

Safe Control and Learning Using Generalized Action Governor

Nan Li, Yutong Li, Ilya Kolmanovsky, Anouck Girard, H. Eric Tseng, Dimitar Filev

Abstract—This paper introduces the Generalized Action Governor, which is a supervisory scheme for augmenting a nominal closed-loop system with the capability of strictly handling constraints. After presenting its theory for general systems and introducing tailored design approaches for linear and discrete systems, we discuss its application to safe online learning, which aims to safely evolve control parameters using real-time data to improve performance for uncertain systems. In particular, we propose two safe learning algorithms based on integration of reinforcement learning/data-driven Koopman operator-based control with the generalized action governor. The developments are illustrated with a numerical example.

I. INTRODUCTION

Safety is a major concern in the development and operation of autonomous systems. For autonomous cars, safety includes not colliding with obstacles and other road users. For autonomous spacecraft, safety includes operational correctness such as not deviating from planned orientation and path so that assigned missions can be performed. In many cases including the above two, safety conditions can be represented as strict constraints on the system state and control variables. Control schemes that can strictly handle constraints include model predictive control (MPC) [1], [2], control Lyapunov/barrier functions [3], [4], reference/action governors [5], [6], and others.

Inspired by the general idea of reference governors (RGs), the action governor is a recently proposed scheme that augments a nominal closed-loop system with the capability of strictly handling constraints [7]–[9]. Unlike the RG scheme which is placed in front of a nominal controller and supervises the reference inputs to the closed-loop system [5], [6], the action governor is placed after the controller and supervises the control actions generated by the controller, adjusting unsafe actions to safe ones. Advantages of placing a supervisory scheme after the controller include the ability to change the nominal controller, such as through online learning, without redesign of the supervisory scheme [10]. The action governor of [7]–[10] is designed based on discrete-time models and schemes that exploit set-based computations, which distinguishes it from control Lyapunov/barrier functions which are most frequently based on continuous-time models and do not use set-based methods [3], [4]. The action governor was first developed for discrete-time linear models in [7] and then extended to piecewise-affine models with additive and parametric uncertainties in [8] and [9].

The first part of this paper aims to generalize the action governor theory. Instead of focusing on system models that take a specific form such as linear or piecewise-affine as

in [7]–[9], we make minimal assumptions on the model and describe the offline design procedure as well as online operation procedure of the action governor in such a general setting. Then, we introduce tailored design procedures and algorithms for linear systems and discrete systems with finite state and action spaces. Note that the procedure and algorithm for linear systems introduced in this paper are different from those in [7] – the ones introduced in this paper are derived based on the generalized action governor theory developed in this paper, which are computationally efficient and scalable but restricted to convex constraints, while those in [7] are not. Moreover, we introduce a novel procedure and algorithm that handle discrete systems.

As many autonomous systems operate in a priori uncertain or changing conditions (e.g., due to environmental factors changing or components aging), online learning capability that evolves control parameters using real-time data to adapt to operating conditions is highly desirable for these systems [11]. The learning must be performed in a safe manner, i.e., constraints must be satisfied during the learning process. However, most conventional learning approaches, including most reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms [12], do not have the ability to strictly respect constraints during learning. As a matter of fact, this has been a major impediment to using these approaches for online learning. To overcome this obstacle, a learning algorithm may be integrated with a constraint handling scheme to realize safe learning. For instance, safe RL using MPC is investigated in [13], [14] and using control Lyapunov/barrier functions in [15]–[17]. Integrating Q -learning and the action governor to realize safe Q -learning has also been proposed in our previous conference paper [10]. These approaches are based on a similar idea of projecting the RL action on a safe set, as described in [18].

Thus, in the second part of this paper, we extend the discussion on safe online learning using the action governor. To make the paper self-contained, we first re-elaborate the integration of Q -learning and the action governor for safe Q -learning, where we provide additional details compared to our previous conference paper [10]. Then, we introduce a new safe learning strategy based on data-driven Koopman control. Koopman operator-based control, where control is determined based on a data-driven Koopman linear model of a nonlinear system, is an emerging area of research [19], [20]. In this paper, we propose to integrate it with the action governor as an alternative safe learning strategy to safe RL. To the best of our knowledge, such a safe learning strategy based on data-driven Koopman control has not been proposed before. Therefore, the contributions of this paper include the following:

- 1) We develop a generalized action governor theory. Unlike previous action governor design approaches that only apply to linear or piecewise-affine models, the theory introduced in this paper is independent of the form of the model and hence applies to significantly more general systems. Moreover,

This research is supported by the Ford Motor Company.

Nan Li is with the Department of Aerospace Engineering, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849, USA (email: nanli@auburn.edu). Ilya Kolmanovsky and Anouck Girard are with the Department of Aerospace Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA. Yutong Li, H. Eric Tseng, and Dimitar Filev are with the Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, MI 48126, USA.

unlike many other constraint handling schemes including control Lyapunov/barrier functions and previous action governor approaches that rely on positive invariance of a safe set to ensure recursive safety [3], [4], [7]–[9], the generalized action governor theory introduced in this paper relaxes the requirement to returnability of a safe set. As returnability is a weaker condition than positive invariance (as will be elaborated in Section II), such a relaxation increases the action governor design flexibility.

2) Based on the generalized action governor theory, we introduce tailored action governor design approaches for linear and discrete systems with bounded uncertainties. For linear systems, we show that the maximum output admissible set, which has been studied extensively in the literature [21] but is previously used mainly in the RG framework [5], [6], can be used to define the safe set for the action governor to handle constraints. This leads to a new, computationally efficient and scalable action governor design approach for linear systems with convex constraints, which is different from the previous approach in [7]. For discrete systems with finite state and action spaces, we introduce an algorithm to compute the safe set, which is also new.

3) We discuss the application of the generalized action governor to safe online learning. Besides the proposed integration of Q -learning and the action governor for safe RL, we also propose a new safe learning strategy based on the integration of data-driven Koopman operator-based control and the action governor. An example is reported which illustrates the effectiveness of this new safe learning strategy in improving control performance using online data for an uncertain system.

The organization of this paper is as follows: In Section II, we introduce the basic models and assumptions for the action governor design. In Section III, we present the generalized action governor, analyze its properties, and introduce tailored approaches for linear and discrete systems. In Section IV, we discuss the application of the generalized action governor to safe online learning. We then use an example to illustrate the previous developments in Section V and conclude the paper in Section VI.

II. MODELS AND ASSUMPTIONS

This paper considers systems the dynamics of which can be represented by the following discrete-time model:

$$x(t+1) = f(x(t), u(t), w(t)) \quad (1)$$

where $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ denotes the discrete time; $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}$ represents the system state at time t , taking values in the state space \mathcal{X} ; $u(t) \in \mathcal{U}$ represents the control action at time t , taking values in the action space \mathcal{U} ; $w(t) \in \mathcal{W}$ represents an uncertainty such as an unmeasured external disturbance, which is assumed to take values in a known bounded set \mathcal{W} ; and $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is the state transition function. At this time, we make no further assumptions on the spaces \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{U} , and \mathcal{W} and on the function f . For instance, \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{U} , and \mathcal{W} can be continuous or discrete spaces, and f can be nonlinear.

This paper deals with safety-critical applications where it is assumed that the system operation must satisfy the following constraints on state and control variables:

$$(x(t), u(t)) \in \mathcal{C}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{C} is a subset of $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}$.

