

A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO GEOMETRIC CONTROL THEORY

SLOBODAN N. SIMIĆ

ABSTRACT. The goal of this expository paper is to present the basics of geometric control theory suitable for advanced undergraduate or beginning graduate students with a solid background in advanced calculus and ordinary differential equations.

This paper consists of three parts:

- (1) Basic concepts;
- (2) Basic results;
- (3) Steering with piecewise constant inputs.

The goal is to present only the necessary minimum to understand part 3, which describes a constructive procedure for steering affine drift-free systems using piecewise constant inputs. All technical details are omitted. The reader is referred to the literature at the end for proofs and details.

1. BASIC CONCEPTS

Control theory studies families of ordinary differential equations parametrized by input, which is external to the ODEs and can be controlled.

1.1. **Definition.** *A control system is an ODE of the form*

$$\dot{x} = f(x, u),$$

where $x \in M$ is the state of the system, M is the state space, $u \in U(x)$ is the input or control, $U(x)$ is the (state-dependent) input set, and f is a smooth map called the system map.

The state space is usually a Euclidean space or a smooth manifold. The set

$$\mathbb{U} = \bigcup_{x \in M} U(x)$$

is called the *control bundle*. With each control system we associate the set of *admissible control functions*, \mathcal{U} , consisting of functions $u : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$, for some $T > 0$. These are usually square integrable functions, such as piecewise continuous, piecewise smooth, or smooth ones (depending on what the control system is modeling).

This work was partially supported by an SJSU Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity grant.





FIGURE 1. Control directions at a point.

1.2. **Definition.** A curve $x : [0, T] \rightarrow M$ is called a *control trajectory* if there exists an admissible control function $u : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ such that $u(t) \in U(x(t))$ and

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t)),$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq T$.

The basic idea is: if we want to move according to control system $\dot{x} = f(x, u)$ starting from a point $x \in M$, the directions that we have at our disposal are given by $f(x, u)$, for all $u \in U(x)$. A control trajectory $x(t)$ defined by an admissible control $u(t)$ picks one such direction for each time $t \in [0, T]$; this choice is, of course, determined by $u(t)$.

FIGURE 2. A control trajectory connecting p and q .

1.3. **Example** (Linear control systems). If $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ and f is linear in both x and u , the system is called *linear*:

$$\dot{x} = Ax + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i b_i = Ax + Bu,$$

where $b_1, \dots, b_m \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and B is the $n \times m$ matrix whose columns are b_1, \dots, b_m .

1.4. **Example** (Affine control systems). If f is affine in u , the system is called *affine*:

$$\dot{x} = g_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i g_i(x),$$

where g_0, \dots, g_m are vector fields on M ; g_0 is called the *drift*, and g_1, \dots, g_m are *control vector fields*. If $g_0 = 0$, the system is called *drift-free*.

The notions of reachability and controllability, fundamental to control theory, are defined next.

1.5. **Definition.** If $x : [0, T] \rightarrow M$ is a control trajectory with $x(0) = p$ and $x(T) = q$, we say that q is *reachable* or *accessible* from p . The set of points reachable from p will be denoted by $\mathcal{R}(p)$.

If the interior (relative to M) of $\mathcal{R}(p)$ is non-empty, we say that the system is *locally accessible* at p . If it is locally accessible at *every* p , it is called *locally accessible*.

If $\mathcal{R}(p) = M$ for some (and therefore all) p , the system is called *controllable*.

1.6. **Example.** The system $\dot{x}_1 = u_1$, $\dot{x}_2 = u_2$, with $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ (the inputs are *unconstrained*) is trivially controllable. □

1.7. **Example.** Consider the control system $\dot{x} = \alpha x + u$, where $\alpha > 0$ and $u \in [-1, 1]$ (the input is *constrained*). We claim that it is *uncontrollable*, for any choice of admissible control functions \mathcal{U} .

