

# Approximate Predictive Control Barrier Functions using Neural Networks: A Computationally Cheap and Permissive Safety Filter

Alexandre Didier<sup>\*,1</sup>, Robin C. Jacobs<sup>\*,1</sup>, Jerome Sieber<sup>1</sup>, Kim P. Wabersich<sup>2</sup>, and Melanie N. Zeilinger<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract**—A predictive control barrier function (PCBF) based safety filter allows for verifying arbitrary control inputs with respect to future constraint satisfaction. The approach relies on the solution of two optimization problems computing the minimal constraint relaxations given the current state, and then computing the minimal deviation from a proposed input such that the relaxed constraints are satisfied. This paper presents an approximation procedure that uses a neural network to approximate the optimal value function of the first optimization problem from samples, such that the computation becomes independent of the prediction horizon. It is shown that this approximation guarantees that states converge to a neighborhood of the implicitly defined safe set of the original problem, where system constraints can be satisfied for all times forward. The convergence result relies on a novel class  $\mathcal{K}$  lower bound on the PCBF decrease and depends on the approximation error of the neural network. Lastly, we demonstrate our approach in simulation for an autonomous driving example and show that the proposed approximation leads to a significant decrease in computation time compared to the original approach.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Recent progress in learning-based control algorithms, as e.g., reinforcement learning [1], has led to control methods that are capable of outperforming classical methods for a wide range of applications, e.g., highly dynamic locomotion of robotic systems (see [2], [3]), however, they often lack rigorous safety guarantees. As a result, there has been a growing interest in combining learning-based methods with modular safety frameworks, which allow safety verification of a proposed input.

One example of such a modular framework is the predictive safety filter [4], which derives constraint satisfaction guarantees from a model predictive control (MPC) based problem formulation. At every time step, the closest possible input to the proposed learning-based input is computed, such that an invariant set can be reached while satisfying constraints. While predictive safety filter methods can be designed to fulfill constraints robustly for bounded uncertainties or with a certain probability in the stochastic case, see, e.g., [4] and [5], respectively, infeasible initial conditions or inaccurate uncertainty descriptions render their theoretical guarantees inapplicable. Even one unexpected disturbance can result in an infeasible optimization problem. To recover from such situations, slack variables can be introduced which allow

for a necessary relaxation of the state constraints, as done e.g., in [6] for a miniature race car example. However, the introduction of slack variables leads to a loss of rigorous safety guarantees. Recent results in [7] enable the use of soft constraints, while guaranteeing that the system will return into the implicitly defined safe set of the original safety filter problem. The idea is to move the computation of the necessary slack variables into a separate optimization problem with increasingly tightened state constraints and a terminal safe set defined by a control barrier function (CBF). These optimal slack variables are then used in a second optimization problem, which realizes the desired safety filter behavior. The safety guarantees follow from showing that the optimal value function of the slack optimization problem is a CBF, see, e.g., [8], whose value decreases at every time step. The drawback of this approach is the need to solve two optimization problems online, where in addition, long planning horizons can potentially be required to reduce conservativeness of the safety filter. The increased computational requirements can render the approach unsuitable for embedded systems with stringent limitations on the computation time.

*Contributions:* This paper proposes a safety filter based on the approximation of the optimal value function of the slack variable computation, denoted predictive control barrier function (PCBF), which was introduced in [7]. The approximation is based on a neural network, whose explicit formulation is used in the safety filter optimization problem, rendering the computation time independent of the planning horizon. By providing a novel, strictly increasing lower bound to the PCBF decrease function, it is shown that convergence to the feasible set of the original predictive safety filter problem is preserved for a sufficiently small approximation error. Furthermore, we discuss the practical design choices of imposing a CBF decrease in the algorithm and demonstrate the proposed methods in simulation for an autonomous driving example.

*Related Work:* An overview of the use of CBFs to ensure system safety is given in [8]. In [9], an MPC method using a discrete time CBF decrease constraint is proposed. The time derivative of a continuous time CBF is learned to episodically decrease model uncertainty of a safety filter method in [10]. A CBF is learned for Lipschitz continuous, continuous time system dynamics from expert demonstration using a support vector machine in [11] and from online sensor data in [12]. Numerous works employ learning-based methods in order to learn a model predictive control policy, such as [13], [14], [15], [16] while guaranteeing stability and robust constraint satisfaction, e.g., through robustness

\* Alexandre Didier and Robin C. Jacobs contributed equally to this paper.

<sup>1</sup> are members of the Institute for Dynamic Systems and Control, ETH Zurich, Zurich 8092, Switzerland.

{adidier, jacobsr, jsieber, mzeilinger}@ethz.ch

<sup>2</sup> is a member of the Corporate Research of Robert Bosch GmbH, Renningen, 71272, Germany. wabersich@kimpeter.de

with respect to input disturbances. However, the policy of the PCBF-based safety filter is generally not continuous and therefore not suitable for a neural network approximation. Learning the optimal value function of an MPC controller to improve controller performance is considered, e.g., in [17] and [18]. In this work, the optimal value function of an MPC-based optimization problem, which fulfills the definition of a CBF, for discrete time, continuous systems is approximated offline and integrated in a safety filter formulation.