In order to develop the safety supervisor called *Generalized Action Governor* for enforcing (2), we assume there is at hand a nominal control policy, $\pi_0 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$, that is,

$$u_0(t) = \pi_0(x(t), v(t)) \quad (3)$$

where $v(t) \in \mathcal{V}$ represents a reference signal, which typically corresponds to the current control objective (e.g., a setpoint for tracking) and is passed to the policy from a higher-level planner or a human operator. We write the closed-loop system under the nominal policy π_0 as

$$x(t+1) = f_{\pi_0}(x(t), v(t), w(t)) = f(x(t), \pi_0(x(t), v(t)), w(t)) \quad (4)$$

and write its response at t for a given initial condition $x(0) = x$, constant reference $v(\tau) \equiv v$, and disturbance sequence $w(\cdot) = \{w(\tau)\}_{\tau=0}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{W}$ as $\phi_{\pi_0}(t | x, v, w(\cdot))$. This nominal closed-loop system shall have some stability-type response characteristics [to ensure the existence of nonempty safe and returnable set as defined in (5) and (6)]. For instance, for a constant $v(t) \equiv v \in V$, the system state $x(t)$ converges to the steady state corresponding to v , $x_v(v)$, i.e., $x(t) \approx x_v(v)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Note that we do not require the nominal policy π_0 to have the ability to handle the safety requirement (2) for all $v \in V$ and do not assume it is an optimal policy. Therefore, for many systems such a policy is easy to design [e.g., it could be based on PID or linear quadratic regulator (LQR) for linear systems].

We now consider a compact set Π_{π_0} of pairs (x, v) that satisfies the following two properties:

A (Safety). For all $(x, v) \in \Pi_{\pi_0}$,

$$(\phi_{\pi_0}(t | x, v, w(\cdot)), \pi_0(\phi_{\pi_0}(t | x, v, w(\cdot)), v)) \in \mathcal{C} \quad (5)$$

for all $w(\cdot) \subset \mathcal{W}$ and $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

B (Returnability). For all $(x, v) \in \Pi_{\pi_0}$ and $w(\cdot) \subset \mathcal{W}$, there exists $\hat{t} = \hat{t}(x, v, w(\cdot)) > 0$ such that

$$(\phi_{\pi_0}(\hat{t} | x, v, w(\cdot)), v) \in \Pi_{\pi_0} \quad (6)$$

The returnability of Π_{π_0} means that state trajectories of the nominal closed-loop system (4) corresponding to constant v beginning in Π_{π_0} eventually return to Π_{π_0} . If for all $(x, v) \in \Pi_{\pi_0}$ and $w(\cdot) \subset \mathcal{W}$ the time $\hat{t} = \hat{t}(x, v, w(\cdot))$ in (6) is equal to 1, then Π_{π_0} is *Positively Invariant*. Thus, positively invariant sets belong to the larger class of returnable sets. Given a nominal control policy π_0 , a variety of tools exist for computing/estimating a set Π_{π_0} that satisfies the two properties – *safety* and *returnability* (or the stronger property of *positive invariance*). In Section III, we will introduce two examples, one for linear systems and the other for discrete nonlinear systems.

III. GENERALIZED ACTION GOVERNOR

The generalized action governor enforces (2) by adjusting actions according to the following algorithm:

$$u(t) = \begin{cases} \hat{u}(t) & \text{if (8) is feasible} \\ \pi_0(x(t), \hat{v}(t)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{u}(t)$ is determined according to

$$\hat{u}(t) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \operatorname{dist}_{x(t)}(u_1(t), u) \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } (x(t), u) \in \mathcal{C} \quad (8b)$$

$$f(x(t), u, w) \in \operatorname{proj}_x(\Pi_{\pi_0}), \forall w \in \mathcal{W} \quad (8c)$$

and $\hat{v}(t)$ is determined according to: If $x(t) \in \operatorname{proj}_x(\Pi_{\pi_0})$,

$$\hat{v}(t) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \operatorname{dist}_{x(t)}(u_1(t), \pi_0(x(t), v)) \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } (x(t), v) \in \Pi_{\pi_0} \quad (9b)$$

and $\hat{v}(t) = \hat{v}(t-1)$ otherwise.

In (8) and (9), $u_1(t)$ is the action before adjustment. It does not have to be the action from the nominal policy π_0 , but can be from another policy π_1 that is currently being used or an exploration action in order to update π_1 through learning (this will be elaborated in Section IV). The function $\operatorname{dist}_x(\cdot, \cdot)$ measures the distance between $u_1(t)$ and u (or $\pi_0(x(t), v)$) in order to minimize the adjustment. A typical choice is $\operatorname{dist}_x(u_1, u) = \|u_1 - u\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ represents a norm, while the subscript x indicates that such a distance function can be state-dependent in general. The function proj_x projects the set Π_{π_0} onto the state space \mathcal{X} .

The principal idea of the action governor algorithm (7)-(9) is as follows: At each $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, if there exist actions u that satisfy the constraint (2) at the present time [according to (8b)] and ensure the satisfaction of (2) for future times to be possible [according to (8c)], then we let $u(t)$ be the one of such actions that is closest to the action before adjustment [according to (8a)]. If such actions do not exist, then we use π_0 as a backup plan and let $u(t) = \pi_0(x(t), \hat{v}(t))$. In the latter case, if $x(t) \in \operatorname{proj}_x(\Pi_{\pi_0})$ (which is equivalent to (9) being feasible), then we select the reference signal $\hat{v}(t)$ to be the one that minimizes the action adjustment [according to (9a)] while satisfying (9b); and we let $\hat{v}(t) = \hat{v}(t-1)$ otherwise.

The generalized action governor algorithm (7)-(9) has the following properties:

Proposition 1 (All-Time Safety). If (8) is feasible at the initial time $t = 0$, then the system trajectory $(x(t), u(t))$ under the action governor supervision satisfies the constraints in (2) for all time $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Proof. Let $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ be arbitrary. Because (8) is feasible at the initial time 0, there must exist a time $\tau' \in [0, \tau]$ that is the last time where (8) is feasible. According to (7) and (8b), $(x(\tau'), u(\tau')) = (x(\tau'), \hat{u}(\tau')) \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, if $\tau' = \tau$, we are done. If $\tau' < \tau$, according to (7) and (8c), it must hold that $x(\tau' + 1) = f(x(\tau'), u(\tau'), w(\tau')) = f(x(\tau'), \hat{u}(\tau'), w(\tau')) \in \operatorname{proj}_x(\Pi_{\pi_0})$. Then, (9) must be feasible at $\tau' + 1$, and accordingly, there must exist a time $\tau'' \in [\tau' + 1, \tau]$ that is the last time where (9) is feasible. According to (9b), $(x(\tau''), \hat{v}(\tau'')) \in \Pi_{\pi_0}$. Note that according to the definition of τ' above, (8) is infeasible over $[\tau' + 1, \tau]$, and according to the definition of τ'' above, (9) is infeasible over $[\tau'' + 1, \tau]$. Then, according to (7) and (9), $u(t) = \pi_0(x(t), \hat{v}(t))$ and $\hat{v}(t) = \hat{v}(\tau'')$ for all $t \in [\tau'', \tau]$. Consequently, $x(\tau) = \phi_{\pi_0}(\tau - \tau'' | x(\tau''), \hat{v}(\tau''), w(\cdot))$ and $u(\tau) = \pi_0(x(\tau), \hat{v}(\tau''))$. Then, according to $(x(\tau''), \hat{v}(\tau'')) \in \Pi_{\pi_0}$ and the safety property of Π_{π_0} in (5), we have $(x(\tau), u(\tau)) \in \mathcal{C}$. Therefore, we have shown that in both cases, $\tau' = \tau$ and $\tau' < \tau$,

$(x(\tau), u(\tau)) \in \mathcal{C}$. Since $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is arbitrary, we have shown that (2) is satisfied for all time. ■

Proposition 2 (Eventual Feasibility). If (8) or (9) is feasible at some time τ , then there exists a future time $\tau' > \tau$ such that (8) or (9) is feasible at τ' .

