that is,  $\Sigma = \cup_j \Sigma_j \subseteq \Sigma_o$ . The second condition is more interesting for, e.g., heavily coupled systems, because it requires that every module contains all observable events, that is,  $\Sigma_o \subseteq \cap_j \Sigma_j$ , which is still quite restrictive.

In general, the existence of interesting sufficient conditions ensuring  $\text{supN}(K, L, P) \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^n \text{supN}(K_i, L_i, P_{loc}^i)$  is a challenging open problem. In particular, a potentially interesting condition is the assumption that all shared events are observable,  $\Sigma_s \subseteq \Sigma_o$ . However, we do not know whether  $\Sigma_s \subseteq \Sigma_o$  implies  $\text{supN}(K, L, P) \subseteq \prod_{i=1}^n \text{supN}(K_i, L_i, P_{loc}^i)$ , for  $n \geq 3$ , although we conjecture it is the case. The conjecture is unknown even if we consider only prefix-closed languages.

On the other hand, the same question under the assumption that  $\Sigma_o \subseteq \Sigma_s$  or  $\cap_j \Sigma_j \subseteq \Sigma_o$  can be answered negatively. For example, we consider languages  $L_1 = \{u_1 u c\}^* \subseteq \{u_1, u, c\}^*$ ,  $L_2 = \{u_2 c u\}^* \subseteq \{u_2, c, u\}^*$ , and  $L_3 = \{u_3 c\}^* \subseteq \{u_3, c\}^*$ , and specifications  $K_1 = \{u_1\}$ ,  $K_2 = \{u_2\}$ , and  $K_3 = \{u_3\}$ , where  $\Sigma_{1,o} = \Sigma_{2,o} = \Sigma_{3,o} = \{c\}$ , and hence  $\Sigma_o = \{c\}$ . Then,




Figure 13. Projections used in the local verification of the MOC condition (left) and in the coordination control framework (right).

$\text{supN}_1 = \emptyset$ ,  $\text{supN}_2 = \{u_2\}$ , and  $\text{supN}_3 = \{u_3\}$ , and  $\text{supN} = K_1 \parallel K_2 \parallel K_3$ . In particular,  $P_1(\text{supN}) = u_1 \notin \text{supN}_1 = \emptyset$ . Therefore, it is a counterexample for the cases where  $\{c\} = \Sigma_o \subseteq \Sigma_s = \{c, u\}$  and  $\{c\} = \Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2 \cap \Sigma_3 \subseteq \Sigma_o = \{c\}$ .

Another interesting challenging open problem is how to verify or guarantee that the global plant  $L$  is MOC using only the local plants  $L_i$ . One option could be to employ Theorem 20 with appropriately adjusted projections. In particular, if we replace the abstraction  $Q$  by the local projection  $P_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , cf. Figure 13, then Theorem 20 states that if, for every  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ , the local module  $L_i$  is MOC with respect to  $P_{i,j}^i$ ,  $P_{i,loc}^i$ ,  $P_{i,j,o}^i$ , then the global plant  $L = \parallel_{i=1}^n L_i$  is MOC with respect to projections  $P_j$ ,  $P$ ,  $P_{i,loc}^j$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . However, Theorem 20 further requires that  $\Sigma_s \subseteq \Sigma_j \cap \Sigma_o$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , that is,  $\Sigma_s \subseteq \Sigma_1 \cap \dots \cap \Sigma_n \cap \Sigma_o$ , which is too restrictive for  $n \geq 3$ .

Notice that for  $n = 2$ , the assumption that  $\Sigma_s \subseteq \Sigma_o$  implies that  $L_1 \parallel L_2$  is MOC holds true; indeed, in this case,  $L_i$  is MOC with respect to  $P_{i,j}^i$ ,  $P_{i,loc}^i$ , and  $P_{i,j,o}^i$ , by Lemma 18, because  $\Sigma_s = \Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2 \subseteq \Sigma_{i,o}$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . Theorem 20 then gives that  $L_1 \parallel L_2$  is MOC as well.