## II. PRELIMINARIES

We consider discrete-time dynamical systems described by a continuous function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$x(k+1) = f(x(k), u(k)) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1)$$

where we denote the state at time step  $k$  as  $x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and the input applied to the system as  $u(k) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . The initial state is given by  $x(0) = x_0$ . At each time step  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , system (1) is subject to state constraints of the form  $x(k) \in \mathcal{X} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid c_x(x) \leq 0\}$ , where  $c_x : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$  and input constraints  $u(k) \in \mathcal{U} := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid c_u(u) \leq 0\}$ , where  $c_u : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m_u}$ . Both the state as well as the input constraint sets  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  are assumed to be compact.

The aim is to apply inputs  $u_p(k) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  proposed by a task-specific controller, e.g., a policy learned via reinforcement learning or a human input, to system (1) while ensuring safety of the system. In order to guarantee safety at all time steps, inputs that lead to future constraint violations need to be detected and modified online. A set of states is therefore deemed safe if state and input constraint satisfaction can be guaranteed for all future time steps within this set.

*Definition 1 (Safe Set):* A set  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$  is called a safe set, if for all  $x \in \mathcal{S}$  there exists an input  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $f(x, u) \in \mathcal{S}$ .

Note that safe sets according to Definition 1 are control invariant sets contained in  $\mathcal{X}$  where the corresponding control actions are restricted to  $\mathcal{U}$ .

In this paper, we consider the following predictive safety filter, as proposed in [7], with relaxed state and terminal constraints to account for infeasible initial conditions or unmodelled disturbances:

$$\{u_{i|k}^*\} \in \arg \min_{u_{i|k}} \|u_p(k) - u_{0|k}\| \quad (2a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \forall i = 0, \dots, N-1,$$

$$x_{0|k} = x(k), \quad (2b)$$

$$x_{i+1|k} = f(x_{i|k}, u_{i|k}), \quad (2c)$$

$$u_{i|k} \in \mathcal{U}, \quad (2d)$$

$$x_{i|k} \in \overline{\mathcal{X}}_i(\xi_{i|k}^*), \quad (2e)$$

$$h_f(x_{N|k}) \leq \xi_{N|k}^*, \quad (2f)$$

The  $i$ -step-ahead predicted state and input variables at time  $k$  are denoted as  $x_{i|k}$  and  $u_{i|k}$  and the planning horizon as  $N$ , respectively. The predicted states are subject to relaxed state constraints via slacks  $\xi_{i|k}^*$ , which are additionally subject to a progressive tightening, i.e.,  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_i(\xi) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid$

$c_x(x) \leq -\Delta_i \mathbf{1} + \xi\}$ , where strictly increasing tightenings  $\Delta_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \Delta_i < \Delta_{i+1}$  are used with  $\Delta_0 = 0$  and  $\mathbf{1}$  denotes the vector of ones. The strictly increasing tightenings allow establishing the main result in [7], which is provided in Theorem 1. Note that the input constraints  $\mathcal{U}$  are not relaxed as they typically represent physical limitations of the actuators. The terminal constraint (2f) is given with respect to a CBF  $h_f$ , which fulfills the following definition.

*Definition 2 (Control barrier function):* A function  $h : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a discrete-time control barrier function with safe set  $\mathcal{S} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h(x) \leq 0\} \subset \mathcal{D}$  if the following hold:

- (1)  $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{D}$  are compact and non-empty sets,
- (2)  $h(x)$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{D}$ ,
- (3)  $\exists \Delta h : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , with  $\Delta h$  continuous and  $\Delta h(x) > 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{S}$  such that:

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{S} : \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} h(f(x, u)) - h(x) \leq -\Delta h(x), \quad (3a)$$

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{S} : \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}} h(f(x, u)) \leq 0. \quad (3b)$$

Given a CBF  $h$ , an input  $u$  applied to system (1) at state  $x$  is said to be *safe*, if  $u \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{CBF}}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  with

$$\mathcal{U}_{\text{CBF}}(x) := \begin{cases} U_1(x, u), & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{S}, \\ U_2(x, u), & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{S}, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where  $U_1(x, u) := \{u \in \mathcal{U} \mid h(f(x, u)) - h(x) \leq -\Delta h(x)\}$  and  $U_2(x, u) := \{u \in \mathcal{U} \mid h(f(x, u)) \leq 0\}$ .

The terminal constraint (2f) therefore requires the predicted state  $x_{N|k}$  to lie inside the safe set defined as the sublevel set of the CBF  $h_f$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{S}_f := \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid h_f(x) \leq 0\}$ , albeit relaxed with the terminal slack  $\xi_{N|k}^*$ . The terminal safe set  $\mathcal{S}_f$  is required to lie within the tightened state constraints  $\mathcal{S}_f \subset \overline{\mathcal{X}}_{N-1}(0)$  and the domain of  $h_f$  is defined as  $\mathcal{D}_f := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_f(x) \leq \gamma_f\}$ , where  $\gamma_f > 0$ . Details on how to design such a CBF are provided in [7, Section IV]. We note that formulation (2) reduces to a nominal predictive safety filter if  $\Delta_i = 0$  and  $\xi_{i|k}^* = 0$  and can be modified to ensure robustness properties similar to [4].