To prove this, let $u \in \mathcal{U}$ be arbitrary and let $x(t)$ be the corresponding control trajectory. The basic theory of linear ODEs yields

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= e^{\alpha t} x(0) + e^{\alpha t} \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s} u(s) ds \\ &\geq x(0) - e^{\alpha t} \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s} ds \\ &= x(0) + \frac{e^{\alpha t} - 1}{\alpha} \\ &> x(0), \end{aligned}$$

for all $t > 0$. Thus any $q < p = x(0)$ is unreachable from p , so the system is uncontrollable. □

1.8. **Exercise.** Consider the system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= x_2 \\ \dot{x}_2 &= -kx_1 - ux_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $k > 0$ is a constant and $u \in \mathbb{R}$ is the input. Show that the system is controllable on $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$. More precisely, show that for every $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, q can be reached from p using piecewise constant input with at most one switch between control vector fields. (This type of system occurs in mechanics.)

A geometric point of view. Suppose we have an affine drift-free system

$$\dot{x} = u_1 X_1(x) + \cdots + u_m X_m(x),$$

where the inputs $u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathbb{R}$ are unconstrained. Then at each point $x \in M$, the set of directions along which the system can evolve is given by

$$\Delta(x) = \text{span}\{X_1(x), \dots, X_m(x)\}.$$

Note that $\Delta(x)$ is a subspace of $T_x M$, the tangent space to M at x . Recall that the tangent bundle of M is defined by

$$TM = \bigcup_{x \in M} T_x M.$$

For instance, if M is \mathbb{R}^n or a Lie group of dimension n , then $TM = M \times \mathbb{R}^n$. (This is not true in general; take for instance $M = S^2$, the 2-sphere in \mathbb{R}^3 .) Therefore, the evolution of the control system is specified by a collection of planes $\Delta(x)$, with $x \in M$. Such an object is called a **plane field** or a **distribution**.

1.9. Definition. A *distribution* on a smooth manifold M is an assignment to each point $x \in M$ of a linear subspace $\Delta(x)$ of the tangent space $T_x M$.

The distribution Δ associated with an affine drift-free control system as above is called the **control distribution**.

Assume for a moment that $M = \mathbb{R}^n$, $m = 1$, and $X_1(x) \neq 0$, for all x . Then Δ is 1-dimensional and through each point $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there passes a curve $\mathcal{F}(x)$ (namely, the integral curve of X_1) everywhere tangent to Δ (i.e., to X_1). This collection of curves $\mathcal{F}(x)$ is called a **foliation** which integrates Δ . It is not hard to see that

$$\mathcal{F}(x) = \mathcal{R}(x),$$

that is, $\mathcal{F}(x)$ is exactly the set of points reachable from x . Since $\mathcal{F}(x) \neq \mathbb{R}^n$, the system is not controllable. Thus at least in this simplified case, we have

$$\Delta \text{ is integrable} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{system is uncontrollable.}$$

So if the system is controllable, its control distribution should satisfy a property that is, intuitively, opposite to integrability. We will soon see that Δ , in fact, has to be *bracket generating*.

2. BASIC RESULTS

For a smooth vector field X on M , denote by $\{X^t\}$ its (local) *flow*. That is, for each $p \in M$, $t \mapsto X^t(p)$ is the integral curve of X starting at p . Recall that $X^{s+t} = X^s \circ X^t$, wherever both sides are defined. If M is compact or if X is bounded, then X^t is defined for all t , i.e., the flow is *complete*. In that case $X^t : M \rightarrow M$ is a diffeomorphism (i.e., smooth together with its inverse).

For a diffeomorphism $\phi : M \rightarrow M$, denote by ϕ_* the associated **push-forward map** defined on vector fields by

$$\phi_*(X)(p) = (T_{\phi^{-1}(p)}\phi)(X(\phi^{-1}(p))),$$

where X is a vector field on M and $T_q\phi$ denotes the derivative (or tangent map) of ϕ at q .

2.1. Definition. *The Lie bracket of smooth vector fields X, Y is defined by*

$$[X, Y] = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} (X^{-t})_*(Y).$$

That is, $[X, Y]$ is the derivative of Y along the integral curves of X . It turns out that $[X, Y]$ can also be expressed in the following way:

$$[X, Y](p) = DY(p)X(p) - DX(p)Y(p).$$

For diffeomorphism $\phi, \psi : M \rightarrow M$ define their **bracket** by

$$[\phi, \psi] = \psi^{-1} \circ \phi^{-1} \circ \psi \circ \phi.$$

2.2. Theorem (The fundamental fact about Lie brackets). *If $[X, Y] = Z$, then*

$$[X^t, Y^t](p) = Z^{t^2}(p) + o(t^2),$$

as $t \rightarrow 0$.