Proof. If (8) is feasible at τ , according to (7) and (8c), it must hold that $x(\tau + 1) = f(x(\tau), u(\tau), w(\tau)) = f(x(\tau), \hat{u}(\tau), w(\tau)) \in \operatorname{proj}_x(\Pi_{\pi_0})$. Then, (9) must be feasible at $\tau' = \tau + 1$.

For the case where (8) is infeasible while (9) is feasible at τ , according to (9b), $(x(\tau), \hat{v}(\tau)) \in \Pi_{\pi_0}$. Let us assume neither (8) nor (9) will be feasible for all future times $t > \tau$. In this case, according to (7) and (9), $u(t) = \pi_0(x(t), \hat{v}(t))$ and $\hat{v}(t) = \hat{v}(\tau)$ for all $t \geq \tau$. Consequently, $x(t) = \phi_{\pi_0}(t - \tau | x(\tau), \hat{v}(\tau), w(\cdot))$ and $u(t) = \pi_0(x(t), \hat{v}(\tau))$. However, according to $(x(\tau), \hat{v}(\tau)) \in \Pi_{\pi_0}$ and the returnability property of Π_{π_0} in (6), there must exist $\hat{t} > \tau$ such that $(x(\hat{t}), \hat{v}(\tau)) = (\phi_{\pi_0}(\hat{t} - \tau | x(\tau), \hat{v}(\tau), w(\cdot)), \hat{v}(\tau)) \in \Pi_{\pi_0}$. That is, (9) will be feasible at \hat{t} . This contradicts the assumption of infeasibility of (8) and (9) for all $t > \tau$ made above.

Therefore, we have shown the necessary existence of a future time $\tau' > \tau$ such that (8) or (9) is feasible at τ' . ■

A. Generalized action governor for linear systems

Suppose (1) is linear with an additive uncertainty, i.e.,

$$x(t+1) = f(x(t), u(t), w(t)) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + Ew(t) \quad (10)$$

where A , B , and E are matrices of consistent dimensions, $w(t)$ takes values in a compact polyhedral set $\mathcal{W} = \{w : Gw \leq g\}$, and the constraints in (2) can be expressed as linear inequalities, i.e.,

$$(x(t), u(t)) \in \mathcal{C} \iff y(t) = Cx(t) + Du(t) \quad (11)$$

$$y(t) \in \mathcal{Y} = \{y : Hy \leq h\}$$

In this case, one can consider a linear nominal policy (3),

$$u_0(t) = \pi_0(x(t), v(t)) = Kx(t) + Lv(t) \quad (12)$$

which leads to the following closed-loop system

$$x(t+1) = f_{\pi_0}(x(t), v(t), w(t)) = \tilde{A}x(t) + \tilde{B}v(t) + Ew(t)$$

$$y(t) = \tilde{C}x(t) + \tilde{D}v(t) \quad (13)$$

where $\tilde{A} = A + BK$, $\tilde{B} = BL$, $\tilde{C} = C + DK$, and $\tilde{D} = DL$. The nominal policy (12) can be designed flexibly, but needs to ensure that the closed-loop matrix \tilde{A} is Schur, i.e., with all eigenvalues strictly inside the unit disk of the complex plane. As will be shown below, this nominal policy is useful for offline computing a set Π_{π_0} that has the desired safety and returnability properties; meanwhile, this nominal policy is never directly used for online control. In particular, one can consider a set Π_{π_0} that is defined as follows:

$$\Pi_{\pi_0} = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{\infty} = \left(\bigcap_{t=0}^{t'} \mathcal{O}_t \right) \cap (\mathcal{X} \times \Omega') \quad (14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_t &= \left\{ (x, v) : \tilde{C}\tilde{A}^t x + (\tilde{C}(I - \tilde{A}^t)(I - \tilde{A})^{-1}\tilde{B} + \tilde{D})v \in \mathcal{Y}_t \right\} \\ \mathcal{Y}_t &= \mathcal{Y} \sim \tilde{C} \left(\bigoplus_{k=0}^{t-1} \tilde{A}^k E \mathcal{W} \right) \\ \Omega' &= \left\{ v : (\tilde{C}(I - \tilde{A})^{-1}\tilde{B} + \tilde{D})v \in (1 - \varepsilon)\mathcal{Y}_{t'} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

with $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$. Under mild assumptions, for all t' sufficiently large, the set $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty$ becomes independent of t' , and it is safe and positively invariant (and hence returnable) [21], i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} (x(t), v(t)) \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty &\implies (16) \\ (\phi_{\pi_0}(1|x(t), v(t), w(\cdot)), v(t)) \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty, \forall w(\cdot) \subset \mathcal{W} \end{aligned}$$

Under the positive invariance of $\Pi_{\pi_0} = \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty$, the action governor algorithm (7)-(9) reduces to

$$u(t) \in \underset{u \in \mathcal{U}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \operatorname{dist}_{x(t)}(u_1(t), u) \quad (17a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } Cx(t) + Du \in \mathcal{Y} \quad (17b)$$

$$Ax(t) + Bu \in \operatorname{proj}_x(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty) \sim E\mathcal{W} \quad (17c)$$

This reduction is due to the following result:

Proposition 3 (Recursive Feasibility). Under the positive invariance of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty$ in (16), if (17) is feasible at t , it is necessarily feasible at $t + 1$.

Proof. If (17) is feasible at t , according to (17c), it must hold that $x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + Ew(t) \in \operatorname{proj}_x(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty)$. Thus, there must exist v such that $(x(t+1), v) \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty$. Now consider $u = \pi_0(x(t+1), v) = Kx(t+1) + Lv$. Because $(x(t+1), v) \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty \subset \mathcal{O}_0$, according to the definition of \mathcal{O}_0 in (15), u must satisfy $Cx(t+1) + Du = Cx(t+1) + D(Kx(t+1) + Lv) = (C + DK)x(t+1) + DLv = \tilde{C}x(t+1) + \tilde{D}v \in \mathcal{Y}$. Furthermore, the positive invariance (16) implies that $(\phi_{\pi_0}(1|x(t+1), v, w(\cdot)), v) = (\tilde{A}x(t+1) + \tilde{B}v + Ew, v) \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$. Thus, $\tilde{A}x(t+1) + \tilde{B}v + Ew = Ax(t+1) + B(Kx(t+1) + Lv) + Ew = Ax(t+1) + Bu + Ew \in \operatorname{proj}_x(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$, which is equivalent to $Ax(t+1) + Bu \in \operatorname{proj}_x(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty) \sim E\mathcal{W}$. Therefore, we have shown that $u = Kx(t+1) + Lv$ satisfies both constraints (17b) and (17c) and is a feasible solution at $t + 1$. This proves the necessary feasibility of (17) at $t + 1$. ■

Note that the procedure for constructing $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\infty$ is computationally simple [21] and hence the action governor can be easily designed for linear systems with linear constraints.

B. Generalized action governor for discrete systems

The second special case we consider is where the spaces \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{U} , \mathcal{W} , and \mathcal{V} are all finite, and the transition function f is a mapping between finite spaces. In this case, the system (1) is referred to as a discrete system. This case is of interest due to several reasons: Firstly, when the uncertainty $w(t)$ takes values according to a probability distribution over \mathcal{W} , the system (1) admits a Markov decision process (MDP) representation [22]. The MDP is a fundamental model for sequential decision-making and is widely used in many disciplines including robotics and manufacturing [23]. An MDP model also admits a graph representation, which further broadens the range of its applications. Secondly, via appropriate discretization, a

general nonlinear system can be approximated by a discrete system on finite spaces, and many control synthesis techniques such as dynamic programming are based on such a discrete approximation [24]. Accordingly, the techniques presented in this subsection for discrete systems can be used to treat general nonlinear systems in an approximate manner.