Finally, in order to derive the desired safety guarantees, the non-negative slack variables  $\xi_{i|k}^*$  that are used in (2) are not optimization variables, but are computed prior to (2) in a second optimization problem aiming to minimize the slack values using a terminal slack weight  $\alpha_f > 0$ :

$$h_{\text{PB}}(x(k)) := \min_{u_{i|k}, \xi_{i|k}} \alpha_f \xi_{N|k} + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|\xi_{i|k}\| \quad (5a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \forall i = 0, \dots, N-1,$$

$$x_{0|k} = x(k), \quad (5b)$$

$$x_{i+1|k} = f(x_{i|k}, u_{i|k}), \quad (5c)$$

$$u_{i|k} \in \mathcal{U}, \quad (5d)$$

$$x_{i|k} \in \overline{\mathcal{X}}_i(\xi_{i|k}), \quad 0 \leq \xi_{i|k}, \quad (5e)$$

$$h_f(x_{N|k}) \leq \xi_{N|k}, \quad 0 \leq \xi_{N|k}. \quad (5f)$$

The resulting two step procedure of first computing the minimal slacks via (5), followed by the computation of the input which is applied to the system in (2) is detailed in Figure 1. It is shown in [7], that the optimal value function




Fig. 1. Outline of the PCBF-based safety filter framework in [7]. Given the current state, the optimal slack variables and the performance input are computed, e.g., by evaluating a learning-based policy. Subsequently, the obtained values are used in the safety filter problem (2).

of (5), denoted as  $h_{\text{PB}}(x(k))$ , fulfills the conditions of a CBF according to Definition 2 and is therefore referred to as a PCBF. In addition, system (1), under the application of the PCBF-based safety filter (2) converges to a safe set which is a subset of the tightened state constraints, when driven outside of the constraint set.

*Theorem 1 (Theorem III.6 in [7]):* Let  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_0(\xi)$  be compact for all  $0 \leq \xi < \infty$ , and  $h_f$  be a control barrier function on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with a corresponding safe set  $\mathcal{S}_f \subset \bar{\mathcal{X}}_{N-1}(0)$ . The minimum (5) exists and if  $\alpha_f$  is chosen sufficiently large, then the optimal value function  $h_{\text{PB}}(x(k))$  defined in (5a) is a (predictive) control barrier function with domain  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_{\text{PB}}(x) \leq \alpha_f \gamma_f\}$  and safe set  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_{\text{PB}}(x) = 0\}$ .

It follows from Theorem 1 that the inputs obtained from the framework are safe, i.e., the optimal solutions  $u_{0|k}^* \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{CBF}}$ . Additionally, in situations where predicted states are forced to leave the tightened state constraints  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_i$ , e.g., due to large, unexpected disturbances or unsafe initial conditions, asymptotic stability of the slack variables  $\xi_{i|k}^*$  with respect to the origin is ensured. Therefore, all states  $x \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}$  converge to the safe set  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}$ , which is a subset of the implicitly defined feasible set of the hard constrained safety filter problem, i.e., (2) with slack variables and additional tightenings  $\Delta_i$  all set to zero, which we denote as  $\mathcal{X}_{\text{feas}}$ .

### III. APPROXIMATE PCBF

In this section, we introduce the proposed method for approximating the PCBF-based safety filter algorithm. We first reformulate the predictive safety filter (5) in terms of a decrease condition on the predictive barrier function over one time step. The resulting formulation is not directly implementable as an explicit formulation for the PCBF is generally not available. However, it provides the foundation for integrating an approximation  $\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}$ , that is obtained by sampling the PCBF, into the approximate safety filter formulation by means of suitable choices for an implementable approximate decrease function. We further show that any CBF  $h$  on a compact domain  $\mathcal{D}$ , which fulfills the conditions in Definition 2 with a continuous decrease function  $\Delta h(x)$  on  $\mathcal{D}$ , admits a class  $\mathcal{K}^1$  decrease function. Such a class  $\mathcal{K}$

<sup>1</sup>A class  $\mathcal{K}$  function  $\gamma$  is continuous, strictly increasing and  $\gamma(0)=0$ .

decrease enables a simplified convergence analysis compared to the positive, continuous decrease  $\Delta h$ .

#### A. One step predictive safety filter

It is shown in [7] that a continuous CBF decrease function  $\Delta h(x)$  exists for the optimal value function  $h_{\text{PB}}(x)$  of the slack computation (5), allowing to formulate the results in Theorem 1 and implying convergence of the PCBF-based safety filter to  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}$ . In order to make use of an approximation of the PCBF in Section III-C, we first consider the following one step safety filter policy, which is in standard CBF form as considered, e.g., in [8] for the continuous time case:

$$\pi(x, u_p) \in \arg \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \|u_p - u\| \quad (6a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } h_{\text{PB}}(f(x, u)) - h_{\text{PB}}(x) \leq -\Delta h_{\text{PB}}(x). \quad (6b)$$

It follows from [7, Theorem III.4], that this safety filter formulation gives convergence guarantees similar to solving (5) and then (2) as at every time step, for any  $x(k) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}}$ , the safety filter policy  $\pi(x(k), u_p(k)) \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{CBF}}(x(k))$ . Compared to the two step formulation in [7], only a single, scalar constraint needs to be imposed in (6). While constraint (6b) is typically non-convex as  $h_{\text{PB}}$  is generally a nonlinear function, (6b) is independent of the time horizon which significantly reduces the number of optimization variables, i.e.,  $u \in \mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  compared to  $\{u_{i|k}\} \in \mathcal{U}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^{Nm}$ . For example, in the case of single input systems, (6b) defines closed intervals of safe input values  $u$  based on the current state  $x(k)$ . Therefore, especially for problems with large prediction horizon, the proposed method can result in a significant decrease in computational complexity compared to the two-step formulation (5) and (2).

