

Optimal Distributed Control for Networked Control Systems with Delays

Zhuwei Wang, and Xiaodong Wang, *Fellow, IEEE*,

Abstract

In networked control systems (NCS), sensing and control signals between the plant and controllers are typically transmitted wirelessly. Thus, the time delay plays an important role for the stability of NCS, especially with distributed controllers. In this paper, the optimal control strategy is derived for distributed control networks with time delays. In particular, we form the optimal control problem as a non-cooperative linear quadratic game (LQG). Then, the optimal control strategy of each controller is obtained that is based on the current state and the last control strategies. The proposed optimal distributed controller reduces to some known controllers under certain conditions. Moreover, we illustrate the application of the proposed distributed controller to load frequency control in power grid systems.

Index Terms

Networked control systems, distributed control, non-cooperative game, delay.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, networked control systems (NCS), which consist of computing and physical systems, have received considerable attention [1] due to their wide applications in various areas such as power grids [2], robotic networks [3] and embedded systems [4]. A typical NCS is equipped with sensing, control and communication capabilities. In many cases, the plant and controllers are at different locations. Hence, a communication network, typically a wireless network, is needed to facilitate the data exchange between the plant and controllers. Then the time delay becomes the key factor that affects the system performance and stability.

Z. Wang and X. Wang are with the Electrical Engineering Department, Columbia University, New York, 10027 (e-mail: wz902@gmail.com, wangx@ee.columbia.edu).

Existing works on NCS with time delay focus on the single-controller case; and two important design considerations are the system stability and the optimality with respect to certain criterion. With full plant state information, the optimal control problem has been investigated. In particular, a suboptimal controller is derived in [5] with time-driven sensor and controller nodes, where the time delay is a multiple of the sampling interval. The optimal controller for an NCS whose network-induced delay is shorter than a sampling period is developed in [6][7]. And the results are generalized in [8] to the case that network-induced delay is longer than a sampling period. In [9], the solution to the optimal control problem for a linear system with multiple control input delays is given. On the other hand, when considering the packet loss, partial state information, link/node failure, etc., only system stability can be investigated [10]-[14], since the optimality problem is extremely difficult.

With the advances of NCS, the concept of distributed controllers in large scale systems becomes an important research topic [15]-[17]. A cross-layer framework for the joint design of wireless networks and distributed controllers is proposed in [15], where the centralized control and clock-driven controllers are considered and the total time delay is assumed to be one sample period. The stability of a distributed control strategy is studied in [16], where the network itself acts as a controller, and each node (including the actuator nodes) performs linear combinations of internal state variables of neighboring nodes. The stability of a multicast routing algorithm for a decentralized control system is investigated in [17] assuming no time delay or extremely small delay. Note that the above works all address stability issues of distributed control, but the optimality problem remains unexplored.

This paper addresses the optimal control problem for a linear distributed control system with time delays. The form of the performance criterion plays an important role in obtaining the optimal solution: previous studies have mostly focused on the quadratic cost function [5]-[9], which is also used in this work. In this paper, the optimal solution is obtained as a feedback non-cooperative control law, which is linear with the current state and the previous control strategies of the distributed controllers. An application of the proposed optimal distributed controller to load frequency control in power grid is also described.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The system model and problem formulation are given in Section II. We then derive the optimal control strategy with two distributed controllers in Section III. Section IV presents the extension to the case of multiple distributed

controllers. Numerical results and conclusions are given in Section IV and Section V, respectively.

II. SYSTEM MODEL AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this section, we first describe the distributed control system under consideration, and then formulate the optimal control problem as a non-cooperative linear quadratic game (LQG).

A. Distributed Control System




Fig. 1. The structure of a networked distributed control system.

We consider a networked control system with distributed sensors and controllers as shown in Fig. 1. We assume that the plant is a continuous-time linear time-invariant (LTI) system while all sensors and controllers operate in discrete-time. Sensor measurements and feedback control signals are sent separately through a shared wireless network. The system under consideration has a time-driven sensor system sampled at a constant sampling rate and event-driven controllers and actuator nodes. We assume that there are M sensor nodes and p distributed controller nodes. Then, free of perturbations, the continuous-time state and measurement equations are given

respectively by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = A^c x(t) + \sum_{i=1}^p B_i^c u_i(t - \tau_i), \\ y(t) = Cx(t), \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where x is an M -dimensional plant state vector, u_i is an N -dimensional i -th control input vector and τ_i is the time delay, A^c and B_i^c are $M \times M$ and $M \times N$ matrices, respectively. For simplicity, we assume that each sensor observes one dimension of x directly so that y is an M -dimensional vector and C is an identity matrix.

B. Problem Formulation




Fig. 2. Timing of signals in the control system.

We assume that there is a wireless communication network from sensors to controllers, and sampling in the sensor nodes are done synchronously with the period h . Upon sampling the measurements are immediately sent to the controller nodes. Thus, the M measurement signals will have individual delays $\tau_{i,j}^{sc}$, $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$, to the i -th controller node. When all measurements have arrived at the controller, a new control signal is calculated and sent to the actuator

nodes. The time delay from sensors to the i -th controller node is $\tau_i^{sc} = \max \{ \tau_{i,1}^{sc}, \tau_{i,2}^{sc}, \dots, \tau_{i,M}^{sc} \}$, and the control signals will have delays τ_i^{ca} , $i = \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$, to the actuator nodes. We assume that all delays in the system are deterministic and known, and as in [6][7] the total time delay $\tau_i^{sc} + \tau_i^{ca}$ is assumed to be smaller than one sampling period. The received control signals are then converted to continuous-time signals and directly act on the plant. The signal timings in the control system are illustrated in Fig. 2.