In the next subsection, we discuss the use of a coordinator to guarantee MOC locally under the assumption that all coordinated events are observable, and show that the coordinator ensures  $\text{supN}(K, L, P) \subseteq \parallel_{i=1}^n \text{supN}(K'_i, L'_i, P_{i,loc}^i)$ , for some languages  $K'_i \subseteq L'_i$  such that  $K = \parallel_{i=1}^n K'_i$ , and  $L = \parallel_{i=1}^n L'_i$ , where  $L$  is MOC by construction.

### C. Verification in Coordinated Modular DES

In the coordination control framework that was introduced for an efficient handling of interactions among various subsystems, we construct a set  $\Sigma_\kappa \supseteq \Sigma_s$  of events the local modules need to communicate to each other, and add it to the alphabets of local modules by defining  $\Sigma_{i+\kappa} = \Sigma_i \cup \Sigma_\kappa$ .

Specifically, for a modular system with local languages  $L_i$ , and a global specification  $K \subseteq L = \parallel_{i=1}^n L_i$ , we choose a coordinator alphabet  $\Sigma_\kappa$  so that it makes the specification  $K$  conditionally decomposable, that is,

$$K = \parallel_{i=1}^n P_{i+\kappa}(K)$$

where  $P_{i+\kappa}: \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma_{i+\kappa}^*$  is a projection, see Komenda et al. [32] for details. The meaning of conditional decomposability is to decompose the global specification  $K$  to local specifications  $P_{i+\kappa}(K)$  over the extended local alphabets  $\Sigma_{i+\kappa}$ , for

$i = 1, \dots, n$ . Having determined the alphabet  $\Sigma_\kappa$ , we compute the coordinator  $G_\kappa$  as the projection of the global plant, but computed locally, defining  $L_\kappa = L(G_\kappa) := P_\kappa(L) = \parallel_{i=1}^n P_\kappa(L_i)$ . This way, we transformed the original modular system with the modules  $L_i$  and the global specification  $K$  to the modular system with the modules

$$L_{i+\kappa} := P_{i+\kappa}(L) = L_i \parallel L_\kappa \quad (3)$$

and the local specifications

$$K_{i+\kappa} := P_{i+\kappa}(K) \quad (4)$$

see Komenda et al. [32] for more details.

We now explain how to make use of Theorem 20 to locally verify MOC in Theorem 21 with the help of a coordinator. Namely, instead of considering the local modules  $L_i$ , we consider  $(P_i^{i+\kappa})^{-1}(L_i)$  as local modules, where  $P_i^{i+\kappa}: \Sigma_{i+\kappa}^* \rightarrow \Sigma_i^*$ . Moreover, the projection  $P_{j+\kappa}$  plays the role of the abstraction  $Q$ , etc., cf. the Figures 12 and 13. Hence, we obtain the following corollary, which fits to the settings of Theorem 21 when the theorem is adapted to our new setting.

**Corollary 23.** Consider a modular DES  $G = G_1 \parallel \dots \parallel G_n$ , define  $L_i = L(G_i)$ , and let  $P_i^{i+\kappa}: \Sigma_{i+\kappa}^* \rightarrow \Sigma_i^*$ . If

- 1)  $(P_i^{i+\kappa})^{-1}(L_i)$  is MOC with respect to  $P_\kappa^{i+\kappa}$ ,  $P_{i,loc}^{i+\kappa}$ , and  $P_{i,loc}^\kappa$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,<sup>5</sup> and
- 2)  $\Sigma_\kappa \subseteq \Sigma_o$ ,

then the global plant  $\parallel_{i=1}^n L_i$  is MOC with respect to projections  $P_{j+\kappa}$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{i,loc}^{j+\kappa}$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