While approach (6) shows several benefits compared to the method in [7], its application requires that both  $h_{\text{PB}}$  and  $\Delta h_{\text{PB}}$  are available in closed form, yet  $h_{\text{PB}}$  is the optimal value function of an optimization problem for which a closed form solution generally is not available. Nonetheless, the exact value of  $h_{\text{PB}}$  can be sampled for any state  $x \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}}$  by solving (5). This motivates the use of learning-based methods to approximate  $h_{\text{PB}}$  and obtain an explicit formulation which can be used in (6). However, as the decrease function  $\Delta h_{\text{PB}}$  is not unique and cannot be easily sampled using the original procedure, a suitable substitute needs to be chosen.

In the following, we show that for any CBF  $h(x)$  which fulfills Definition 2, a class  $\mathcal{K}$  lower bound exists for any continuous decrease function  $\Delta h(x)$  on the compact set  $\mathcal{D}$ , which enables a simplified convergence analysis. The lower bound construction is illustrated in Figure 2.

*Proposition 1:* Consider a CBF function  $h(x)$  according to Definition 2 and a corresponding decrease function  $\Delta h(x)$  which is continuous and strictly positive for all  $x \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{S}$  and  $\Delta h(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{S}$ . Then there exists a class  $\mathcal{K}$  function  $\gamma : [0, \bar{r}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , with  $\bar{r} := \max_{x \in \mathcal{D}} |x|_{\mathcal{S}}$  and  $|x|_{\mathcal{S}} := \inf_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \|x - y\|$ , such that  $\Delta h(x) \geq \gamma(|x|_{\mathcal{S}})$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{D}$ .




Fig. 2. Illustration of the proof of Proposition 1. The continuous function  $\Delta h$  is 0 on the compact set  $\mathcal{S}$  and strictly positive on  $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ . A non-decreasing, potentially non-continuous, lower bound  $p$  is constructed, which is in turn lower bounded by a piecewise linear function connecting the sequence of points  $(R_k, \phi_k)$ .

*Proof:* Define the auxiliary function  $p: [0, \bar{r}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  as

$$p(r) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } r = 0, \\ \min_{\substack{y \\ \text{s.t. } y \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |y|_{\mathcal{S}} < r\}}} \Delta h(y) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Since  $\Delta h$  is a continuous function and  $\mathcal{D} \setminus \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |y|_{\mathcal{S}} < r\}$  is a compact set, the above minimum is attained for all  $r \in (0, \bar{r}]$ . It holds that

$$p(|x|_{\mathcal{S}}) \leq \Delta h(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{D},$$

which follows directly from the above minimization as  $x$  is a feasible point if  $|x|_{\mathcal{S}} > 0$  and the fact that  $\Delta h = 0, \forall x \in \mathcal{S}$ . Additionally, it holds that  $p$  is non-decreasing with increasing  $r$ , since  $\bar{r} > r$  implies  $\mathcal{D} \setminus \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |y|_{\mathcal{S}} < \bar{r}\} \subseteq \mathcal{D} \setminus \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |y|_{\mathcal{S}} < r\}$ , i.e., the domain in the constrained minimization problem (second case in (7)) is non-increasing and  $\Delta h(x) = 0, \forall x \in \mathcal{S}$ . As  $p(r)$  is not necessarily continuous for non-convex sets  $\mathcal{S}$ , we construct a class  $\mathcal{K}$  function  $\gamma: [0, \bar{r}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  which is a lower bound of  $p$  on  $\mathcal{D}$  similarly to the result in [19, Lemma 2.5]. Consider the partitions  $(R_{k+1}, R_k]$  on the interval  $(0, \bar{r}]$  with boundary points  $R_k := \bar{r}2^{-k}$ , for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  and define  $\phi_k := 2^{-k}p(R_{k+1})$ . Note that  $\phi_{k+1} < \phi_k$ , since  $p(r)$  is non-decreasing and  $2^{-k-1} < 2^{-k} \forall k \geq 0$ . In addition, it holds that  $\phi_k \leq p(r), \forall r \in (R_{k+1}, R_k]$  as  $\phi_k = 2^{-k}p(R_{k+1}) \leq p(R_{k+1})$ .

We construct the function

$$\gamma(r) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } r = 0, \\ \phi_{k+1} + \frac{\phi_k - \phi_{k+1}}{R_k - R_{k+1}}(r - R_{k+1}), & r \in (R_{k+1}, R_k], \end{cases}$$

which is piecewise affine on successive intervals  $r \in (R_{k+1}, R_k]$ , continuous, as  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \phi_k = 0$ , strictly increasing and is therefore a class  $\mathcal{K}$  function. Furthermore, it holds that  $\gamma(r) \leq p(r)$ , which implies  $\gamma(|x|_{\mathcal{S}}) \leq \Delta h(x) \forall x \in \mathcal{D}$  as desired. ■

The provided class  $\mathcal{K}$  lower bound on the decrease implies that under the application of  $\pi(x(k), u_p(k))$ , at every time

step and for all  $x(k) \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}}$ , the PCBF decrease is given by  $h_{\text{PB}}(f(x(k), u(k))) - h_{\text{PB}}(x(k)) \leq -\Delta h_{\text{PB}}(x(k)) \leq -\gamma(|x(k)|_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}})$ , which implies convergence to  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}$ . Furthermore, this result enables showing convergence to a neighborhood of the safe set defined by the PCBF  $h_{\text{PB}}$  of the approximate safety filter scheme proposed in Section III-C.