We assume that all nodes have synchronized clocks. This is needed both for synchronized sampling and time-stamping of signals. By the use of time-stamping we assume that all delays are known to the controller node. Then, discretizing the process in (1) gives

$$x(k+1) = \Phi x(k) + \sum_{i=1}^p [\Gamma_{i,0} u_i(k) + \Gamma_{i,1} u_i(k-1)], \quad (2)$$

where $x(k)$ and $u_i(k)$ represent the state and the control signals at the k -th sampling instant, respectively, and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &= e^{A^c h}, \\ \Gamma_{i,0} &= \int_0^{h-\tau_i^{sc}-\tau_i^{ca}} e^{A^c s} ds B_i^c, \\ \Gamma_{i,1} &= \int_{h-\tau_i^{sc}-\tau_i^{ca}}^h e^{A^c s} ds B_i^c. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Using a quadratic cost function, the design problem is to find a control strategy to drive the plant from its initial state x_0 to minimize the total cost, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\substack{u_i(k), k=0, 1, \dots, N-1 \\ i=1, 2, \dots, p}} J_N &= x^T(N) Q_N x(N) + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left\{ x^T(k) Q x(k) + \sum_{i=1}^p u_i^T(k) R_i u_i(k) \right\}, \\ \text{s.t. } x(k+1) &= \Phi x(k) + \sum_{i=1}^p [\Gamma_{i,0} u_i(k) + \Gamma_{i,1} u_i(k-1)], \\ x(0) &= x_0, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where N is the total number of sampling instants, $Q_N \succeq 0$, $Q \succ 0$, and $R_i \succ 0$ are symmetric positive semi-definite/definite weight matrices.

Since the controllers are distributed and they cannot obtain the current control strategies of each other, we reformulate the optimization problem in (4) as a non-cooperative control game

as [18]

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min_{u_i(k), k=0, 1, \dots, N-1} J_{i,N} = x^T(N) Q_{i,N} x(N) + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \{x^T(k) Q_i x(k) + u_i^T(k) R_i u_i(k)\}, \quad \forall i, \\
& \text{s.t. } x(k+1) = \Phi x(k) + \sum_{j=1}^p [\Gamma_{j,0} u_j(k) + \Gamma_{j,1} u_j(k-1)], \\
& x(0) = x_0,
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $Q_{i,N} \succeq 0$ and $Q_i \succ 0$ are symmetric weight matrices.

In what follows, we first focus on a two-controller distributed system, i.e., $p = 2$, and then extend the results to the case with multiple distributed controllers.

III. OPTIMAL SOLUTION FOR TWO-CONTROLLER CASE

In this section, we first derive the optimal linear control strategy for the non-cooperative game in (5) with two distributed controllers, and then consider two special cases, where the obtained optimal controller becomes some existing controllers in the literature.

A. Derivation of Optimal Controllers

Since the two controllers are distributed, at any time, the current control signal of one controller is not known to the other. We assume that each controller can obtain the other controller's past control signals. Then, the linear control law can be written as

$$u_i(k) = A_i(k)x(k) + \sum_{j=1}^k [B_{1,j}^i(k)u_1(k-j) + B_{2,j}^i(k)u_2(k-j)], \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{6}$$

where $A_i(k)$, $B_{1,j}^i(k)$, $B_{2,j}^i(k)$ are $N \times M$, $N \times N$, $N \times N$ coefficient matrices, respectively.

Taking controller 1 as the desired controller, substituting $u_2(k)$ in (6) into (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
x(k+1) &= [\Phi + \Gamma_{2,0}A_2(k)]x(k) + [\Gamma_{1,1} + \Gamma_{2,0}B_{1,1}^2(k)]u_1(k-1) + [\Gamma_{2,1} + \Gamma_{2,0}B_{2,1}^2(k)]u_2(k-1) \\
&\quad + \Gamma_{1,0}u_1(k) + \sum_{i=2}^k [\Gamma_{2,0}B_{1,i}^2(k)u_1(k-i) + \Gamma_{2,0}B_{2,i}^2(k)u_2(k-i)].
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Define

$$z(k) = \begin{bmatrix} x(k) & u_1(k-1) & u_2(k-1) & \cdots & u_1(0) & u_2(0) \end{bmatrix}^T. \tag{8}$$

Then, we can rewrite (7) as

$$z(k+1) = C_1(k)z(k) + D_1u_1(k), \quad (9)$$

where

$$D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{1,0} \\ I \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$C_1(k) = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi + \Gamma_{2,0}A_2(k) & \Gamma_{1,1} + \bar{B}_{1,1}^2(k) & \Gamma_{2,1} + \bar{B}_{2,1}^2(k) & \bar{B}_{1,2}^2(k) & \bar{B}_{2,2}^2(k) & \cdots & \bar{B}_{1,k}^2(k) & \bar{B}_{2,k}^2(k) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ A_2(k) & B_{1,1}^2(k) & B_{2,1}^2(k) & B_{1,2}^2(k) & B_{2,2}^2(k) & \cdots & B_{1,k}^2(k) & B_{2,k}^2(k) \\ 0 & I & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\bar{B}_{i,j}^2(k) = \Gamma_{2,0}B_{i,j}^2(k), \quad i = 1, 2; j = 1, 2, \dots, k, \quad (10)$$

with 0 and I denoting the zero matrix and the identity matrix, respectively, $u_i(k)$, $i = 1, 2$ are set to be zero when $k < 0$.