*Proof:* The proof follows by applying Theorem 20 to the local languages  $(P_i^{i+\kappa})^{-1}(L_i)$  over  $\Sigma_{i+\kappa} = \Sigma_i \cup \Sigma_\kappa$ , where the projection  $P_i^{i+\kappa}$  plays the role of  $Q_i$ ,  $P_{i,loc}^{i+\kappa}$  plays the role of  $P_{i,loc}^i$ ,  $P_{i,loc}^\kappa$  plays the role of  $P_{i,loc}^i$ ,  $P_{j+\kappa}$  plays the role of  $Q$ , and  $P_{i,loc}^{j+\kappa}$  plays the role of  $P_{hi}$ , cf. the Figures 12 and 13. Notice that Theorem 20 requires that the set of shared events  $\Sigma_s \subseteq \Sigma_{hi} \cap \Sigma_o$ , whereas this corollary only requires that  $\Sigma_\kappa \subseteq \Sigma_o$ . However, we have that  $\Sigma_\kappa$  is the set of all shared events of the languages  $(P_i^{i+\kappa})^{-1}(L_i)$ , which comes from the fact that  $\Sigma_{i+\kappa} \cap \Sigma_{j+\kappa} = \Sigma_\kappa$ . Furthermore, the alphabet  $\Sigma_{j+\kappa} = \Sigma_j \cup \Sigma_\kappa$ , playing the role of  $\Sigma_{hi}$  of Theorem 20, contains  $\Sigma_\kappa$ , and hence we trivially have that  $\Sigma_\kappa \subseteq \Sigma_{j+\kappa} \cap \Sigma_o$ . The result then follows from Theorem 20 and the observation that  $\parallel_{i=1}^n (P_i^{i+\kappa})^{-1}(L_i) = \parallel_{i=1}^n L_i$ . ■

In other words, Corollary 23 states that if the coordinator events  $\Sigma_\kappa$  are observable, then we can replace the requirement that the global language  $L = \parallel_{i=1}^n L_i$  is MOC with respect to projections  $P_{i+\kappa}$ ,  $P$ ,  $P_{i,loc}^{i+\kappa}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , in Theorem 21 by computationally more efficient assumptions that every local language  $(P_i^{i+\kappa})^{-1}(L_i)$  is MOC with respect to projections  $P_\kappa^{i+\kappa}$ ,  $P_{i,loc}^{i+\kappa}$ ,  $P_{i,loc}^\kappa$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

We now state the main result illustrating the advantage of the use of a coordinator for modular systems.

**Theorem 24.** Consider prefix-closed languages  $L_i$  over  $\Sigma_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , and define the global language  $L = \parallel_{i=1}^n L_i$ . Let  $K \subseteq L$  be a specification.<sup>6</sup> Compute the alphabet  $\Sigma_\kappa$

<sup>5</sup>See Figure 13 for the definitions of the projections.

<sup>6</sup>Notice that the case where  $K = \parallel_{i=1}^n K_i$  is also possible.




Figure 14. The traffic lights' fairness specification  $K$  lifted to the alphabet  $\Sigma = \{r_1, r_2, g_1, g_2, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ .

containing all shared events so that  $\Sigma_\kappa$  makes  $K$  conditionally decomposable. Let  $P_i^{i+\kappa}: \Sigma_{i+\kappa}^* \rightarrow \Sigma_i^*$ . If  $\Sigma_\kappa \subseteq \Sigma_o$  consist only of observable events,  $L_{i+\kappa}$  and  $K_{i+\kappa}$  are defined as in (3) and (4), and the languages  $\text{supN}(K_{i+\kappa}, L_{i+\kappa}, P_{loc}^{i+\kappa})$  are nonconflicting, then

$$\|_{i=1}^n \text{supN}(K_{i+\kappa}, L_{i+\kappa}, P_{loc}^{i+\kappa}) = \text{supN}(K, L, P).$$

*Proof:* Since  $\Sigma_\kappa \subseteq \Sigma_o$ , Lemma 18 applied to projections  $P_\kappa^{i+\kappa}$ ,  $P_{loc}^{i+\kappa}$ , and  $P_{loc}^\kappa$  implies that the language  $(P_i^{i+\kappa})^{-1}(L_i)$  is MOC with respect to projections  $P_\kappa^{i+\kappa}$ ,  $P_{loc}^{i+\kappa}$ , and  $P_{loc}^\kappa$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Then, by Corollary 23, the global plant  $L = \|_{i=1}^n L_i$  is MOC with respect to projections  $P_{i+\kappa}$ ,  $P$ , and  $P_{loc}^{i+\kappa}$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Since, by definition,  $L_{i+\kappa} = P_{i+\kappa}(L)$ , and, by the assumption, the languages  $\text{supN}(K_{i+\kappa}, L_{i+\kappa}, P_{loc}^{i+\kappa})$  are nonconflicting, Theorem 21 gives that  $\text{supN}(K, L, P) = \|_{i=1}^n \text{supN}(K_{i+\kappa}, L_{i+\kappa}, P_{loc}^{i+\kappa})$ . ■

We now finish our running railway example.