The Landau “little o ” notation $f(t) = o(t^2)$ means that $f(t)/t^2 \rightarrow 0$, as $t \rightarrow 0$.




FIGURE 3. The fundamental fact about the Lie bracket.

Therefore, to advance in the direction of the Lie bracket $Z = [X, Y]$ while moving only along integral curves of X and Y , we need to move from p to $p_1 = X^t(p)$ (along X), then to $p_2 = Y^t(p_1)$ (along Y), etc. (Figure 3). From the point of view of control theory, this is crucial information if $Z \notin \text{span}\{X, Y\}$.

Remark. Observe that the “price to pay” to move t^2 units of time in the Z -direction using only X and Y is $4t$ units of time. When t is very small, $4t$ is much larger than t^2 .

2.3. Definition. *A distribution Δ is called involutive if for every two vectors fields X, Y in Δ (in the sense that $X(p), Y(p) \in \Delta(p)$), $[X, Y]$ is in Δ .*

That is, Δ is involutive if it is closed under the Lie bracket.

A fundamental result in the theory of smooth manifolds is the following:

2.4. Theorem (Frobenius's theorem). *If a smooth distribution Δ on M of constant dimension k is involutive, then it is completely integrable. That is, through every point $p \in M$ there passes a k -dimensional (immersed) submanifold $\mathcal{F}(p)$ (called an integral manifold of Δ) which is everywhere tangent to Δ ; i.e., for every $q \in \mathcal{F}(p)$, $T_q\mathcal{F}(p) = \Delta(q)$. The collection $\mathcal{F}(p)$ ($p \in M$) forms the integral foliation of Δ .*

Equivalently, for every $p \in M$ there is a neighborhood U of p and a diffeomorphism $\phi : U \rightarrow \phi(U)$, with $\phi(q) = (x_1(q), \dots, x_n(q))$ such that the slices $x_{k+1} = \text{constant}, \dots, x_n = \text{constant}$ is an integral manifold of Δ .

If Δ happens to be the control distribution of an affine drift-free system, then for every $p \in M$, we have $\mathcal{R}(p) = \mathcal{F}(p)$. That is, the set of points reachable from p is precisely the integral manifold $\mathcal{F}(p)$.

Thus if we want a control system to be controllable, its control distribution needs to have a property that is diametrically opposite to involutivity. That property is defined as follows.

2.5. Definition. *A distribution $\Delta = \text{span}\{X_1, \dots, X_k\}$ on M is bracket generating if the iterated Lie brackets*

$$X_i, [X_i, X_j], [X_i, [X_j, X_k]], \dots$$

with $1 \leq i, j, k, \dots \leq m$ span the tangent space of M at every point.

In other words, one can obtain all directions in the tangent space to M by taking iterated Lie brackets of vector fields in Δ . It turns out that the property of being bracket generating does not depend on the choice of the frame X_1, \dots, X_m .

The fundamental result in geometric control theory is the following theorem.

2.6. Theorem (Chow-Rashevskii). *If $\Delta = \text{span}\{X_1, \dots, X_m\}$ is a bracket generating distribution on M , then every two points in M can be connected by a path which is almost everywhere tangent to Δ . The path can be chosen to be piecewise smooth, consisting of arcs of integral curves of X_1, \dots, X_m .*

In the language of control theory, we have:

2.7. Corollary. *If the control distribution of an affine drift-free control system is bracket generating, then the system is controllable.*

2.8. Example (The Heisenberg group). On \mathbb{R}^3 define a distribution $\Delta = \text{span}\{X_1, X_2\}$, where

$$X_1(x, y, z) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad X_2(x, y, z) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ x \end{bmatrix}.$$

Observe that

$$X_3 := [X_1, X_2] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since X_1, X_2, X_3 span the tangent space to \mathbb{R}^3 at every point, Δ is a 2-dimensional bracket generating distribution. The triple $(\mathbb{R}^3, \Delta, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the restriction of the usual dot product to Δ , is called the **Heisenberg group**, a basic example of a *subriemannian geometry*.