Then, the optimization problem for controller 1 in (5) can be rewritten as

$$\min_{u_1(k), k=0, 1, \dots, N-1} J_{1,N} = z^T(N)Q_N^1z(N) + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} z(k) \\ u_1(k) \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} Q_{1,1}^1 & 0 \\ 0 & R_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z(k) \\ u_1(k) \end{pmatrix} \right\},$$

$$s.t. \quad z(k+1) = C_1(k)z(k) + D_1u_1(k), \quad (11)$$

where

$$Q_N^1 = \begin{pmatrix} Q_{1,N} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q_{1,1}^1 = \begin{pmatrix} Q_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

Define

$$V_L^1 = \min_{u_1(k), k=L, L+1, \dots, N-1} \left\{ z^T(N) Q_N^1 z(N) + \sum_{k=L}^{N-1} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} z(k) \\ u_1(k) \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} Q_{1,1}^1 & 0 \\ 0 & R_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z(k) \\ u_1(k) \end{pmatrix} \right\} \right\}. \quad (13)$$

We next derive the expressions for V_L^1 for different L .

1) $L = N$: When $L = N$, we have

$$V_N^1 = z^T(N) S^1(N) z(N), \quad (14)$$

with

$$S^1(N) = Q_N^1.$$

2) $L = N - 1$: When $L = N - 1$, from (9), (13) and (14), we get

$$\begin{aligned} V_{N-1}^1 &= \min_{u_1(N-1)} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} z(N-1) \\ u_1(N-1) \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} Q_{1,1}^1 & 0 \\ 0 & R_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z(N-1) \\ u_1(N-1) \end{pmatrix} + z^T(N) S^1(N) z(N) \right\} \\ &= \min_{u_1(N-1)} \begin{pmatrix} z(N-1) \\ u_1(N-1) \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} P_{1,1}^1(N-1) & (P_{1,2}^1(N-1))^T \\ P_{1,2}^1(N-1) & P_{2,2}^1(N-1) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z(N-1) \\ u_1(N-1) \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P_{1,1}^1(N-1) &= C_1^T(N-1) S^1(N) C_1(N-1) + Q_{1,1}^1, \\ P_{1,2}^1(N-1) &= D_1^T S^1(N) C_1(N-1), \\ P_{2,2}^1(N-1) &= D_1^T S^1(N) D_1 + R_1. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The optimal solution to (15) is given by [20]

$$u_1(N-1) = -L_1(N-1) z(N-1), \quad (17)$$

where

$$L_1(N-1) = (P_{2,2}^1(N-1))^{-1} P_{1,2}^1(N-1). \quad (18)$$

Similarly, we get the optimal control strategy of the other controller as

$$u_2(N-1) = -L_2(N-1) z(N-1), \quad (19)$$

where

$$L_2(N-1) = (P_{2,2}^2(N-1))^{-1} P_{1,2}^2(N-1), \quad (20)$$

and

$$P_{1,2}^2(N-1) = D_2^T S^2(N) C_2(N-1),$$

$$P_{2,2}^2(N-1) = D_2^T S^2(N) D_2 + R_2,$$

$$S^2(N) = \begin{pmatrix} Q_{2,N} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{2,0} \\ 0 \\ I \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$C_2(k) = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi + \Gamma_{1,0}A_1(k) & \Gamma_{1,1} + \bar{B}_{1,1}^1(k) & \Gamma_{2,1} + \bar{B}_{2,1}^1(k) & \bar{B}_{1,2}^1(k) & \bar{B}_{2,2}^1(k) & \cdots & \bar{B}_{1,k}^1(k) & \bar{B}_{2,k}^1(k) \\ A_1(k) & B_{1,1}^1(k) & B_{2,1}^1(k) & B_{1,2}^1(k) & B_{2,2}^1(k) & \cdots & B_{1,k}^1(k) & B_{2,k}^1(k) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\bar{B}_{i,j}^1(k) = \Gamma_{1,0}B_{i,j}^1(k), \quad i = 1, 2; \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, k.$$

(21)

From (6), (8), (17) and (19), we have

$$L_i(N-1) = - \begin{bmatrix} A_i(N-1) & B_{1,1}^i(N-1) & B_{2,1}^i(N-1) \\ \cdots & B_{1,N-1}^i(N-1) & B_{2,N-1}^i(N-1) \end{bmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (22)$$

Based on (18), (20), from (22), we obtain

$$B_{j,i}^1(N-1) = -\alpha B_{j,i}^2(N-1), \quad (23)$$

$$B_{j,i}^2(N-1) = -\beta B_{j,i}^1(N-1), \quad i = 2, 3, \dots, N-1; \quad j = 1, 2,$$

where

$$\alpha = (\Gamma_{1,0}^T Q_{1,N} \Gamma_{1,0} + R_1)^{-1} \Gamma_{1,0}^T Q_{1,N} \Gamma_{2,0}, \quad (24)$$

$$\beta = (\Gamma_{2,0}^T Q_{2,N} \Gamma_{2,0} + R_2)^{-1} \Gamma_{2,0}^T Q_{2,N} \Gamma_{1,0}.$$

Then, from (23), we have

$$B_{j,i}^1(N-1) \equiv \alpha \beta B_{j,i}^1(N-1), \quad i = 2, 3, \dots, N-1; \quad j = 1, 2, \quad (25)$$

which means that

$$B_{j,i}^1(N-1) = B_{j,i}^2(N-1) = 0, \quad i = 2, 3, \dots, N-1; \quad j = 1, 2. \quad (26)$$

Based on (22) and (26), when $L = N - 1$, the optimal solutions can be simplified as

$$L_i(N-1) = - \left[A_i(N-1) \quad B_{1,1}^i(N-1) \quad B_{2,1}^i(N-1) \right], \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (27)$$