**Example 25.** We continue Example 22 by considering the requirements defined by the DES depicted in Figure 8. However, since we are now in the modular setting, and not in the hierarchical setting, we need to lift the specification to the alphabet  $\Sigma = \{r_1, r_2, g_1, g_2, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ . The result obtained by the parallel composition of the original specification with the language  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}^*$  is depicted in Figure 14. Since our aim is to illustrate the case of partial observation, we assume that all events are controllable, and we set the events  $\Sigma_{uo} = \{x_2, x_4\}$  to be unobservable. Now, we need to find the alphabet  $\Sigma_\kappa$ , containing all shared events, that makes the specification  $K$  conditionally decomposable. Since the local alphabets are  $\Sigma_1 = \{g_1, r_1, x_1, x_2\}$  and  $\Sigma_2 = \{g_2, r_2, x_3, x_4\}$ , the set of all shared events is  $\Sigma_s = \emptyset$ . The reader may verify that  $\Sigma_\kappa = \{r_1, r_2\}$  makes the specification  $K$  of Figure 14 conditionally decomposable, that is,  $K = P_{1+\kappa}(K) \| P_{2+\kappa}(K)$ . Making use of the alphabet  $\Sigma_\kappa$ , we compute the language  $L_\kappa := \|_{i=1}^n P_\kappa(L_i) = \{r_1, r_2\}$ , and the new modules  $L_{i+\kappa} := L_i \| L_\kappa$ . Using the local specifications  $K_{i+\kappa} := P_{i+\kappa}(K)$ , we compute the local supervisors  $\text{supN}(K_{i+\kappa}, L_{i+\kappa}, P_{loc}^{i+\kappa})$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $\Sigma_\kappa \subseteq \Sigma_o$ , and the languages  $\text{supN}(K_{i+\kappa}, L_{i+\kappa}, P_{loc}^{i+\kappa})$  are prefix-closed, and hence nonconflicting, Theorem 24 gives that  $\text{supN}(K, L, P) = \|_{i=1}^n \text{supN}(K_{i+\kappa}, L_{i+\kappa}, P_{loc}^{i+\kappa})$ . ◇

## IX. CONCLUSION

We suggested a new sufficient condition of MOC guaranteeing maximal permissiveness of supervisors in hierarchical and modular supervisory control under partial observation. We showed that the MOC condition is preserved by parallel composition, and illustrated how to use it for the local computation of supervisors in modular and coordinated DES under partial observation. Since decidability and complexity of the verification of (M)OC for systems modeled by finite automata is an open problem, we showed that the finite-automata models are essential for potential decidability, because the problem is undecidable for slightly more expressive models of one-turn deterministic pushdown automata. Therefore, we discussed several practically relevant conditions that ensure MOC, that turned out to be useful in the applications of the coordination control framework.

In the future, we will explore the decidability of (M)OC and include local supervisors based on supremal relatively observable languages. Our plan is also to extend the hierarchical approach to modular supervisory control of networked DES to account for delays and losses in observation channels.

## APPENDIX A

### UNDECIDABILITY OF (M)OC IN NON-REGULAR SYSTEMS

We now show that for a slightly more expressive model than DFAs, verifying (M)OC is undecidable.