*Remark 1:* Note that the result from Proposition 1 can also be used to simplify the convergence proof in [7, Theorem III.4].

## B. Learning the CBF

An approximation of  $h_{\text{PB}}$ , denoted by  $\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}$ , is obtained by training a regression model on a data-set  $\mathbb{D} = \{(x_i, h_{\text{PB}}(x_i))\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{data}}}$ , where  $n_{\text{data}}$  is the number of sampled points. The sampled state space  $\Omega$  is chosen to cover scenarios which are task specific and deemed physically realistic. One possible choice for the sample space is  $\Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h_{\text{PB}}(x) \leq H\}$  with  $0 < H \leq \alpha_f \gamma_f$ , where a rejection sampler similar to [16] can be used to generate  $\mathbb{D}$ . Note that  $h_{\text{PB}}$  is always decreasing along individual trajectories in  $\Omega \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}}$  under the PCBF-based safety filter algorithm, which implies that the specified  $\Omega$  is an invariant set for inputs  $u \in \mathcal{U}_{\text{CBF}}$ . In this work, we focus on neural networks  $\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) = \text{NN}(x; \theta)$  whose weights are denoted as  $\theta$ . In principle, the proposed algorithm can be used with other regression techniques as long as they allow to be integrated in an optimization-based framework. We assume that  $\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}$  fulfills the following assumption.

*Assumption 1:* The approximation error is uniformly bounded for the trained regressor, i.e., it holds that  $|h_{\text{PB}}(x) - \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x)| \leq \epsilon_h$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}}$ . In other words, it holds that  $\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) = h_{\text{PB}}(x) + e_h(x)$ , where the error  $e_h(x)$  is bounded by  $|e_h(x)| \leq \epsilon_h$ .

Since  $h_{\text{PB}}$  is continuous and defined on a compact set  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  (see, [7, Theorem III.6]), the universal approximation theorem in [20] guarantees the existence of a neural network, which can approximate  $h_{\text{PB}}$  with an arbitrary small approximation error. Note that if the chosen regression results in a continuous function  $\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}$  on  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}}$ , then a bounded approximation error always exists on the compact domain  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}}$ . Furthermore, Assumption 1 can be validated, by extracting a statistical estimate obtained from a certain number of sampled points, as done, e.g., in [13].

## C. Safety filter using PCBF approximation

The learned neural network approximation  $\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) = \text{NN}(x; \hat{\theta})$  can be used in an approximate safety filter scheme by inserting the approximation into (6), resulting in the approximate safety filter control law

$$\hat{\pi}(x, u_p) \in \arg \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \|u_p - u\| \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(f(x, u)) - \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) \leq -\Delta \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x), \quad (8b)$$

where  $\Delta \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}$  is a decrease function for the approximate CBF. The resulting safety filter scheme is illustrated in Figure 3. In order to provide a safety filter formulation which guarantees

feasibility, we consider the maximal approximate decrease, which is given by

$$\Delta \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x(k)) := \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x(k)) - \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(f(x(k), u)). \quad (9)$$

Note that similarly to the methods presented in [7], this choice of decrease function requires the solution to two optimization problems, which are however still independent of the prediction horizon. In Section III-D, we discuss how a decrease function can be designed, which requires only one optimization problem, however at the expense of recursive feasibility guarantees.




Fig. 3. Illustration of the proposed approximation of the PCBF method. The optimization problem (5), which computes the optimal slack variables is only solved offline to sample data points of  $h_{\text{PB}}$ . Based on these samples, a neural network is trained so that an explicit formulation of the approximation  $\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}$  of  $h_{\text{PB}}$ , can be used online in an approximate safety filter scheme.

**Theorem 2:** Let  $\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x)$  be an approximate CBF function which fulfills Assumption 1. Then it holds that the approximate safety filter policy computation (8), where  $\Delta \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x)$  is given by the solution of (9), is feasible for  $x \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}}$  and for a sufficiently small error bound  $\epsilon_h \geq 0$ , there exists  $R \geq 0$  such that the system (1) under the application of  $\hat{\pi}(x, u_p)$  converges to  $\mathcal{C} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |x|_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}} \leq R\}$ . Furthermore, if  $\epsilon_h = 0$ , the closed-loop system converges to  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}$ .

*Proof:* Feasibility of using (9) in (8) follows from  $u^* \in \arg \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) - \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(f(x, u))$  being a feasible solution in (8). Under Assumption 1, we have that for all  $x \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}}$ , the maximum decrease (9) is bounded as follows:  $\max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) - \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(f(x, u)) = \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} h_{\text{PB}}(x) - h_{\text{PB}}(f(x, u)) + e_h(x) - e_h(f(x, u)) \geq \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} h_{\text{PB}}(x) - h_{\text{PB}}(f(x, u)) - 2\epsilon_h \geq \Delta h_{\text{PB}}(x) - 2\epsilon_h$ , where the last inequality follows from the existence of  $\Delta h_{\text{PB}}$  from Definition 2. It holds that  $h_{\text{PB}}(f(x, \hat{\pi}(x, u_p))) - h_{\text{PB}}(x) = \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(f(x, \hat{\pi}(x, u_p))) - \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) + e_h(f(x, \hat{\pi}(x, u_p))) - e_h(x) \leq -\Delta \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) + 2\epsilon_h$ , which, using Proposition 1 and the previous maximum decrease bound, results in

$$h_{\text{PB}}(f(x, \hat{\pi}(x, u_p))) - h_{\text{PB}}(x) \leq -\gamma(|x|_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}}) + 4\epsilon_h,$$

which implies convergence to  $\mathcal{C}$  for small enough  $\epsilon_h$ . Furthermore, it follows directly that for  $\epsilon_h = 0$ , the closed-loop system converges to  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}$ . ■