Then, from (17) and (19), the optimal control strategies of the two controllers can be rewritten as

$$u_i(N-1) = -L_i(N-1) \begin{pmatrix} x(N-1) \\ u_1(N-2) \\ u_2(N-2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (28)$$

and the related parameters can be simplified as

$$Q_{1,1}^i = \begin{pmatrix} Q_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S^i(N) = \begin{pmatrix} Q_{i,N} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (29)$$

and

$$D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{1,0} \\ I \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{2,0} \\ 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix},$$

$$C_1(k) = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi + \Gamma_{2,0}A_2(k) & \Gamma_{1,1} + \Gamma_{2,0}B_{1,1}^2(k) & \Gamma_{2,1} + \Gamma_{2,0}B_{2,1}^2(k) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ A_2(k) & B_{1,1}^2(k) & B_{2,1}^2(k) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (30)$$

$$C_2(k) = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi + \Gamma_{1,0}A_1(k) & \Gamma_{1,1} + \Gamma_{1,0}B_{1,1}^1(k) & \Gamma_{2,1} + \Gamma_{1,0}B_{2,1}^1(k) \\ A_1(k) & B_{1,1}^1(k) & B_{2,1}^1(k) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Substituting $u_1(N-1)$ in (28) into (15), V_{N-1}^1 can be expressed as

$$V_{N-1}^1 = \begin{pmatrix} x(N-1) \\ u_1(N-2) \\ u_2(N-2) \end{pmatrix}^T \bar{S}^1(N-1) \begin{pmatrix} x(N-1) \\ u_1(N-2) \\ u_2(N-2) \end{pmatrix} = z^T(N-1) S^1(N-1) z(N-1), \quad (31)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}^1(N-1) &= P_{1,1}^1(N-1) - L_1^T(N-1)P_{2,2}^1(N-1)L_1(N-1), \\ S^1(N) &= \begin{pmatrix} \bar{S}^1(N-1) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

3) $L = N-2, \dots, 1, 0$: When $L = N-2$, from (13) and (31), we have

$$V_{N-2}^1 = \min_{u_1(N-2)} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} z(N-2) \\ u_1(N-2) \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} Q_{1,1}^1 & 0 \\ 0 & R_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z(N-2) \\ u_1(N-2) \end{pmatrix} + z^T(N-1)S^1(N-1)z(N-1) \right\}. \quad (33)$$

We can see that, (15) and (33) have the same form. Thus, repeat the same process as that for $L = N-1$, we can derive the optimal controller $u_1(k)$, $k = N-2, \dots, 1, 0$, which can be expressed as

$$u_i(k) = -L_i(k) \begin{pmatrix} x(k) \\ u_1(k-1) \\ u_2(k-1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2; k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (34)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_i(k) &= (P_{2,2}^i(k))^{-1} P_{1,2}^i(k), \\ S^i(k) &= P_{1,1}^i(k) - L_i^T(k) P_{2,2}^i(k) L_i(k), \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} P_{1,1}^i(k) &= C_i^T(k) S^i(k+1) C_i(k) + Q_{1,1}^i, \\ P_{1,2}^i(k) &= D_i^T S^i(k+1) C_i(k), \\ P_{2,2}^i(k) &= D_i^T S^i(k+1) D_i + R_i. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

From (6) and (34), we have

$$L_i(k) = - \begin{bmatrix} A_i(k) & B_{1,1}^i(k) & B_{2,1}^i(k) \end{bmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2; k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (37)$$

which means that the optimal control strategies are the linear with current plant states and the last control strategies.

Based on (35) and (37), we can deduce the values of $A_i(k)$, $B_{1,1}^i(k)$ and $B_{2,1}^i(k)$, $i = 1, 2$ as follows (see Appendix A for details).

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1(k) &= [I - a_2^1(k) a_2^2(k)]^{-1} [a_2^1(k) a_1^2(k) - a_1^1(k)], \\
B_{1,1}^1(k) &= [I - b_2^1(k) b_2^2(k)]^{-1} [b_2^1(k) b_1^2(k) - b_1^1(k)], \\
B_{2,1}^1(k) &= [I - c_2^1(k) c_2^2(k)]^{-1} [c_2^1(k) c_1^2(k) - c_1^1(k)], \\
A_2(k) &= [I - a_2^2(k) a_2^1(k)]^{-1} [a_2^2(k) a_1^1(k) - a_1^2(k)], \\
B_{1,1}^2(k) &= [I - b_2^2(k) b_2^1(k)]^{-1} [b_2^2(k) b_1^1(k) - b_1^2(k)], \\
B_{2,1}^2(k) &= [I - c_2^2(k) c_2^1(k)]^{-1} [c_2^2(k) c_1^1(k) - c_1^2(k)].
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Then, using (37) and (38), from (34), we can achieve the optimal control strategies. The algorithm can be summarized as follows.

The optimal distributed controllers

Off-line:

- 1: Initialize $S^1(N)$ and $S^2(N)$ using (29).
- 2: **for** $k = N - 1 : -1 : 0$ **do**.
- 3: Calculate $A_i(k)$, $B_{1,1}^i(k)$ and $B_{2,1}^i(k)$, $i = 1, 2$ using (38).
Calculate $L_1(k)$ and $L_2(k)$ using (37).
Calculate $S^1(k)$ and $S^2(k)$ using (35).
- 4: **end for**.