A *pushdown automaton* is a septuple  $\mathcal{M} = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, Z_0, F)$ , where  $Q$  is a finite set of states,  $\Sigma$  is an alphabet,  $\Gamma$  is a pushdown alphabet,  $\delta: Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}) \times \Gamma \rightarrow 2^{Q \times \Gamma^*}$  is the transition function,  $q_0 \in Q$  is the initial state,  $Z_0 \in \Gamma$  is the initial pushdown symbol, and  $F \subseteq Q$  is the set of accepting states. A *configuration* of  $\mathcal{M}$  is a triplet  $(q, w, \gamma)$ , where  $q \in Q$  is the current state,  $w \in \Sigma^*$  is the unread part of the input, and  $\gamma \in \Gamma^*$  is the current content of the pushdown (the leftmost symbol of  $\gamma$  represents the top pushdown symbol). For  $p, q \in Q$ ,  $a \in \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ ,  $w \in \Sigma^*$ ,  $\gamma, \beta \in \Gamma^*$ ,  $Z \in \Gamma$ , and  $(p, \beta) \in \delta(q, a, Z)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$  makes a move from  $(q, aw, Z\gamma)$  to  $(p, w, \beta\gamma)$ , denoted by  $(q, aw, Z\gamma) \vdash_{\mathcal{M}} (p, w, \beta\gamma)$ . The reflexive and transitive closure of the relation  $\vdash_{\mathcal{M}}$  is denoted by  $\vdash_{\mathcal{M}}^*$ . The *language accepted* by  $\mathcal{M}$  is the set  $L(\mathcal{M}) = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid (q_0, w, Z_0) \vdash_{\mathcal{M}}^* (q, \varepsilon, \gamma) \text{ for some } q \in F \text{ and } \gamma \in \Gamma^*\}$ . A pushdown automaton  $\mathcal{M}$  is *deterministic* (DPDA) if (1)  $|\delta(q, a, Z)| \leq 1$ , for all  $a \in \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ ,  $q \in Q$ , and  $Z \in \Gamma$ , and (2) for all  $q \in Q$  and  $Z \in \Gamma$ , if  $\delta(q, \varepsilon, Z) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\delta(q, a, Z) = \emptyset$ , for all  $a \in \Sigma$ . During the computation of a DPDA, the height of its pushdown increases and decreases. The situation where the pushdown changes from the increasing phase to the decreasing phase, or vice versa, is a turn [49]. A language is *linear deterministic context-free* if it is accepted by a one-turn DPDA (1-DPDA), i.e., by a DPDA whose pushdown content first only increases and then only decreases.

Linear deterministic context-free languages are slightly more expressive than regular languages. Intuitively, linear deterministic context-free languages are a generalization of languages of palindromes [50]. Perhaps a better argument expressing the closeness of linear deterministic context-free

languages to regular languages is provided by Rosenberg [51], who relates linear languages to 2-tape finite automata.

**Theorem 26.** *Verifying (M)OC for 1-DPDAs is undecidable.*

*Proof:* We prove the theorem by reduction of the Post's Correspondence Problem (PCP) [52] to (M)OC. The PCP asks whether, given two finite lists  $A = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$  and  $B = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$  of  $n$  strings over  $\Sigma$ , there is a sequence of indices  $i_1 i_2 \dots i_k$ , for some  $k \geq 1$ , such that  $w_{i_1} w_{i_2} \dots w_{i_k} = u_{i_1} u_{i_2} \dots u_{i_k}$ . To eliminate trivial cases, we may assume that  $w_i \neq u_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . We denote by  $E = \{1, \dots, n\}$  a new alphabet, such that  $E \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$ , to represent the indices of words in the lists  $A$  and  $B$ , and by  $w^R$  the mirror image of  $w \in \Sigma^*$ , e.g.,  $(abc)^R = cba$ . Now, we define the language

$$L = \{i_1 i_2 \dots i_m \$ w_{i_m}^R \dots w_{i_2}^R w_{i_1}^R @ \mid m \geq 1\} \\ \cup \{i_1 i_2 \dots i_m \$' u_{i_m}^R \dots u_{i_2}^R u_{i_1}^R \# \mid m \geq 1\}$$

where  $\$, @, \$',$  and  $\#$  are new events.

Languages  $L$  and  $\bar{L}$  are accepted by a 1-DPDA: For a given input string, the 1-DPDA initially reads the events from  $E$  and pushes them to the pushdown. Then it reads  $\$$  or  $\$'$ , which specifies whether the rest of the input consists of the mirrored strings from  $A$  or from  $B$ , respectively. Next, it pops events one by one from the pushdown, say  $i$ , and tries to read the corresponding mirrored string  $w_i^R$ , resp.  $u_i^R$ , from the input. To recognize  $L$ , the 1-DPDA accepts an input string if it successfully empties the pushdown and reads the whole input string; otherwise, it rejects. To recognize  $\bar{L}$ , the 1-DPDA accepts if it successfully reads the whole input.