When the system (1) is discrete, Algorithm 1 can be used to compute a set Π_{π_0} that is safe and returnable. The algorithm relies on an initial set of pairs (x, v) , denoted as $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$, which is safe and positively invariant under π_0 , that is, $(x, v) \in \Pi_{\pi_0}^0$ implies

$$(1) \quad (x, \pi_0(x, v)) \in \mathcal{C} \quad (18a)$$

$$(2) \quad (f_{\pi_0}(x, v, w), v) \in \Pi_{\pi_0}^0, \forall w \in \mathcal{W} \quad (18b)$$

While there may exist many sets that satisfy the above properties, one of them may be particularly easy to compute – that is the set of safe steady-state pairs. Recall that the nominal policy π_0 is assumed to stabilize the system in terms of making $x(t) \approx x_v(v)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, where $x_v(v)$ denotes the steady state corresponding to v . In the disturbance-free case, $\mathcal{W} = \{0\}$, $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$ is the set of $(x_v(v), v)$ that satisfies $(x_v(v), \pi_0(x_v(v), v)) \in \mathcal{C}$. When there is disturbance, $\mathcal{W} \neq \{0\}$, states in the vicinity of $x_v(v)$ may need to be checked for safety and be included in order to ensure positive invariance of $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$. Such a set of safe steady-state pairs is easy to compute when the steady-state map $x_v(v)$ is known; otherwise it can be constructed using data from steady-state experiments.

Algorithm 1 Computation of Π_{π_0}

- 1: Initialize the datasets \mathcal{D}_{xv}^+ as $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$, \mathcal{D}_{xv}^- as empty, $\mathcal{D}_{xv}^{\operatorname{remain}}$ as $(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{V}) \setminus \Pi_{\pi_0}^0$, and the counter k as 0;
 - 2: **while** $\mathcal{D}_{xv}^{\operatorname{remain}}$ is nonempty and $k < k_{\max}$ **do**
 - 3: Pick a pair (x, v) in $\mathcal{D}_{xv}^{\operatorname{remain}}$;
 - 4: **if** $(x, \pi_0(x, v)) \in \mathcal{C}$ **then**
 - 5: **if** $(f_{\pi_0}(x, v, w), v) \in \mathcal{D}_{xv}^+$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$ **then**
 - 6: Add (x, v) to \mathcal{D}_{xv}^+ , remove (x, v) from $\mathcal{D}_{xv}^{\operatorname{remain}}$;
 - 7: **elseif** $(f_{\pi_0}(x, v, w), v) \in \mathcal{D}_{xv}^-$ for some $w \in \mathcal{W}$ **then**
 - 8: Add (x, v) to \mathcal{D}_{xv}^- , remove (x, v) from $\mathcal{D}_{xv}^{\operatorname{remain}}$;
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: **else** Add (x, v) to \mathcal{D}_{xv}^- , remove (x, v) from $\mathcal{D}_{xv}^{\operatorname{remain}}$;
 - 11: **end if**
 - 12: Increase k by 1;
 - 13: **end while**
 - 14: Set Π_{π_0} as any set satisfying $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0 \subset \Pi_{\pi_0} \subset \mathcal{D}_{xv}^+$.
-

In Algorithm 1, \mathcal{D}_{xv}^+ represents a set of state-reference pairs that will safely and eventually enter $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$ regardless of disturbance (and stay in $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$ after that by the positive invariance of $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$), \mathcal{D}_{xv}^- represents a set of state-reference pairs that will eventually violate the safety requirement $(x, u) \in \mathcal{C}$ under some disturbance realization, and $\mathcal{D}_{xv}^{\operatorname{remain}}$ is the set of pairs that remain to be verified for safety and returnability. In particular, if a pair (x, v) is safe (checked in Step 4) and will enter \mathcal{D}_{xv}^+ for all possible disturbance values (checked in Step 5), then this pair can be added to \mathcal{D}_{xv}^+ (because once entering \mathcal{D}_{xv}^+ , it is in the course of safely and eventually entering $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$); if a pair (x, v) is not safe or will enter \mathcal{D}_{xv}^- under some disturbance value (checked in Step 7), then this pair can be added to \mathcal{D}_{xv}^-

(because once entering \mathcal{D}_{xv}^- , it is in the course of violating $(x, u) \in \mathcal{C}$ at some future time). If a pair (x, v) is determined as either safe and eventually entering $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$ or unsafe, it is removed from the remaining set $\mathcal{D}_{xv}^{\text{remain}}$.

The algorithm terminates either when $\mathcal{D}_{xv}^{\text{remain}}$ becomes empty (i.e., all state-reference pairs have been determined as either safe and eventually entering $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$ or unsafe) or when the maximum number of iterations k_{max} is reached. The desired set Π_{π_0} is selected as any set that contains $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$ and is contained in \mathcal{D}_{xv}^+ . Note that since any (x, v) in \mathcal{D}_{xv}^+ will safely and eventually enter $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$, any such selection of Π_{π_0} will be safe and returnable. While $\Pi_{\pi_0} = \mathcal{D}_{xv}^+$ is a trivial valid selection, other selections may be preferred in certain cases, for instance, for storage simplicity. We also note that although the initial set $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$ is already safe and returnable (since it is safe and positively invariant), it may be small, for instance, when it is the set of safe steady-state pairs. Algorithm 1 enlarges the set and thereby enables the action governor algorithm (7)-(9) to have a higher flexibility for selecting safe actions.

IV. SAFE ONLINE LEARNING

While the generalized action governor presented in the previous section can be used as a safety supervisor to protect a controlled system/process from potential safety constraint violation in quite general settings, one of its applications is to enable safe online learning (i.e., satisfying prescribed safety requirements during the entire learning process). This application is elaborated in this section.

A diagram that illustrates the proposed safe learning architecture is shown in Fig. 1. A learning algorithm evolves the control policy to improve its performance or make it adapt to changes in system parameters or operating environment. In order to learn, *excitation signals* (or, *exploratory actions*) must be applied, which may cause the system behavior to violate prescribed safety requirements, even if the original control policy was designed to respect these requirements. In this case, an action governor can be used to supervise the learning process – it is placed between the control policy and the system and adjusts the actions that potentially lead to safety violations to safe actions.




Fig. 1: Safe online learning architecture.

Various learning algorithms can be integrated with the action governor according to this architecture to realize safe online learning. For illustration, we introduce two examples that involve different learning algorithms in what follows.

A. Safe Q-learning

Q-learning is a classical RL algorithm [25]. Given a reward function $r : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that measures the immediate

performance of each state-action pair (x, u) , the Q-learning algorithm aims to estimate the optimal Q-value of each pair (x, u) , which is defined as

$$Q^*(x, u) = r(x, u) + \gamma \mathbb{E}\{V^*(x') \mid x, u\} \quad (19)$$

where $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is a discount factor to ensure boundedness of the Q-value, the expectation $\mathbb{E}\{\cdot\}$ is taken over the next state x' conditioned on the current state-action pair (x, u) , and the optimal V-value of each state is defined as

$$V^*(x) = \max_{\pi} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(x(t), u(t)) \mid x(0) = x, u \sim \pi \right\} \quad (20)$$

where the expectation $\mathbb{E}\{\cdot\}$ is taken over all trajectories $\{x(0), u(0), x(1), u(1), \dots\}$ conditioned on the given initial state $x(0) = x$ and control policy π (i.e., the control action $u(t)$ is selected according to π at each time t). After a sufficiently accurate estimate of the optimal Q-value for each state-action pair (x, u) is obtained, an optimal control policy is calculated according to

$$\pi^*(x) \in \operatorname{argmax}_u Q^*(x, u) \quad (21)$$

In other words, the ultimate goal of Q-learning is to obtain a control policy π^* that maximizes the expectation of infinite-horizon discounted cumulative reward $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t r(x(t), u(t))$.