On-line:

- 1: Initialize $x(0) = x_0$, and $u_i(k) = 0$, $i = 1, 2$; $k < 0$.
 - 2: **for** $k = 0 : 1 : N - 1$ **do** .
 - 3: Use $x(k)$, $u_1(k-1)$, $u_2(k-1)$ and $L_1(k)$ to compute $u_1(k)$ in (34) .
Use $x(k)$, $u_1(k-1)$, $u_2(k-1)$ and $L_2(k)$ to compute $u_2(k)$ in (34) .
Exchange control signals $u_1(k)$ and $u_2(k)$ between the two controllers.
 - 4: **end for**.
-

B. Special Cases

In this subsection, the optimal control solutions derived in the last subsection are applied to two special cases. One is the optimal control strategy for a single controller with time delay,

and the other is the optimal control strategy for two controllers without time delays.

1) *Single controller with time delay:*

Consider the case of a single controller, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_2(k) &= B_{1,1}^2(k) = B_{2,1}^2(k) = 0, \\ \Gamma_{2,0} &= \Gamma_{2,1} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Then, the optimal control strategies in (34) can be simplified as

$$u_1(k) = -L_1(k) \begin{pmatrix} x(k) \\ u_1(k-1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (40)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_1(k) &= (P_{2,2}^1(k))^{-1} P_{1,2}^1(k), \\ S^1(k) &= P_{1,1}^1(k) - L_1^T(k) P_{2,2}^1(k) L_1(k), \\ S^1(N) &= \begin{pmatrix} Q_{1,N} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ P_{1,1}^1(k) &= C_1^T(k) S^1(k) C_1(k) + Q_{1,1}^1, \\ P_{1,2}^1(k) &= D_1^T S^1(k+1) C_1(k), \\ P_{2,2}^1(k) &= D_1^T S^1(k+1) D_1 + R_1, \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

and

$$Q_{1,1}^1 = \begin{pmatrix} Q_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{1,0} \\ I \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_1(k) = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi & \Gamma_{1,1} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

The above optimal solution is the same as that in [19] when the time delay is deterministic.

2) *Two controllers without time delays:*

If we ignore the time delays, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{1,1}^1(k) &= B_{2,1}^1(k) = B_{1,1}^2(k) = B_{2,1}^2(k) = 0, \\ \Gamma_{i,1} &= 0, \quad i = 1, 2. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Then, the optimal control strategies become

$$u_i(k) = A_i(k)x(k), \quad i = 1, 2; \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (44)$$

where $A_i(k)$ is derived by

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(k) &= [I - a_2^1(k) a_2^2(k)]^{-1} [a_2^1(k) a_1^2(k) - a_1^1(k)], \\ A_2(k) &= [I - a_2^2(k) a_2^1(k)]^{-1} [a_2^2(k) a_1^1(k) - a_1^2(k)], \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_1^i(k) &= (R_i + \Gamma_{i,0}^T S^i(k+1) \Gamma_{i,0})^{-1} \Gamma_{i,0}^T S^i(k+1) \Phi, \\ a_2^i(k) &= (R_i + \Gamma_{i,0}^T S^i(k+1) \Gamma_{i,0})^{-1} \Gamma_{i,0}^T S^i(k+1) \Gamma_{3-i,0}, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S^i(N) &= Q_{i,N}, \\ S^i(k) &= Q_i + (\Phi + \Gamma_{3-i,0} A_{3-i}(k))^T S^i(k+1) (\Phi + \Gamma_{3-i,0} A_{3-i}(k)) \\ &\quad - A_i^T(k) (\Gamma_{i,0}^T S^i(k+1) \Gamma_{i,0} + R_i) A_i(k). \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

These results correspond to the discrete-time control strategies for the non-cooperative feedback games in [18].

IV. EXTENSION TO MULTIPLE DISTRIBUTED CONTROLLERS

In this section, we extend the results for the case of two distributed controllers in Section III to multiple distributed controllers. We will omit the detailed derivations since they are similar to those in Section III.

Similar to (37), the optimal linear control strategies are linear with the current plant states and the last control strategies, i.e.,

$$u_i(k) = A_i(k)x(k) + \sum_{j=1}^p B_j^i(k) u_j(k-1), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, p, \quad (48)$$

where p is the number of controllers, A_i and B_j^i , $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$ are coefficient matrices.

Taking controller i as the desired one, we can rewrite the control process as

$$\begin{aligned} x(k+1) &= \Phi x(k) + \sum_{j=1}^p [\Gamma_{j,0} u_j(k) + \Gamma_{j,1} u_j(k-1)] \\ &= \left(\Phi + \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \neq i}}^p \Gamma_{m,0} A_m(k) \right) x(k) + \Gamma_{i,0} u_i(k) + \sum_{j=1}^p \left[\left(\Gamma_{j,1} + \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq i}}^p \Gamma_{n,0} B_j^n(k) \right) u_j(k-1) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Define

$$z(k) = \begin{pmatrix} x(k) \\ u_1(k-1) \\ u_2(k-1) \\ \vdots \\ u_p(k-1) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (50)$$

Similarly as in Section III, we can derive the optimal solution for controller i as

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(k) &= -L_i(k)z(k), \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1, \\ L_i(k) &= (P_{2,2}^i(k))^{-1}P_{1,2}^i(k), \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S^i(k) &= P_{1,1}^i(k) - L_i^T(k)P_{2,2}^i(k)L_i(k), \\ S^i(N) &= \begin{pmatrix} Q_{i,N} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