Let  $\Sigma_{hi} = \Sigma \cup E \cup \{@, \#\}$  and  $\Sigma_o = \Sigma \cup E \cup \{\$, \$'\}$ . We prove that the instance has a solution if and only if  $\bar{L}$  is not (M)OC.

Assume that  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  is a solution of the instance of PCP. We consider the two strings  $r = i_1 \dots i_k \$ w_{i_k}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R @$  and  $t' = i_1 \dots i_k u_{i_k}^R \dots u_{i_1}^R \#$ , and show that  $t = Q(r) = i_1 \dots i_k w_{i_k}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R @$  and  $t'$  violate OC, which, by Lemma 10, violates MOC as well. To this end, notice first that  $P_{hi}(t) = P_{hi}(Q(r)) = i_1 \dots i_k w_{i_k}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R = i_1 \dots i_k u_{i_k}^R \dots u_{i_1}^R = P_{hi}(t')$ , and hence we need to show that for any  $s, s' \in \bar{L}$  with  $Q(s) = t$  and  $Q(s') = t'$ , the observations of  $s$  and  $s'$  are different, i.e.,  $P(s) \neq P(s')$ . However,  $s \in Q^{-1}(t) \cap L = \{i_1 \dots i_k \$ w_{i_k}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R @\}$  contains the symbol  $\$,$  whereas  $s' \in Q^{-1}(t') \cap L = \{i_1 \dots i_k \$' u_{i_k}^R \dots u_{i_1}^R \#\}$  contains  $\$'$  but no  $\$,$  and hence  $P(s') \neq P(s)$  and  $L$  is not (M)OC.

On the other hand, we assume that the instance of PCP has no solution. In this case, we consider any two strings  $s \in \bar{L}$  and  $t' \in Q(\bar{L})$  satisfying  $P_{hi}(Q(s)) = P_{hi}(t')$ . Then, if  $Q(s) = t'$ , we may simply take  $s' = s$  to obtain that  $Q(s) = Q(s') = t'$  and  $P(s) = P(s')$ , as required by MOC. Otherwise, if  $Q(s) \neq t'$ , then the language  $Q(\bar{L}) = \{i_1 \dots i_m w_{i_m}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R @, i_1 \dots i_m u_{i_m}^R \dots u_{i_1}^R \# \mid m \geq 1\}$ , the language  $P_{hi}(Q(\bar{L})) = \{i_1 \dots i_m w_{i_m}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R \mid m \geq 1\} \cup \{i_1 \dots i_m u_{i_m}^R \dots u_{i_1}^R \mid m \geq 1\}$ , and the assumption that the instance of PCP has no solution imply that  $@$  and  $\#$  are the only way to distinguish the strings  $Q(s)$  and  $t'$ . If  $Q(s)$  contains  $@$ , we may deduce that  $s = i_1 \dots i_m \$ w_{i_m}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R @$ . Since  $P_{hi}(t') = P_{hi}(Q(s)) = i_1 \dots i_m w_{i_m}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R$ , we have

that  $t' = i_1 \dots i_m w_{i_m}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R \in Q(\bar{L})$ . Such a  $t'$  can be obtained either directly as  $i_1 \dots i_m w_{i_m}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R$  or as a strict prefix of the string  $i_1 \dots i_m u_{i_m}^R \dots u_{i_1}^R$ . We now show that  $s' = i_1 \dots i_m \$ w_{i_m}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R$  satisfies MOC. Indeed,  $Q(s') = i_1 \dots i_m w_{i_m}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R = t'$  and  $P(s') = i_1 \dots i_m \$ w_{i_m}^R \dots w_{i_1}^R = P(s)$ . Since the case where  $Q(s)$  contains  $\#$  is analogous, we conclude that if the instance of PCP has no solution,  $\bar{L}$  is MOC, and hence OC by Lemma 10. ■