The Q-learning algorithm is extremely simple and serves as the foundation of many more advanced RL algorithms (such as neural-fitted/deep Q-learning [26], double Q-learning [27], etc). In order for the estimated Q-values to converge to the optimal Q-values, the algorithm must be able to explore different actions at each given state [25]. A classical exploration strategy is called ε -greedy [28], where

$$u(t) \in \begin{cases} \operatorname{argmax}_u \tilde{Q}(x(t), u) & \text{with prob.} = 1 - \varepsilon \\ \text{random action in } \mathcal{U} & \text{with prob.} = \varepsilon \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

i.e., the algorithm has a large probability of $1 - \varepsilon$ to take an action that is optimal according to the latest estimates of the Q-values at the current state $x(t)$, and it has a small probability of ε to take an arbitrary action in the action space \mathcal{U} .

During the learning process, violations of prescribed safety conditions may occur, due to, for instance, the application of random exploratory actions. A common strategy is to impose a penalty for such violations so that the control policy gradually learns to satisfy the safety conditions. However, such a strategy learns from safety violations and thus cannot avoid the occurrence of safety violations during learning. In addition, even after a sufficient learning phase and no longer applying any further exploratory actions, safety violations may still occur, due to, for instance, errors in the estimated Q-values or the fact that maximizing the expectation of reward allows small (but non-zero) probability of safety violations and penalties. An integration of Q-learning and an action governor according to Fig. 1 can avoid the application of any unsafe actions while maintaining the ability of Q-learning to evolve the control policy to improve performance. Such an integration is presented in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 updates a Q-function estimate, $\tilde{Q}(x, u)$, in a mini-batch manner, where $T_{\text{max}} > 0$ represents the maximum number of batch updates and $t_{\text{max}} > 0$ represents the batch

Algorithm 2 Safe Q -learning using the action governor

- 1: Initialize Q -function estimate, $\tilde{Q}(x, u)$; create empty buffer, \mathcal{D} ; initialize state, $x(0)$;
 - 2: **for** $T = 0, 1, \dots, T_{\max} - 1$ **do**
 - 3: **for** $t = T_{\max}, \dots, (T + 1)t_{\max} - 1$ **do**
 - 4: Select an action $u_1(t)$ according to (22);
 - 5: Adjust $u_1(t)$ to a safe action $u(t)$ using (7)-(9);
 - 6: Apply $u(t)$ to system and observe next state $x(t+1)$;
 - 7: Evaluate a modified immediate reward according to
$$\tilde{r}(x(t), u_1(t)) = r(x(t), u(t)) - M \text{dist}_{x(t)}(u_1(t), u(t))$$
where $M > 0$ is a large penalty coefficient;
 - 8: Calculate a new estimate of the Q -value of state-action pair $(x(t), u_1(t))$ according to
$$Q(x(t), u_1(t)) = (1 - \alpha)\tilde{Q}(x(t), u_1(t)) + \alpha(\tilde{r}(x(t), u_1(t)) + \gamma \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \tilde{Q}(x(t+1), u))$$
where $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ is a learning rate;
 - 9: Store $Q(x(t), u_1(t))$ in buffer \mathcal{D} ;
 - 10: **end for**
 - 11: Update the Q -function estimate $\tilde{Q}(x, u)$ according to data in buffer \mathcal{D} ;
 - 12: Empty the buffer \mathcal{D} ;
 - 13: **end for**
-

size. The batch size t_{\max} should be chosen according to how the Q -function estimate $\tilde{Q}(x, u)$ is represented. When $\tilde{Q}(x, u)$ is represented using a lookup table, for instance, for discrete systems, t_{\max} can be chosen as 1. For continuous systems or when the state and action spaces are large, a function approximator such as a neural network can be used in place of a lookup table to avoid the need to store a large table and the need to update each cell of the table separately (which often leads to an increase in learning speed). In this case, Step 11 corresponds to the training of the function approximator/neural network to fit the data in buffer \mathcal{D} , and the batch size t_{\max} should be chosen relatively large to improve training stability.

In Step 7, we consider a modified reward function $\tilde{r}(x, u_1)$, which is defined as the original reward $r(x, u)$ minus a penalty for the difference between the original action, u_1 , and the action after action governor adjustment, u . This modified reward function achieves the following two goals: 1) If the original action u_1 is safe and the action governor passes u_1 through (i.e., $u = u_1$), then the modified reward $\tilde{r}(x, u_1)$ is equal to the original reward $r(x, u)$. 2) If the original action u_1 is unsafe and the action governor adjusts u_1 to another action u , then the algorithm is informed by the penalty and will learn to not choose the unsafe action u_1 at the state x . In particular, the original reward is evaluated at the action after adjustment, u , because it is the action that is actually applied and thus the received reward at t , $r(t)$, corresponds to the state and this actually applied action at t , $(x(t), u(t))$. The penalty is proportional to the distance between u_1 and u so that the algorithm is informed not only of the fact that u_1 is unsafe but also of how different it is from the closest safe action u . This will make the Q -function have a continuous transition between safe and unsafe actions (instead of a step change),

which can facilitate function fitting.

Remark 1 (Use Case). In many applications, it is relatively easy to establish a set bound for an uncertainty/disturbance, $w(t) \in \mathcal{W}$, while more difficult to know the statistics (or, probability distribution) of the uncertainty in the set bound, $w(t) \sim \mathcal{P}_w$, which may even be state and control action-dependent, $\mathcal{P}_w = \mathcal{P}_w(x, u)$. On the one hand, to ensure safety, constraints such as (2) shall be enforced robustly (i.e., for all $w(t) \in \mathcal{W}$). On the other hand, optimal control, in terms of achieving highest average/expected performance, clearly depends on the unknown statistics of $w(t)$. In such a scenario, an integrated safe RL algorithm can be very useful, where the action governor ensures robust safety while RL evolves the control policy according to online data (which contain information of the underlying statistics of $w(t)$) to improve its optimality. Algorithm 2 exemplifies such an integration with a fixed control objective represented by the reward function $r(x, u)$. For applications where the current control objective is determined by a reference input $v(t) \in \mathcal{V}$, a reward function parameterized by $v \in \mathcal{V}$, $r_v(x, u) = r(x, u, v)$, can be used. For such a case, the Q -values and optimal control policy should also be parameterized by v , i.e., $Q_v^*(x, u) = Q^*(x, u, v)$ and $\pi_v^*(x) = \pi^*(x, v)$, and Algorithm 2 can be extended to account for parameterized Q -function estimate.

B. Safe data-driven Koopman control

The Koopman operator theory provides a framework for converting a nonlinear control problem into a higher-dimensional linear control problem for which many linear control techniques such as LQR and linear MPC may be used [19]. Specifically, for a given system with dynamics $x(t+1) = f(x(t), u(t))$, the idea is to consider a set of functions, $g = \{g_1, g_2, \dots\}$, with $g_i : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, called *observables*, and identify a pair of matrices (A, B) such that

$$g(x(t+1)) \approx Ag(x(t)) + Bu(t) \quad (23)$$

Then, by treating $z = g(x)$ as the lifted state, one obtains the following linear model

$$z(t+1) = Az(t) + Bu(t) \quad (24)$$

to which linear control techniques can be applied so that the determined $u(t)$ can satisfactorily control the original system $x(t+1) = f(x(t), u(t))$. To be able to accomplish this, the original state x is typically included in the set of observables [19].

While the computational advantages of the above Koopman operator approach are appealing, its practical applications are still facing many major challenges yet to be addressed. One of such challenges relates to guaranteed safety in terms of strictly satisfying prescribed state and control constraints. Even if these constraints are enforced during the determination of control based on the Koopman linear model, undesirable constraint violations may still occur in actual application of the determined control to the original nonlinear system, due to errors between the nonlinear system and its Koopman linear model. Such errors mainly come from two sources: First, although a Koopman operator can fully linearize nonlinear dynamics by lifting the dynamics into an infinite-dimensional space of observables, a finite-dimensional approximation of

the operator is typically used in practical applications, due to computational reasons, resulting in approximation residuals. Second, a common strategy for calculating an approximate Koopman operator is data-driven, where data are sampled system trajectories [19], [20]. Although it is possible to monitor and minimize the model errors on the samples, the errors at unsampled locations are not known. An integration of the Koopman method and an action governor according to Fig. 1 can address this safety challenge.