$$P_{1,1}^i(k) = C_i^T(k)S^i(k+1)C_i(k) + Q_{1,1}^i,$$

$$P_{1,2}^i(k) = D_i^T S^i(k+1)C_i(k),$$

$$P_{2,2}^i(k) = D_i^T S^i(k+1)D_i + R_i,$$

and

$$Q_{1,1}^i = \begin{pmatrix} Q_i & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_i = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{i,0} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ I_{i+1} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$C_i(k) = \begin{pmatrix} \left(\Phi + \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq i}}^p \Gamma_{n,0} A_n(k) \right) & (\Gamma_{1,1} + \bar{B}_1(k)) & (\Gamma_{2,1} + \bar{B}_2(k)) & \cdots & (\Gamma_{p,1} + \bar{B}_p(k)) \\ A_1(k) & B_1^1(k) & B_2^1(k) & \cdots & B_p^1(k) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_{i-1}(k) & B_1^{i-1}(k) & B_2^{i-1}(k) & \cdots & B_p^{i-1}(k) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ A_{i+1}(k) & B_1^{i+1}(k) & B_2^{i+1}(k) & \cdots & B_p^{i+1}(k) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_p(k) & B_1^p(k) & B_2^p(k) & \cdots & B_p^p(k) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (53)$$

that $\bar{B}_j(k) = \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \neq i}}^p \Gamma_{n,0} B_j^n(k)$, and I_{i+1} denotes the $(i+1)$ -th block of D_i , which is a identity matrix of size $N \times N$.

From (48) and (51), for controller i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_i(k) &= E_i^{-1} \left[\Gamma_{i,0}^T S_{1,1}^i(k+1) \Phi + S_{i+1,1}^i(k+1) \Phi + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^p F_i^j A_j(k) \right], \\ B_1^i(k) &= E_i^{-1} \left[\Gamma_{i,0}^T S_{1,1}^i(k+1) \Gamma_{1,1} + S_{i+1,1}^i(k+1) \Gamma_{1,1} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^p F_i^j B_1^j(k) \right], \\ &\vdots \\ B_p^i(k) &= E_i^{-1} \left[\Gamma_{i,0}^T S_{1,1}^i(k+1) \Gamma_{p,1} + S_{i+1,1}^i(k+1) \Gamma_{p,1} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^p F_i^j B_p^j(k) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where

$$E_i = D_i^T S^i(k+1) D_i + R_i, \quad (55)$$

$$F_i^j = \Gamma_{i,0}^T S_{1,1}^i(k+1) \Gamma_{j,0} + S_{i+1,1}^i(k+1) \Gamma_{j,0} + \Gamma_{i,0}^T S_{1,j+1}^i(k+1) + S_{i+1,j+1}^i(k+1),$$

and $S_{m,n}^i(k+1)$ is the (m,n) -th block of matrix $S^i(k+1)$, whose size is $M \times M$ when $m = n = 1$, $M \times N$ when $m = 1; n \geq 2$, $N \times M$ when $m \geq 2; n = 1$, and $N \times N$ when $m \geq 2; n \geq 2$.

It can be seen that all the equations in (54) are linear functions. We can easily calculate all values of $A_i(k)$, $B_j^i(k)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$. Then we can obtain the optimal control

strategies from (48).




Fig. 3. Total cost with two distributed controllers under various time delays.

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we provide simulation studies on the performance of the proposed optimal distributed control strategies. First we consider a generic control system, and then introduce a power-grid application.

A. A Generic System

We consider a system with two distributed controllers. The sampling period is chosen as $h = 0.05$, the sampling duration $N = 50$, and the other parameters of the control system are set as follows [7]:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -3 & -4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_1 = B_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

and, for simplicity, we choose

$$Q_{i,N} = Q_i = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \times 100, R_i = 1, i = 1, 2.$$

Fig. 3 shows the total costs of the system with various time delays. TD1 and TD2 represent the time delays of controller 1 and controller 2, respectively. It can be seen that the total cost becomes larger when either time delay increases, especially when both time delays are large. This is because the effect of the previous control signals increases when the time delay becomes larger, which leads to less system stability and larger cost.




Fig. 4. Ratio of costs between two distributed controllers under various time delays.

Fig. 4 depicts the ratio of costs between controller 1 and controller 2. It can be seen that the ratio decreases with TD1 and increases with TD2, which means that the controller with smaller time delay contributes more to the total cost. This is because when the time delay becomes smaller, the system becomes more stable using the corresponding controller, and the effect of the controller will increase.

Fig. 5 shows the performance comparison for three schemes: (1) the proposed distributed control algorithm; (2) the LQG-controller algorithm designed for a single controller with time delay in [19], where controller 1 is assumed to be the desired controller; (3) the LQG-controller algorithm designed for two distributed controllers neglecting the time delays in [18]. In the simulations, TD2 is set to be 0 and 0.02, and TD1 varies within $[0, 0.02]$. It can be seen that the proposed algorithm outperforms the other two schemes in the sense that it has a lower total cost. It can also be seen that the total cost of the two distributed controllers without delays increases more rapidly with the time delay than the other two schemes when $TD2 = 0.02$. It is because this scheme cannot effectively deal with the time delay so that large time delay introduces severe performance degradation. Note that, in Fig. 5, the total cost of the single controller scheme is the same for different TD2, since only controller 1 is considered in this scheme.




Fig. 5. Performance comparison for three schemes with various TD1.

B. Load Frequency Control in Power Grid

We next consider the application of the proposed optimal distributed control scheme to two-area load frequency control (LFC) in power grid systems [21][22]. The LFC block diagram is shown in Fig. 6, where the system states and feedback control signals are separately transmitted through a shared wireless network, which incur the time delays. The adjusting speed u_i will be optimally designed according to the requested deviation of generator outputs ΔP_{ci} .