While the approximate decrease in (9) benefits from strong theoretical guarantees, it limits the available input space for finding a safe input lying as close as possible to  $u_p(k)$  substantially, which potentially renders (8) conservative. This conservativeness is especially problematic in the presence of approximation errors, where  $\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) \neq 0$  for some  $x \in$

$\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}$ , resulting in unnecessary safety filter interventions. To counteract this effect, the decrease constraint (8b) can be relaxed by subtracting a small, fixed tolerance parameter  $\delta_{\text{tol}} > 0$ , i.e.,  $\Delta \bar{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) := \Delta \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) - \delta_{\text{tol}}$ , resulting in the following CBF decrease at every time step:

$$h_{\text{PB}}(f(x, \hat{\pi}(x, u_p))) - h_{\text{PB}}(x) \leq -\gamma(|x|_{\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}}) + 4\epsilon_h + \delta_{\text{tol}}.$$

Such a relaxation preserves recursive feasibility and convergence to a neighborhood of  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}$ , i.e., to a set  $\bar{\mathcal{C}} \supset \mathcal{C}$ , however for  $\epsilon_h = 0$ , the system is no longer guaranteed to converge to  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}$ .

**Remark 2:** The choice of the tightening terms  $\Delta_i$  in the constraints  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_i(\xi)$  directly affect the size of  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}$ , since  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}} \subset \mathcal{X}_{\text{feas}}$ . Consequently, choosing  $\Delta_i$  large enough and for small approximation errors, it holds that  $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}_{\text{feas}}$ . Additionally, instead of its use as an approximate CBF decrease, the optimization problem (9) can also be employed directly as a recovery strategy for system (1) whenever the unrelaxed and untightened problem (2) becomes infeasible.

#### D. Designing a decrease function

While the maximum approximate decrease described in (9) guarantees the safety filter optimization in (8) to be recursively feasible and enables convergence to a neighborhood of  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}$ , it requires the solution of two optimization problems at every time step. An alternative approach consists of designing a decrease function  $\Delta \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}$  in (8) as done, e.g., in [9], such that only one optimization is required. Such a design can lead to a fast safety filter which works well in practice but does not guarantee that the employed safety filter is recursively feasible. Verifying whether the decrease condition holds for all states in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}}$  is challenging in general.

One option to design an approximate decrease function is in the form of a class  $\mathcal{K}$  function  $\alpha(\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x))$ , such as, e.g., the linear function  $\alpha(\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x)) = c_\alpha \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x)$  with  $c_\alpha \in (0, 1]$ , for which an exponential decrease to a neighborhood of  $\mathcal{S}_{\text{PB}}$  is achieved if the safety filter optimization problem is feasible. Such a design choice requires only one design parameter but can lead the system back to the feasible set of the unrelaxed and untightened safety filter  $\mathcal{X}_{\text{feas}}$  as demonstrated in Section IV.

**Remark 3:** In order to ensure feasibility of the safety filter problem in (8) despite using a simple, e.g., class  $\mathcal{K}$ , decrease function, a scalar slack variable  $\eta \geq 0$  can be introduced in (8b), i.e.,  $\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(f(x, u)) - \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) \leq -\Delta \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) + \eta$ . By introducing an exact penalty term in the cost of (8), it can be ensured, if additional assumptions are satisfied, that  $\eta > 0$  only when the original problem is infeasible, see, e.g., [21] for more details.

## IV. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

In this section, we demonstrate the proposed method for a simple autonomous driving application<sup>2</sup>, where we highlight its performance and compare the solve time of

<sup>2</sup>The code will be made available under <https://gitlab.ethz.ch/ics>.

our approach to the original PCBF-based algorithm. The numerical example is implemented using CasADi [22] and the optimization problems are solved with IPOPT [23]. The example is run on a machine equipped with an AMD Ryzen 7 5800X CPU with 8 cores.

*System:* We consider the same kinematic car model used in [7], with the dynamics given by

$$\dot{y}_{\text{off}} = (v + v_s) \sin(\Psi) \quad (10a)$$

$$\dot{\Psi} = \frac{v + v_s}{L} \tan(\delta) \quad (10b)$$

$$\dot{\delta} = u_1 \quad (10c)$$

$$\dot{v} = u_2, \quad (10d)$$

where  $y_{\text{off}}$  and  $\Psi$  are the lateral position of the vehicle and the relative angle with respect to the center line, respectively,  $\delta$  is the steering angle, and  $v$  the velocity of the vehicle defined relative to a target velocity  $v_s = 5$  [m/s]. The wheelbase is set to  $L = 5$  [m]. The system can be controlled using the steering input  $u_1$  and the acceleration  $u_2$ . The state constraints on the system are given by  $|y_{\text{off}}| \leq 2$ ,  $|\Psi| \leq \pi/4$ ,  $|\delta| \leq \pi/9$ , and  $-5 \leq v \leq 4$ . The input constraints are set to  $|u_1| \leq 1.4$ ,  $-5 \leq u_2 \leq 2$  and system (10) is discretized using Euler forward with sampling time  $T_s = 0.05$ .