The action governor algorithm (7)-(9) to adjust control actions can be considered as a function π_a that takes system state $x(t)$ and action before adjustment $u_1(t)$ as inputs and produces an adjusted action $u(t)$ as output, i.e.,

$$u(t) = \pi_a(x(t), u_1(t)) \quad (25)$$

Then, with the action governor in the loop, the system dynamics (1) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} x(t+1) &= f_a(x(t), u_1(t), w(t)) \\ &= f(x(t), \pi_a(x(t), u_1(t)), w(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Note that even if the original system f is linear, the system with action governor, f_a , is typically nonlinear, due to the action governor function π_a that enforces constraints and is typically nonlinear. In this case, one may apply the Koopman method and estimate a linear model for f_a in a higher-dimensional space of observables. As mentioned above, a typical approach to estimating a Koopman linear model is data-driven: Suppose a set of observables g has been chosen and a set of trajectory data $\{x^k(t), u_1^k(t), x^k(t+1)\}_{k=1}^{k_{\max}}$ has been collected. Then, one can estimate an (A, B) pair that best fits the data using a linear relation (24) in the least-squares sense by solving the following minimization problem

$$\min_{A, B} \|Z^+ - AZ - BU_1\|_F \quad (27)$$

where $Z^+ = [g(x^1(t+1)), \dots, g(x^{k_{\max}}(t+1))]$, $Z = [g^1(x(t)), \dots, g(x^{k_{\max}}(t))]$, $U_1 = [u_1^1(t), \dots, u_1^{k_{\max}}(t)]$, and $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm. An analytical solution to (27) is given as

$$[A, B] = Z^+ \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ U_1 \end{bmatrix}^\dagger = Z^+ \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ U_1 \end{bmatrix}^\top \left(\begin{bmatrix} Z \\ U_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ U_1 \end{bmatrix}^\top \right)^{-1} \quad (28)$$

where $(\cdot)^\dagger$ denotes the Moore-Penrose inverse.

The estimation of (A, B) can also be performed in an online recursive manner: Let (A_{t-1}, B_{t-1}) denote the previous estimate. When a new data point $(x(t-1), u_1(t-1), x(t))$ becomes available at time t , the estimate can be updated according to

$$[A_t, B_t] = [A_{t-1}, B_{t-1}] + \varepsilon(t)\gamma(t) \quad (29)$$

where $\varepsilon(t) = g(x(t)) - A_{t-1}g(x(t-1)) - B_{t-1}u_1(t-1)$ represents the prediction error, and $\gamma(t)$ represents a correction vector, updated according to

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{\begin{bmatrix} g(x(t-1)) \\ u_1(t-1) \end{bmatrix}^\top \Gamma(t)}{\begin{bmatrix} g(x(t-1)) \\ u_1(t-1) \end{bmatrix}^\top \Gamma(t) \begin{bmatrix} g(x(t-1)) \\ u_1(t-1) \end{bmatrix} + \lambda} \quad (30)$$

$$\Gamma(t+1) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \Gamma(t) \left(I - \begin{bmatrix} g(x(t-1)) \\ u_1(t-1) \end{bmatrix} \gamma(t) \right) \quad (31)$$

where $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ is a forgetting factor and $\lambda = 1$ corresponds to no forgetting. For the derivation of these updating equations, see [29].

The above recursive estimation procedure enables online learning/updating of the Koopman model using data collected as the system operates so that the model most accurately represents the system dynamics corresponding to the present system parameter values and environmental (e.g., temperature, humidity, wind, etc.) conditions. An integration of online learning Koopman model, model-based determination of control, and an action governor to enforce safety is presented in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 Safe data-driven Koopman control using the action governor

- 1: Select observables, g ; initialize Koopman model, (A_0, B_0) ; initialize state, $x(0)$, and calculate lifted state, $z(0) = g(x(0))$;
 - 2: **for** $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 3: Determine a control action $u_1(t)$ using the linear model $z(t+k+1) = A_t z(t+k) + B_t u_1(t+k)$ [e.g., according to (32)];
 - 4: Adjust $u_1(t)$ to a safe action $u(t)$ using (7)-(9);
 - 5: Apply $u(t)$ to system and observe next state $x(t+1)$;
 - 6: Calculate lifted state $z(t+1) = g(x(t+1))$;
 - 7: Update Koopman model (A_t, B_t) to (A_{t+1}, B_{t+1}) using (29)-(31);
 - 8: **end for**
-

In Step 3, given the linear model $z(t+k+1) = A_t z(t+k) + B_t u_1(t+k)$, where $k = 0, 1, \dots$ corresponds to predicted steps into the future, various strategies can be used to determine the control action $u_1(t)$. Here, we consider a stabilization setting and a strategy based on MPC: At each time step t , a sequence of actions, $\{u_1(k|t)\}_{k=0}^{N-1}$, that solves the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{u_1(\cdot|t)} \quad & \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(z(k|t)^\top Q z(k|t) + u_1(k|t)^\top R u_1(k|t) \right) \\ & + z(N|t)^\top Q_f z(N|t) \quad (32) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & z(k+1|t) = A_t z(k|t) + B_t u_1(k|t) \\ & z(0|t) = g(x(t)) \end{aligned}$$

is calculated, where Q , R , and Q_f are penalty matrices, and N is a selected prediction horizon; then the first action, $u_1(0|t)$, is applied, i.e., $u_1(t) = u_1(0|t)$. This procedure is repeated at every step t in a receding horizon manner. Among other strategies, the MPC strategy (32) is chosen due to the following two reasons: 1) It does not have any constraints except for the dynamic equation and initial condition as equality constraints. Indeed, (32) is a discrete-time finite-horizon LQR problem – it admits a closed-form solution [30] and, thereby, solving for $u_1(0|t)$ is computationally very easy. Note that the system with action governor in the loop, (26), will never violate constraints (2). Therefore, if the learned Koopman linear model accurately reproduces the dynamics of (26), its response will never violate constraints [even though the constraints are not explicitly incorporated in the control determination process (32)]. Although the model may have certain errors, thanks to

the action governor supervision and adjustment of $u_1(t)$ to $u(t)$, the actual system response will never violate constraints. 2) We consider a finite-horizon LQR instead of an infinite-horizon LQR because for an infinite-horizon LQR solution to converge certain controllability condition of the pair (A_t, B_t) is needed [30], which may not always be satisfied during online data-driven update of (A_t, B_t) .

Remark 2 (Use Case). Potential use cases of the safe data-driven Koopman control method introduced in this section are similar to those of safe Q -learning in Remark 1, where a set bound \mathcal{W} for uncertainty/disturbance $w(t)$ is known but the probability distribution of $w(t)$ in \mathcal{W} , $\mathcal{P}_w = \mathcal{P}_w(x, u)$ [which also covers the cases where w is a deterministic function of (x, u)] is a priori unknown. Through online data-driven update of (A_t, B_t) , the statistical characteristics of $w(t)$ are embedded in the learned Koopman model, and therefore control performance can be improved using the learned model. Similar to Algorithm 2, the control determination process (32) can be extended from stabilization to a reference tracking setting. One advantage of this safe data-driven Koopman control method over the safe Q -learning method is that, although both methods guarantee safety, this Koopman control method learns a (linear) model of the system and thereby the determined control is more interpretable. However, in this Koopman control method, the eventual control performance is influenced, even significantly, by the choice of observables [31]. How to select (or, optimize the selection of) observables in Koopman-based control is still an open problem, which, although beyond the scope of this paper, will be investigated in future research.

V. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

We now use the following example to illustrate the generalized action governor framework for safe control and learning: Consider the following discrete-time system,

$$\begin{aligned} x(t+1) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t) + Ew(t) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} x(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} u(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} w(t) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where $x(t) = [x_1(t), x_2(t)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is a two-dimensional vector state, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is a scalar control action input, and $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ depends on the state as follows

$$w(t) = \sin(10x_1(t)) \quad (34)$$

Due to the expression (34) for $w(t)$, this system is nonlinear: The linearization about the origin yields a Jacobian $f_x(0) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 10 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, which is different from the matrix $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ in (33); while for $|x_1| \gg 0$, the term $w(t)$ changes between -1 and 1 rapidly. A practical strategy for control of this system is to treat it as a linear system with a bounded disturbance $w(t) \in \mathcal{W} = [-1, 1]$. Following this strategy, for stabilization, one may design a linear controller as follows

$$u(t) = Kx(t) = [-0.2054, -0.7835]x(t) \quad (35)$$

where $K = [-0.2054, -0.7835]$ is the infinite-horizon LQR gain corresponding to $Q = \text{diag}(1, 1)$ and $R = 10$. However, due to the nonlinearity $w(t)$ that takes values according to (34), such a linear controller can at most drive the state $x(t)$

to a neighborhood of the origin, as shown by the blue curve in Fig. 2. Furthermore, we assume that the system operation must satisfy the following constraints:

$$-20 \leq x_1(t) \leq 20, \quad -4 \leq x_2(t) \leq 10, \quad -6 \leq u(t) \leq 6, \quad \forall t \quad (36)$$

The linear controller (35) does not have the ability to handle these constraints. In what follows we illustrate the generalized action governor framework to handle constraints and improve control performance with safe learning.

A. Action governor design and safe control

The first step of designing a generalized action governor for handling the constraints in (36) is to consider a nominal control policy π_0 for which there exists a nonempty safe and returnable set. We consider the following policy

$$u_0(t) = \pi_0(x(t), v(t)) = Kx(t) + Lv(t) \quad (37)$$

where $K = [-0.2054, -0.7835]$ is the same as that of (35) such that the closed-loop matrix $\hat{A} = A + BK$ is stable, and $L = -K \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = 0.2054$. Then, treating (33) as a linear system with a bounded disturbance $w(t) \in \mathcal{W} = [-1, 1]$ and following the approach in Section III-A, we can compute the MOAS $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_\infty$ and set $\Pi_{\pi_0} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_\infty$. The projection of the computed $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_\infty$ onto the state space, $\text{proj}_x(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_\infty)$, is shown in Fig. 2, where the black curve indicates the boundary. Then, we can design an action governor that uses $\Pi_{\pi_0} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}_\infty$ and the online optimization problem (17) with $\text{dist}_{x(t)}(u_1(t), u) = |u_1(t) - u|$ to adjust control actions to enforce the constraints in (36). The trajectories of system (33) starting with initial condition $x(0) = (14, 6)$ under nominal controller (35) with and without action governor supervision are shown in Fig. 2 by the blue and red curves, respectively. It can be observed that without action governor supervision, the trajectory violates the constraints; while with action governor supervision, the trajectory strictly satisfies the constraints.




Fig. 2: State trajectories under nominal control without action governor (AG), nominal control with AG, and learned Koopman control with AG.

In order to illustrate Algorithm 1 for computing Π_{π_0} for discrete systems, here we also consider a discretized version of the closed-loop system. Specifically, we grid the range $[-25, 25] \times [-10, 15]$ for state x with a resolution of $\Delta x_1 \times \Delta x_2 = 0.5 \times 0.5$, the range $[-25, 25]$ for reference

input v with a resolution of $\Delta v = 0.5$, and the range $[-1, 1]$ for disturbance input w with a resolution of $\Delta w = 0.1$. Note that the above ranges cover the safe operation ranges of x and u defined in (36) and the set bound for w , $\mathcal{W} = [-1, 1]$. The discrete transition function f maps each (x, v, w) on the grids to x^+ on the grid that is closest to $\tilde{A}x + BLv + Ew$ measured by the Euclidean distance. Recall that Algorithm 1 requires an initial set $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$ that satisfies the conditions in (18). For computing a valid $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$, we consider the ellipsoidal set

$$\mathcal{E}(v) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (x - x_v(v))^{\top} P^{-1} (x - x_v(v)) \leq 1\} \quad (38)$$

where $x_v(v) = (I_2 - \tilde{A})^{-1} BLv = \begin{bmatrix} v \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ is the steady state corresponding to constant v and $w \equiv 0$, and P is the solution to the following discrete-time Lyapunov equation

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} \tilde{A} P \tilde{A}^{\top} - P + \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} E E^{\top} = 0 \quad (39)$$

where $\alpha = 0.75$ is a parameter that is chosen strictly between $\rho(\tilde{A})^2$, the square of the spectral radius of \tilde{A} , and 1. According to Theorem 3 of [32], $\mathcal{E}(v)$ is positively invariant under the closed-loop dynamics $x^+ = \tilde{A}x + BLv + Ew$, constant v , and $w \in \mathcal{W} = [-1, 1]$. Therefore, $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$ can be constructed as the collection of all (x, v) on the grids and in $\bigcup_v (\mathcal{E}(v), v)$ where the union is taken over all $v \in \mathcal{V}$ such that any $x \in \mathcal{E}(v)$ satisfies $(x, \pi_0(x, v)) \in \mathcal{C}$. With $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$, we can then run Algorithm 1 to compute Π_{π_0} .

The projections of $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$ and Π_{π_0} onto the state space are shown in Fig. 3 by the blue and red points, respectively, where the boundary of projection of \tilde{O}_{∞} computed using the linear systems approach is also shown by the black dashed curve. The following observations can be made from Fig. 3: 1) The safe set is significantly enlarged from the initial set $\Pi_{\pi_0}^0$ (blue) to the final set Π_{π_0} (red) by Algorithm 1. 2) The final safe set computed using Algorithm 1 based on discrete approximation of the original continuous system almost overlaps with that computed using the linear systems approach. The differences are mainly due to discrete approximation errors (when next state is mapped to the nearest grid point). These two observations verify the effectiveness of Algorithm 1.




Fig. 3: Safe sets computed using linear systems approach versus discrete systems approach.

B. Safe online learning using action governor

Although with the action governor supervision constraints are enforced, the system performance under the controller (35) is not satisfactory – as shown by the blue and red curves in Fig. 2, the state $x(t) = (x_1(t), x_2(t))$ significantly oscillates around the origin, which is due to the nonlinearity $w(t)$. In many practical applications, such nonlinearities as well as other possibly state-dependent disturbances are a priori unknown or hard to model. In such a case a viable option for improving control performance is through safe online learning. As the safe Q -learning algorithm introduced in Section IV-A has been illustrated in multiple occasions including in [9] and [10], here we focus on illustration of the newly proposed safe data-driven Koopman control algorithm presented in Section IV-B.