The linear dynamic control model can be described as

$$\dot{x}(t) = A^c x(t) + B_1^c u_1(t - \tau_1) + B_2^c u_2(t - \tau_2), \quad (56)$$

where

$$x(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta f_1 & \Delta P_{g1} & \Delta X_{g1} & \Delta f_2 & \Delta P_{g2} & \Delta X_{g2} & \Delta P_{tie} & \Delta P_{c1} & \Delta P_{c2} \end{bmatrix}^T,$$

$$A^c = \begin{bmatrix} -1/T_{p1} & K_{p1}/T_{p1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & K_{p1}/T_{p1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1/T_{t1} & 1/T_{t1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1/r_1 T_{g1} & 0 & -1/T_{g1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/T_{g1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/T_{p2} & K_{p2}/T_{p2} & 0 & K_{p2}/T_{p2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/T_{t2} & 1/T_{t2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1/r_2 T_{g2} & 0 & -1/T_{g2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/T_{g2} \\ T_{12} & 0 & 0 & -T_{12} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B_1^c = B_2^c = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (57)$$

and the subscript $i = 1, 2$ representing the i -th control area, Δf_i is the deviation of frequency, ΔP_{gi} is the deviation of generator mechanical output, ΔX_{gi} is the deviation of valve position, ΔP_{tie} is the deviation of tie-line power, ΔP_{ci} is the requested deviation of generator output, T_{gi} is the time constant of the governor, T_{ti} is the time constant of the turbine, K_{pi} is the electric system gain, T_{pi} is the electric system time constant, T_{12} is the tie-line synchronizing coefficient, and r_i is the speed drop.

In Fig. 6, the system state $x(t)$ has nine elements. We need nine sensors, each observing one dimension of $x(t)$ directly, and after sampling the measurement signals are immediately sent




Fig. 6. Block diagram of a two-area LFC system for power grid.

to the LFC controllers. Then, discretizing the process at the sampling instant gives the same formulas as in (2) and (3) choosing $p = 2$.

In the simulation, based on [21][22], the sampling period is set to be $h=0.01$, $T_{12} = 2.4$, $K_{pi} = 1$, $T_{pi} = 0.2$, $T_{ti} = 0.3$, $T_{gi} = 0.08$, $r_i = 0.2545$, $R_i = 1$, $i = 1, 2$, and

$$Q_{i,N} = Q_i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (58)$$

In Fig. 7, we also compare the system performances of the three schemes. Again we see

that the proposed optimal distributed control strategy significantly outperforms the other two methods.




Fig. 7. Performance comparison for three schemes under various TD1 for a two-area LFC system.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have considered the problem of optimal control for networked control systems with distributed controllers and time delays under the linear quadratic control framework. In particular, the optimal control problem is formulated as a non-cooperative linear quadratic game, and we have obtained the optimal distributed controllers assuming the time delays between sensors and actuators are deterministic and within one sampling period. We have also applied the proposed optimal distributed control scheme to load frequency control in power grid systems. Future works include to investigate the optimal distributed controller when the time delays are larger than one sampling period and stochastic.

APPENDIX A

From (35) and (36), we can rewrite $L_1(k)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} L_1(k) &= (P_{2,2}^1(k))^{-1} P_{1,2}^1(k) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} a_1^1(k) + a_2^1(k)A_2(k) & b_1^1(k) + b_2^1(k)B_{1,1}^2(k) & c_1^1(k) + c_2^1(k)B_{2,1}^2(k) \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-1})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_1^1(k) &= E_1^{-1} [\Gamma_{1,0}^T S_{1,1}^1(k+1) \Phi + S_{2,1}^1(k+1) \Phi], \\ b_1^1(k) &= E_1^{-1} [\Gamma_{1,0}^T S_{1,1}^1(k+1) \Gamma_{1,1} + S_{2,1}^1(k+1) \Gamma_{1,1}], \\ c_1^1(k) &= E_1^{-1} [\Gamma_{1,0}^T S_{1,1}^1(k+1) \Gamma_{2,1} + S_{2,1}^1(k+1) \Gamma_{2,1}], \\ a_2^1(k) &= b_2^1(k) = c_2^1(k) \\ &= E_1^{-1} [\Gamma_{1,0}^T S_{1,1}^1(k+1) \Gamma_{2,0} + S_{2,1}^1(k+1) \Gamma_{2,0} + \Gamma_{1,0}^T S_{1,3}^1(k+1) + S_{2,3}^1(k+1)], \\ E_1 &= D_1^T S^1(k+1) D_1 + R_1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-2})$$

and $S_{m,n}^1(k+1)$ is the (m,n) -th block of matrix $S^1(k+1)$, whose size is $M \times M$ when $m = n = 1$, $M \times N$ when $m = 1; n \geq 2$, $N \times M$ when $m \geq 2; n = 1$, and $N \times N$ when $m \geq 2; n \geq 2$.

From (A-1) and (37), we have

$$\begin{aligned} -A_1(k) &= a_1^1(k) + a_2^1(k)A_2(k), \\ -B_{1,1}^1(k) &= b_1^1(k) + b_2^1(k)B_{1,1}^2(k), \\ -B_{2,1}^1(k) &= c_1^1(k) + c_2^1(k)B_{2,1}^2(k). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-3})$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -A_2(k) &= a_1^2(k) + a_2^2(k)A_1(k), \\ -B_{1,1}^2(k) &= b_1^2(k) + b_2^2(k)B_{1,1}^1(k), \\ -B_{2,1}^2(k) &= c_1^2(k) + c_2^2(k)B_{2,1}^1(k). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-4})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1^2(k) &= E_2^{-1} [\Gamma_{2,0}^T S_{1,1}^2(k+1) \Phi + S_{3,1}^2(k+1) \Phi], \\
b_1^2(k) &= E_2^{-1} [\Gamma_{2,0}^T S_{1,1}^2(k+1) \Gamma_{1,1} + S_{3,1}^2(k+1) \Gamma_{1,1}], \\
c_1^2(k) &= E_2^{-1} [\Gamma_{2,0}^T S_{1,1}^2(k+1) \Gamma_{2,1} + S_{3,1}^2(k+1) \Gamma_{2,1}], \\
a_2^2(k) &= b_2^2(k) = c_2^2(k) \\
&= E_2^{-1} [\Gamma_{2,0}^T S_{1,1}^2(k+1) \Gamma_{1,0} + S_{3,1}^2(k+1) \Gamma_{1,0} + \Gamma_{2,0}^T S_{1,2}^2(k+1) + S_{3,2}^2(k+1)], \\
E_2 &= D_2^T S^2(k+1) D_2 + R_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{A-5}$$

and $S_{m,n}^2(k+1)$ is the (m,n) -th block of matrix $S^2(k+1)$.