In the following, we demonstrate the capability of the proposed approximate safety filter to recover from large constraint violations in  $y_{\text{off}}$ . We use the linear performance controller  $u_p(k) = K_p x(k)$ , where  $K_p \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 4}$  is a matrix with all entries set to 10, i.e., the input is destabilizing and therefore not safe to apply. We use the design parameters  $\mu_x = \mu_u = 0.1$ ,  $\Delta_i = i \cdot 0.004$ ,  $\alpha_f = 1000$ , prediction horizon  $N = 50$ , and terminal control barrier function  $h_f(x) = x^T P x$ , where<sup>3</sup>

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 1.05 & 5.47 & 2.80 & 0 \\ 5.47 & 31.63 & 16.74 & 0 \\ 2.80 & 16.74 & 9.37 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.21 \end{bmatrix}.$$

*Learning:* We sample from the state space using the approach outlined in Section III-B, where we set  $H = 100$  in conjunction with the rejection sampling scheme presented in [16]. In total, we generate 8.9 million data points using the rejection sampler and sample additional 2 million data points from a region corresponding to a scaled (by factor of 1.2) version of the state constraints to increase the diversity of the data set. The neural network is trained using a Huber loss to account for the fact that  $h_{\text{PB}}$  can attain values over a wide range of magnitudes and we are generally more interested in a precise approximation close to the safe set, i.e., regions with small  $h_{\text{PB}}$  values. We use a neural network with three hidden layers, each containing 64 neurons. In order to analyze how the number of parameters in the neural network

<sup>3</sup>We used the approach described in [7, Section IV] to calculate  $P$ . This results in the domain  $\mathcal{D}_f = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : h_{\text{PB}} \leq \gamma_f\}$  with  $\gamma_f = 0.01$ . Note that  $P$  differs from the one stated in [7] due to the use of the trace instead of log det to compute the terminal CBF.




Fig. 4. State trajectories for the closed loop simulation of system (10) for multiple initial conditions using the PCBF-based safety filter in [7]. The shaded background represents the state constraints  $\mathcal{X}$  on the system.




Fig. 5. State trajectories for the closed loop simulation of system (10) for multiple initial conditions using the class  $\mathcal{K}$  function  $\Delta \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) = 0.5 \cdot \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x)$  as local approximation. The CBF is approximated with a neural network with 3 hidden layers and 64 neurons per layer.

affects the solve time of our method, we additionally train a shallower network with two hidden layers. The *softplus* activation function is used as the activation layer, which forces  $\hat{h}_{\text{PB}}$  to be positive.

*Simulation Results:* We test our approach for the  $\Delta h_{\text{PB}}$  approximation using the class  $\mathcal{K}$  function  $\Delta \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) = 0.5 \cdot \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x)$  as discussed in Section III-D, where the tolerance parameter is set to  $\delta_{\text{tol}} = 10^{-6}$ . The simulation for multiple initial conditions is shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5 for the original PCBF-based approach in [7] and the approximate safety filter using the class  $\mathcal{K}$  decrease approximation, respectively. Both approaches are able to steer the closed-loop system starting at  $y_{\text{off}}(0) \notin \mathcal{X}$  back into a region around the state constraints. Figure 6 shows how the approximation error of a learned NN affects the state evolution of the closed-loop system. As shown in both plots, NNs with an on average smaller approximation error  $e_h$ , which we estimate using the  $\ell_1$ -loss over the training data set, result in state trajectories converging to a region closer to the state constraints  $\mathcal{X}$ .

For the solve time measurements, we sample  $10^4$  states inside  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}}$  and state the results in Table I. We observe a 34-fold decrease in minimum solve time compared to the original PCBF-based algorithm and a 58-fold decrease




Fig. 6. Comparison of the closed loop performance of the proposed safety filter when using the approximate decrease  $\Delta \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x) = 0.5 \cdot \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x)$  for NNs at different points in the training progress. The left plot shows the closed-loop trajectory of  $y_{\text{off}}$  for a single initial condition. The shaded background represents the imposed constraints on  $y_{\text{off}}$ . The right plot shows the distance of states with respect to the constraints  $\mathcal{X}$  at time step  $k = 2000$  for 1000 different initial states sampled from  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{PB}}$ . The individual NNs are specified by their  $\ell_1$ -loss over the training data set, denoted as  $e_{\ell_1}$ . The error bars represent the standard deviations, and the mean distance is marked in black.

in average solve time. In general, larger neural network architectures lead to a larger solve time. When we double the number of parameters (factor of 1.9, from 2 hidden layers to 3 hidden layers with 64 neurons), the minimum solve time increases by 17% for the approximate safety filter using the class  $\mathcal{K}$  function decrease. As expected, the approximate safety filter using the maximum decrease takes on average 45% longer to solve than the method with the class  $\mathcal{K}$  function decrease.