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Komenda and T. Masopust, "Conditions for hierarchical supervisory control under partial observation," in *WODES*, ser. IFAC-PapersOnLine, vol. 53, no. 4, 2020, pp. 303–308.
- [2] C. Baier and T. Moor, "A hierarchical and modular control architecture for sequential behaviours," *Discrete Event Dyn. Syst.*, vol. 25, no. 1-2, pp. 95–124, 2015.
- [3] P. Hubbard and P. Caines, "Dynamical consistency in hierarchical supervisory control," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 37–52, 2002.
- [4] C. Torrico and J. Cury, "Hierarchical supervisory control of discrete event systems based on state aggregation," in *IFAC World Congress*, ser. IFAC Proceedings Volumes, vol. 35, 2002, pp. 169–174.
- [5] A. da Cunha and J. Cury, "Hierarchical supervisory control based on discrete event systems with flexible marking," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 52, no. 12, pp. 2242–2253, 2007.
- [6] D. Li, E. Mayer, and J. Raisch, "A novel hierarchical control architecture for a class of discrete-event systems," in *WODES*, ser. IFAC Proceedings Volumes, vol. 37, 2004, pp. 405–410.
- [7] Q. Ngo and K. Seow, "A hierarchical consistency framework for real-time supervisory control," *Discrete Event Dyn. Syst.*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 375–426, 2018.
- [8] A. Sylla, M. Louvel, É. Rutten, and G. Delaval, "Modular and hierarchical discrete control for applications and middleware deployment in IoT and smart buildings," in *CCTA*, 2018, pp. 1472–1479.
- [9] J. Raisch and T. Moor, "Hierarchical hybrid control synthesis and its application to a multiproduct batch plant," in *Control and Observer Design for Nonlinear Finite and Infinite Dimensional Systems*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005, pp. 199–216.
- [10] A. Girard and G. Pappas, "Hierarchical control using approximate simulation relations," in *CDC*, 2006, pp. 264–269.
- [11] X. David-Henriet, J. Raisch, and L. Hardouin, "Consistent control hierarchies with top layers represented by timed event graphs," in *MMAR*, 2012, p. 15.
- [12] H. Zhong and W. Wonham, "On the consistency of hierarchical supervision in discrete-event systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 35, no. 10, pp. 1125–1134, 1990.
- [13] —, "Hierarchical coordination," in *ISIC*, vol. 1, 1990, pp. 8–14.
- [14] K. Wong and W. Wonham, "Hierarchical control of discrete-event systems," *Discrete Event Dyn. Syst.*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 241–273, 1996.
- [15] —, "Hierarchical control of timed discrete-event systems," *Discrete Event Dyn. Syst.*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 275–306, 1996.
- [16] Z. Chao and Y. Xi, "Necessary conditions for control consistency in hierarchical control of discrete-event systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 465–468, 2003.
- [17] K. Schmidt, T. Moor, and S. Perk, "Nonblocking hierarchical control of decentralized discrete event systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 53, no. 10, pp. 2252–2265, 2008.
- [18] K. Schmidt and C. Breindl, "Maximally permissive hierarchical control of decentralized discrete event systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 723–737, 2011.
- [19] M. Z. Fekri and S. Hashtrudi-Zad, "Hierarchical supervisory control of discrete-event systems under partial observation," in *CDC-CCC*, 2009, pp. 181–186.
- [20] J. Komenda and T. Masopust, "Supremal normal sublanguages in hierarchical supervisory control," in *WODES*, 2010, pp. 121–126.
- [21] O. Boutin, J. Komenda, T. Masopust, K. Schmidt, and J. H. van Schuppen, "Hierarchical control with partial observations: Sufficient conditions," in *CDC-ECC*, 2011, pp. 1817–1822.
- [22] C. Griffin, "Decidability and optimality in pushdown control systems: a new approach to discrete event control," Ph.D. dissertation, Penn State University, 2007.
- [23] —, "On partial observability in discrete event control with pushdown systems," in *ACC*, 2010, pp. 2619–2622.