Note that at the origin, $X_1(0, 0, 0) = (1, 0, 0)^T$ and $X_2(0, 0, 0) = (0, 1, 0)^T$. It is natural to ask: how do we reach the point $(0, 0, z)$ (with, e.g., $z > 0$) from the origin by a control trajectory of the control system $\dot{x} = u_1 X_1(x) + u_2 X_2(x)$?

Theorem 2.2 and $[X_1, X_3] = [X_2, X_3] = 0$ imply that

$$X_3^{t^2} = [X_1^t, X_2^t],$$

with exact rather than asymptotic equality. It follows that for $z > 0$, we have

$$(0, 0, z) = [X_1^{\sqrt{z}}, X_2^{\sqrt{z}}](0, 0, 0).$$

Therefore, a piecewise constant input function which steers the control system $\dot{x} = u_1 X_1(x) + u_2 X_2(x)$ from $(0, 0, 0)$ to $(0, 0, z)$ (with $z > 0$) is the following:

$$u(t) = (u_1(t), u_2(t)) = \begin{cases} (1, 0), & \text{for } 0 \leq t < \sqrt{z} \\ (0, 1), & \text{for } \sqrt{z} \leq t < 2\sqrt{z} \\ (-1, 0), & \text{for } 2\sqrt{z} \leq t < 3\sqrt{z} \\ (0, -1), & \text{for } 3\sqrt{z} \leq t < 4\sqrt{z}. \end{cases}$$

If $z < 0$, we can simply reverse the order of X_1 and X_2 , and use $\sqrt{-z}$ instead of \sqrt{z} . \square

A brief look into sub-Riemannian geometry. In the Heisenberg group, for any two points $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^3$ there exists a *horizontal path* c (i.e., a path almost everywhere tangent to Δ) which starts at p and terminates at q . It is natural to ask, what is the length of the shortest such path? Let

$$d_\Delta(p, q) = \inf\{\ell(c) : c \text{ is a horizontal path and } c(0) = p, c(1) = q\},$$

where $\ell(c)$ is the arc-length of c . This well-defined number is called the **sub-Riemannian distance** between p and q . It turns out that for every two points p and q there exists a horizontal path c_0 , called a **sub-Riemannian geodesic**, which realizes this distance: $d_\Delta(p, q) = \ell(c_0)$. Sub-Riemannian geometry is closely related relative of **optimal control theory**, which is beyond the scope of this paper.

3. STEERING AFFINE DRIFT-FREE SYSTEMS USING PIECEWISE CONSTANT INPUTS

The goal of this section is to outline an answer to the question:

How does one steer a general affine drift-free system?

We begin by recalling that in the Heisenberg group, all Lie brackets of the generating vector fields X_1, X_2 of order > 2 vanish. We say that the Lie algebra generated by X_1, X_2 is nilpotent of order 2.

3.1. Definition. *A Lie algebra \mathcal{L} is called nilpotent of order k if all Lie brackets of elements of \mathcal{L} of order $> k$ vanish.*

Now consider an affine control system on an n -dimensional manifold M :

$$\dot{x} = u_1 X_1(x) + \cdots + u_m X_m(x). \quad (1)$$

Let Δ be its control distribution. Assume that

- (1) Δ is bracket generating, and
- (2) the Lie algebra \mathcal{L} generated by X_1, \dots, X_m is nilpotent of order k .

To make the notation more intuitive, we will denote the flow of a vector field X by e^{tX} , and will pretend that

$$e^{tX} = I + tX + \frac{t^2}{2!}X^2 + \frac{t^3}{3!}X^3 + \cdots,$$

which of course makes sense and is correct for *linear* vector fields. In general, this expression makes no sense without further clarification, but we can still treat it as a formal series in some “free Lie algebra” (namely \mathcal{L} , if $X = X_i$, for some i).