TABLE I  
SOLVE TIME MEASUREMENTS

Nonlinear System	Solve Time [ms]		
$\Delta \hat{h}_{\text{PB}}(x)$ (NN Architecture)	Minimum	Average	Std. Dev.
Maximum Decrease ( $2 \times 64$ )	2.551	4.571	1.234
Maximum Decrease ( $3 \times 64$ )	2.920	5.257	1.458
Class $\mathcal{K}$ function ( $2 \times 64$ )	<b>2.129</b>	<b>3.040</b>	<b>0.465</b>
Class $\mathcal{K}$ function ( $3 \times 64$ )	2.491	3.495	0.580
PCBF safety filter [7]	72.51	176.5	197.3
Max. decrease in solve time	$-34\times$	$-58\times$	$-424\times$

## V. CONCLUSION

This work presented an approximate predictive control barrier function (PCBF) scheme. The proposed approach relies on a neural network approximation of the predictive CBF presented in [7], reducing the problem to one optimization problem. We present convergence guarantees to a neighbourhood of the safe set defined by the exact PCBF method, which depends on the approximation error and relies on a novel class  $\mathcal{K}$  lower bound result on compact sets. Different design methods for the decrease bound of the approximate CBF are discussed. We show in an example how the proposed method can be applied to recover an autonomous car outside the state constraints in simulation and how the approximate method leads to a significant decrease in computation times.

## REFERENCES

[1] D. Bertsekas, *Reinforcement learning and optimal control*. Athena Scientific, 2019.

[2] J. Hwangbo, J. Lee, A. Dosovitskiy, D. Bellicoso, V. Tsounis, V. Koltun, and M. Hutter, "Learning agile and dynamic motor skills for legged robots," *Science Robotics*, vol. 4, no. 26, p. eaau5872, 2019.

[3] T. Haarnoja, A. Zhou, S. Ha, J. Tan, G. Tucker, and S. Levine, "Learning to Walk via Deep Reinforcement Learning," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1812.11103, 2018.

[4] K. P. Wabersich and M. N. Zeilinger, "Linear Model Predictive Safety Certification for Learning-Based Control," in *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2018, pp. 7130–7135.

[5] K. P. Wabersich, L. Hewing, A. Carron, and M. N. Zeilinger, "Probabilistic model predictive safety certification for learning-based control," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 176–188, 2021.

[6] B. Tearle, K. P. Wabersich, A. Carron, and M. N. Zeilinger, "A Predictive Safety Filter for Learning-Based Racing Control," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 7635–7642, 2021.

[7] K. P. Wabersich and M. N. Zeilinger, "Predictive control barrier functions: Enhanced safety mechanisms for learning-based control," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pp. 1–1, 2022.

[8] A. D. Ames, S. Coogan, M. Egerstedt, G. Notomista, K. Sreenath, and P. Tabuada, "Control Barrier Functions: Theory and Applications," in *2019 18th European Control Conference (ECC)*, 2019, pp. 3420–3431.

[9] J. Zeng, B. Zhang, and K. Sreenath, "Safety-critical model predictive control with discrete-time control barrier function," in *2021 American Nuclear Society Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 3882–3889.

[10] A. Taylor, A. Singletary, Y. Yue, and A. Ames, "Learning for Safety-Critical Control with Control Barrier Functions," in *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Learning for Dynamics and Control*, vol. 120. PMLR, 10–11 Jun 2020, pp. 708–717.

[11] A. Robey, H. Hu, L. Lindemann, H. Zhang, D. V. Dimarogonas, S. Tu, and N. Matni, "Learning control barrier functions from expert demonstrations," in *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2020, pp. 3717–3724.

[12] M. Srinivasan, A. Dabholkar, S. Coogan, and P. A. Vela, "Synthesis of control barrier functions using a supervised machine learning approach," in *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 7139–7145.

[13] M. Hertneck, J. Köhler, S. Trimpe, and F. Allgöwer, "Learning an Approximate Model Predictive Controller With Guarantees," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 543–548, 2018.

[14] J. A. Paulson and A. Mesbah, "Approximate closed-loop robust model predictive control with guaranteed stability and constraint satisfaction," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 719–724, 2020.

[15] J. Nubert, J. Köhler, V. Berenz, F. Allgöwer, and S. Trimpe, "Safe and Fast Tracking on a Robot Manipulator: Robust MPC and Neural Network Control," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 3050–3057, 2020.

[16] S. W. Chen, T. Wang, N. Atanasov, V. Kumar, and M. Morari, "Large scale model predictive control with neural networks and primal active sets," *Automatica*, vol. 135, p. 109947, 2022.

[17] A. Tamar, G. Thomas, T. Zhang, S. Levine, and P. Abbeel, "Learning from the hindsight plan — Episodic MPC improvement," in *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 336–343.

[18] N. Karnchanachari, M. I. Valls, D. Hoeller, and M. Hutter, "Practical Reinforcement Learning For MPC: Learning from sparse objectives in under an hour on a real robot," in *Learning for Dynamics and Control*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 211–224.

[19] F. Clarke, Y. Ledyev, and R. Stern, "Asymptotic Stability and Smooth Lyapunov Functions," *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 149, no. 1, pp. 69–114, 1998.

[20] K. Hornik, M. Stinchcombe, and H. White, "Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators," *Neural Networks*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 359–366, 1989.

[21] S.-P. Han and O. L. Mangasarian, "Exact penalty functions in nonlinear programming," *Mathematical programming*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 251–269, 1979.

[22] J. A. E. Andersson, J. Gillis, G. Horn, J. B. Rawlings, and M. Diehl, "CasADi — A software framework for nonlinear optimization and optimal control," *Mathematical Programming Computation*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–36, 2019.

[23] L. Biegler and V. Zavala, "Large-scale nonlinear programming using IPOPT: An integrating framework for enterprise-wide dynamic optimization," *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 575–582, 2009.