Then, based on (A-3) and (A-4), we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1(k) &= [I - a_2^1(k) a_2^2(k)]^{-1} [a_2^1(k) a_1^2(k) - a_1^1(k)], \\
B_{1,1}^1(k) &= [I - b_2^1(k) b_2^2(k)]^{-1} [b_2^1(k) b_1^2(k) - b_1^1(k)], \\
B_{2,1}^1(k) &= [I - c_2^1(k) c_2^2(k)]^{-1} [c_2^1(k) c_1^2(k) - c_1^1(k)], \\
A_2(k) &= [I - a_2^2(k) a_2^1(k)]^{-1} [a_2^2(k) a_1^1(k) - a_1^2(k)], \\
B_{1,1}^2(k) &= [I - b_2^2(k) b_2^1(k)]^{-1} [b_2^2(k) b_1^1(k) - b_1^2(k)], \\
B_{2,1}^2(k) &= [I - c_2^2(k) c_2^1(k)]^{-1} [c_2^2(k) c_1^1(k) - c_1^2(k)].
\end{aligned} \tag{A-6}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Lee, "Cyber physical systems: Design challenges," University of California, Berkeley Technical Report, 2008.
- [2] ISO New England Inc., *Overview of the Smart Grid: Policies, Initiatives and Needs*, Feb. 17, 2009.
- [3] F. Bullo, J. Cortes, and S. Martinez, *Distributed Control of Robotic Networks: A Mathematical Approach to Motion Coordination Algorithms*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2009.
- [4] P. Marwedel, "Embedded and cyber-physical systems in a nutshell," in *Proc. Design Autom. Conf.*, Anaheim, CA, 2010.
- [5] R. Luck and A. Ray, "An observer-based compensator for distributed delays," *Automatica*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 903-908, 1990.
- [6] J. Nilsson, B. Bernhardsson, and B. Wittenmark, "Stochastic analysis and control of real-time systems with random time delays," *Proc. 13th Int. Fed. of Autom. Control World Congress*, pp. 267-272, 1996.
- [7] J. Nilsson, B. Bernhardsson, and B. Wittenmark, "Stochastic analysis and control of real-time systems with random time delays," *Automatica*, vol. 34, no 1, pp. 57-64, Jan. 1998.
- [8] S. Hu and W. Zhu, "Stochastic optimal control and analysis of stability of networked control systems with long delay," *Automatica*, vol. 39, pp. 1877-1884, 2003.
- [9] M. V. Basin and J. R. Gonzalez, "Optimal control for linear systems with multiple time delays in control input," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 91-97, Jan. 2006.

- [10] W. Zhang, M. S. Branicky, and S. M. Phillips, "Stability of networked control systems," *IEEE Contr. Syst. Mag.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 84-99, Feb. 2001.
- [11] G. C. Walsh, H. Ye, and L. G. Bushnell, "Stability analysis of networked control systems," *IEEE Trans. Contr. Syst. Tech.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 438-446, May 2002.
- [12] H. Lin, G. Zhai, and P. J. Antsaklis, "Robust stability and disturbance attenuation analysis of a class of networked control systems," in *Proc. 42nd Conf. Decision and Contr.*, vol. 2, pp. 1182-1187, Dec. 2003.
- [13] J. P. Hespanha, P. Naghshtabrizi, and Y. Xu, "A survey of recent results in networked control systems," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 95, no. 1, pp. 138-162, 2007.
- [14] H. Li, M. Chow, and Z. Sun, "Optimal stabilizing gain selection for networked control systems with time delays and packet losses," *IEEE Trans. Contr. Syst. Tech.*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 1154-1162, Sep. 2009.
- [15] X. Liu and A. Goldsmith, "Wireless medium access control in networked control systems," in *Proc. IEEE Amer. Contr. Conf.*, pp. 688-694, 2004.
- [16] M. Pajic, S. Sundaram, G. J. Pappas, and R. Mangharam, "The wireless control network: A new approach for control over networks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 56, no.10, pp. 2305-2318, Oct. 2011.
- [17] H. Li, L. Lai, and H. V. Poor, "Multicast routing for decentralized control of cyber physical systems with an application in smart grid," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 1097-1107, July 2012.
- [18] J. C. Engwerda, *Linear Quadratic Dynamic Optimization and Differential Game Theory*, Chichester: Wiley, 2005.
- [19] J. Nilsson, "Real-time control systems with delays," Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Inst. Technology, Lund, Sweden, 1998.
- [20] K. J. Astrom and B. Wittenmark, *Computer-Controlled Systems Theory and Design*, Prentice Hall, 3rd edition, 1997.
- [21] R. Ye, H. Chen, and X. Wang, "Load frequency control in power systems based on differential games," *IEEE Trans. Power System*, submitted.
- [22] C. E. Fosha and O. I. Elgerd, "The megawatt frequency control problem: A new approach via optimal control theory," *IEEE Trans. Power App., Syst.*, vol. PAS-89, no. 4, pp. 563-577, Apr. 1970.