- [24] T. Masopust, "A note on controllability of deterministic context-free systems," *Automatica*, vol. 48, pp. 1934–1937, 2012.
- [25] R. Sreenivas, "On a weaker notion of controllability of a language K with respect to a language L," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 38, no. 9, pp. 1446–1447, 1993.
- [26] A. Schmuck, S. Schneider, J. Raisch, and U. Nestmann, "Supervisory control synthesis for deterministic context free specification languages - enforcing controllability least restrictively," *Discrete Event Dyn. Syst.*, vol. 26, pp. 5–32, 2016.
- [27] M. H. de Queiroz and J. E. R. Cury, "Modular supervisory control of large scale discrete event systems," in *Discrete Event Systems*. Springer US, 2000, pp. 103–110.
- [28] R. C. Hill and D. M. Tilbury, "Modular supervisory control of discrete-event systems with abstraction and incremental hierarchical construction," in *WODES*, 2006.
- [29] B. Gaudin and H. Marchand, "An efficient modular method for the control of concurrent discrete event systems: A language-based approach," *Discrete Event Dyn. Syst.*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 179–209, 2007.
- [30] Y. Willner and M. Heymann, "Supervisory control of concurrent discrete-event systems," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 1143–1169, 1991.
- [31] K. Rohloff and S. Lafortune, "The verification and control of interacting similar discrete-event systems," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 634–667, 2006.
- [32] J. Komenda, T. Masopust, and J. H. van Schuppen, "Coordination control of discrete-event systems revisited," *Discrete Event Dyn. Syst.*, vol. 25, no. 1-2, pp. 65–94, 2015.
- [33] C. G. Cassandras and S. Lafortune, *Introduction to discrete event systems*, 3rd ed. Springer, 2021.
- [34] W. M. Wonham and K. Cai, *Supervisory control of discrete-event systems*. Springer, 2018.
- [35] F. Lin and W. M. Wonham, "On observability of discrete event systems," *Inf. Sci.*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 173–198, 1988.
- [36] A. Arnold, *Finite transition systems*. Prentice–Hall, 1994.
- [37] J. Sakarovitch, "The "last" decision problem for rational trace languages," in *LATIN*, ser. LNCS, vol. 583. Springer, 1992, pp. 460–473.
- [38] A. C. Gómez, G. Guaiana, and J. Pin, "When does partial commutative closure preserve regularity?" in *ICALP*, ser. LNCS, vol. 5126. Springer, 2008, pp. 209–220.
- [39] A. Muscholl and H. Petersen, "A note on the commutative closure of star-free languages," *Inf. Process. Lett.*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 71–74, 1996.
- [40] R. D. Brandt, V. Garg, R. Kumar, F. Lin, S. I. Marcus, and W. M. Wonham, "Formulas for calculating supremal controllable and normal sublanguages," *Syst. Control. Lett.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 111–117, 1990.
- [41] J.-Y. Kao, N. Rampersad, and J. Shallit, "On NFAs where all states are final, initial, or both," *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 410, no. 47-49, pp. 5010–5021, 2009.
- [42] J. Komenda, T. Masopust, and J. H. van Schuppen, "On conditional decomposability," *Syst. Control. Lett.*, vol. 61, no. 12, pp. 1260–1268, 2012.
- [43] P. Pena, J. Cury, and S. Lafortune, "Verification of nonconflict of supervisors using abstractions," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 54, no. 12, pp. 2803–2815, 2009.
- [44] R. Malik and S. Ware, "On the computation of counterexamples in compositional nonblocking verification," *Discrete Event Dyn. Syst.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 301–334, 2020.
- [45] J. Komenda, F. Lin, and J. H. van Schuppen, "A unifying approach to maximal permissiveness in modular control of discrete-event systems," in *CDC*, 2019, pp. 2009–2014.
- [46] J. Komenda and J. H. van Schuppen, "Modular control of discrete-event systems with coalgebra," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 447–460, 2008.
- [47] J. Komenda, T. Masopust, and J. H. van Schuppen, "Synthesis of controllable and normal sublanguages for discrete-event systems using a coordinator," *Syst. Control. Lett.*, vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 492–502, 2011.
- [48] J. Komenda and J. H. van Schuppen, "Control of discrete-event systems with modular or distributed structure," *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 388, no. 3, pp. 199–226, 2007.
- [49] S. Ginsburg and E. H. Spanier, "Finite-turn pushdown automata," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 429–453, 1966.
- [50] J. Berstel, *Transduction and Context-free Languages*. Stuttgart: Teubner Studienbücher, 1979.
- [51] A. L. Rosenberg, "A machine realization of the linear context-free languages," *Information and Control*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 175–188, 1967.
- [52] E. L. Post, "A variant of a recursively unsolvable problem," *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 52, 1946.