Inspired by the approach to selecting observables based on higher-order derivatives of nonlinear dynamics proposed in [33], for system (33) with nonlinearity (34), we consider the following set of observables:

$$z(t) = g(x(t)) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1(t) \\ x_2(t) \\ \sin(10x_1(t)) \\ \sin(10x_1(t) + 10x_2(t)) \end{bmatrix} \quad (40)$$

Then, we implement Algorithm 3 with initial model

$$A_0 = \begin{bmatrix} A & 0_{2 \times 2} \\ 0_{2 \times 2} & 0_{2 \times 2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_0 = \begin{bmatrix} B \\ 0_{2 \times 1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (41)$$

so that the initial model is the linear model without accounting for the nonlinearity. For this example, we determine control $u_1(t)$ according to infinite-horizon LQR with $Q' = \text{diag}(1, 1, 0, 0)$ and $R' = 10$. This choice aims to minimize the contribution of difference in cost functions to the difference in control performance – recall that the original control (35) is infinite-horizon LQR with $Q = \text{diag}(1, 1)$ and $R = 10$. We note that infinite-horizon LQR control can be obtained from the finite-horizon LQR formulation (32) if the terminal cost matrix Q_f is chosen as the solution to the discrete-time algebraic Riccati equation. During learning, we reset the state $x(t)$ uniformly at random within $\text{proj}_x(\Pi_{\pi_0})$ every $\Delta t = 20$ discrete-time steps to have trajectories sufficiently covering the safe operation range of x . Similar to the average reward used in RL to monitor policy improvement, we consider the following cost function

$$c(t) = x(t)^{\top} Q x(t) + u(t)^{\top} R u(t) = \|x(t)\|_2^2 + 10|u(t)|^2 \quad (42)$$

which is the single-step cost of the LQR infinite-horizon cumulative cost, and calculate the average cost

$$\bar{c}(t) = \frac{1}{t+1} \sum_{k=0}^t c(k) \quad (43)$$

to monitor control performance during online learning. The average cost during learning is shown in Fig. 4. It can be observed that the average cost decreases and converges as learning proceeds, which indicates improvement of control performance. Note that due to the action governor supervision, no constraint violation has occurred during the entire learning process. Therefore, a plot showing the constraint violation during learning is omitted.




Fig. 4: Average cost during learning.

The trajectories of system (33) starting with initial condition $x(0) = (14, 6)$ under the initial controller (35) and under the controls determined based on the learned Koopman model (both with action governor supervision) are shown in Fig. 2 by the red and green curves, respectively. It can be observed that the learned Koopman control is able to drive and maintain the state $x(t)$ within a significantly smaller neighborhood around the origin compared to the initial controller (35), which illustrates the effectiveness of online learning for improving control performance.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper introduced the safety supervisor called *Generalized Action Governor* for augmenting a nominal closed-loop system with the capability of strictly handling constraints on system state and control variables. After presenting the generalized action governor and analyzing its properties for general systems, we introduced tailored design approaches for linear and discrete systems with bounded uncertainties. Then, we discussed the application of the generalized action governor to safe online learning, where we proposed two different safe learning algorithms based on integration of reinforcement learning and data-driven Koopman control, respectively, with the generalized action governor. The developments were illustrated with a numerical example, which indicated that the generalized action governor provides a viable framework for realizing safe autonomy.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. F. Camacho and C. B. Alba, *Model predictive control*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [2] F. Borrelli, A. Bemporad, and M. Morari, *Predictive control for linear and hybrid systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [3] K. P. Tee, S. S. Ge, and E. H. Tay, “Barrier Lyapunov functions for the control of output-constrained nonlinear systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 918–927, 2009.
- [4] A. D. Ames, X. Xu, J. W. Grizzle, and P. Tabuada, “Control barrier function based quadratic programs for safety critical systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 3861–3876, 2016.
- [5] E. Garone, S. Di Cairano, and I. Kolmanovsky, “Reference and command governors for systems with constraints: A survey on theory and applications,” *Automatica*, vol. 75, pp. 306–328, 2017.
- [6] I. Kolmanovsky and N. Li, “Protecting systems from violating constraints using reference governors,” *SN Computer Science*, vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 1–13, 2022.

- [7] N. Li, K. Han, A. Girard, H. E. Tseng, D. Filev, and I. Kolmanovsky, “Action governor for discrete-time linear systems with non-convex constraints,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 121–126, 2020.
- [8] Y. Li, N. Li, H. E. Tseng, A. Girard, D. Filev, and I. Kolmanovsky, “Robust action governor for discrete-time piecewise affine systems with additive disturbances,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 6, pp. 950–955, 2021.
- [9] —, “Robust action governor for uncertain piecewise affine systems with non-convex constraints and safe reinforcement learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.08240*, 2022.
- [10] —, “Safe reinforcement learning using robust action governor,” in *Learning for Dynamics and Control*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 1093–1104.
- [11] S. Nagesh Rao, H. E. Tseng, D. P. Filev, R. L. Baker, C. Cruise, L. Daehler, S. Mohan, and A. Kusari, “Vehicle adaptive learning,” U.S. Patent 10 733 510, August 4, 2020.
- [12] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto, *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [13] M. Zanon and S. Gros, “Safe reinforcement learning using robust MPC,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 8, pp. 3638–3652, 2020.
- [14] S. Li and O. Bastani, “Robust model predictive shielding for safe reinforcement learning with stochastic dynamics,” in *International Conference on Robotics and Automation*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 7166–7172.
- [15] R. Cheng, G. Orosz, R. M. Murray, and J. W. Burdick, “End-to-end safe reinforcement learning through barrier functions for safety-critical continuous control tasks,” in *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 33, no. 1, 2019, pp. 3387–3395.
- [16] J. Choi, F. Castaneda, C. J. Tomlin, and K. Sreenath, “Reinforcement learning for safety-critical control under model uncertainty, using control Lyapunov functions and control barrier functions,” in *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2020.
- [17] Z. Marvi and B. Kiumarsi, “Safe reinforcement learning: A control barrier function optimization approach,” *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 1923–1940, 2021.
- [18] S. Gros, M. Zanon, and A. Bemporad, “Safe reinforcement learning via projection on a safe set: How to achieve optimality?” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 8076–8081, 2020.
- [19] M. Korda and I. Mezić, “Linear predictors for nonlinear dynamical systems: Koopman operator meets model predictive control,” *Automatica*, vol. 93, pp. 149–160, 2018.
- [20] D. Bruder, X. Fu, R. B. Gillespie, C. D. Remy, and R. Vasudevan, “Data-driven control of soft robots using Koopman operator theory,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 948–961, 2020.
- [21] I. Kolmanovsky and E. G. Gilbert, “Theory and computation of disturbance invariant sets for discrete-time linear systems,” *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 317–367, 1998.
- [22] N. Li, A. Girard, and I. Kolmanovsky, “Stochastic predictive control for partially observable Markov decision processes with time-joint chance constraints and application to autonomous vehicle control,” *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control*, vol. 141, no. 7, 2019.
- [23] S. Thrun, W. Burgard, and D. Fox, *Probabilistic robotics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005.
- [24] M. L. Puterman, *Markov decision processes: Discrete stochastic dynamic programming*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [25] C. J. Watkins and P. Dayan, “Q-learning,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 279–292, 1992.
- [26] M. Riedmiller, “Neural fitted Q iteration—first experiences with a data efficient neural reinforcement learning method,” in *European Conference on Machine Learning*. Springer, 2005, pp. 317–328.
- [27] H. Hasselt, “Double Q-learning,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 23, 2010.
- [28] S. D. Whitehead and D. H. Ballard, “Learning to perceive and act by trial and error,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 45–83, 1991.
- [29] H. M. Calderón, E. Schulz, T. Oehlschlägel, and H. Werner, “Koopman operator-based model predictive control with recursive online update,” in *European Control Conference*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1543–1549.
- [30] F. L. Lewis, D. Vrabie, and V. L. Syrmos, *Optimal control*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- [31] V. Cibulka, T. Haniš, and M. Hromčík, “Data-driven identification of vehicle dynamics using Koopman operator,” in *22nd International Conference on Process Control*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 167–172.
- [32] B. T. Polyak, A. V. Nazin, M. V. Topunov, and S. A. Nazin, “Rejection of bounded disturbances via invariant ellipsoids technique,” in *45th Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2006, pp. 1429–1434.
- [33] G. Mamakoukas, M. L. Castano, X. Tan, and T. D. Murphey, “Derivative-based Koopman operators for real-time control of robotic systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 2173–2192, 2021.