As a vector space, the Lie algebra \mathcal{L} admits a basis B_1, \dots, B_s called the **Philip Hall basis**. This is a canonically chosen basis of \mathcal{L} , which takes into account the Jacobi identity. (We won’t go into details of how to compute this basis.) The vector fields B_i are suitably chosen Lie brackets of X_1, \dots, X_m , with $B_i = X_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq m$. (Thus possibly $s > n$.)

The so called **Chen-Fliess formula** asserts us that every “flow” (i.e., control trajectory) of (1) is of the form

$$S(t) = e^{h_s(t)B_s} \cdots e^{h_1(t)B_1}, \quad (2)$$

for some real-valued functions h_1, \dots, h_s called the **Philip Hall coordinates**. Furthermore, we have $S(0) = I$ (the identity) and

$$\dot{S}(t) = S(t)\{v_1(t)B_1 + \cdots + v_s(t)B_s\}, \quad (3)$$

where $v_1(t), \dots, v_s(t)$ are called **fictitious inputs**. (Why fictitious? Only v_1, \dots, v_m are “real”, corresponding to the vector fields X_1, \dots, X_m .)

Let $p, q \in M$ be arbitrary. The algorithm due to Sussmann and Lafferriere for steering the control system (1) from p to q is defined as follows:

STEP 1 Find fictitious inputs steering the *extended system*

$$\dot{x} = v_1 B_1(x) + \cdots + v_s B_s(x)$$

from p to q .

STEP 2 Find “real” inputs u_1, \dots, u_m which generate the same evolution as v_1, \dots, v_s .

Details follow.

STEP 1: First note that by bracket generating property of Δ , we have $s \geq n = \dim M$. Thus the first step is easy: simply take any curve γ connecting p and q , and for each t , express $\dot{\gamma}(t)$ as a linear combination of B_1, \dots, B_s . The coefficients are the desired fictitious inputs:

$$\dot{\gamma}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^s v_i(t) B_i(\gamma(t)).$$

STEP 2: Next, differentiate (2) with respect to t and use the chain rule:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{S}(t) &= \sum_{i=1}^s e^{h_s(t)B_s} \dots e^{h_{i+1}B_{i+1}} \cdot \dot{h}_i(t) B_i \cdot e^{h_{i-1}(t)B_{i-1}} \dots e^{h_1(t)B_1} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^s S(t) S_i(t) \{ \dot{h}_i(t) B_i \} S_i^{-1}(t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^s S(t) \text{Ad}_{S_i(t)}(\dot{h}_i(t) B_i), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where

$$S_i(t) = e^{-h_1(t)B_1} \dots e^{-h_{i-1}B_{i-1}}$$

and

$$\text{Ad}_T(X) = TXT^{-1}.$$

Since \mathcal{L} is nilpotent, it follows that

$$\text{Ad}_{S_i(t)}(B_i) = \sum_{j=1}^s p_{ij}(h(t)) B_j,$$

for some *polynomials* $p_{ij}(h_1, \dots, h_s)$, where $h(t) = (h_1(t), \dots, h_s(t))$. Substituting into (4), we obtain

$$\dot{S}(t) = S(t) \sum_{j=1}^s \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^s p_{ij}(h(t)) \dot{h}_i(t) \right\} B_j.$$

A comparison with (3) yields the following system of equation for the fictitious inputs $v = (v_1, \dots, v_s)^T$:

$$v(t) = P(h(t)) \dot{h}(t),$$

where $P(h) = [p_{ij}(h)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq s}$. It can be shown that $P(h)$ is invertible; denote its inverse by $Q(h)$. Then

$$\dot{h} = Q(v)v.$$

This is called the **Chen-Fliess-Sussmann equation**. Given v , obtained in STEP 1, we can use it to solve for h .

What remains to be done is to find “real” piecewise constant inputs u_1, \dots, u_m which generate the same motion. The basic idea is to use the Theorem 2.2 and the *Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff* formula to express the term $o(t^2)$ in terms of the higher order Lie brackets. Instead

of showing how to do this in general, here is an example. Here's an example of how to do this.

3.2. Example. Consider the case $n = 4, m = 2$, and $k = 3$. This corresponds to a control system $\dot{x} = u_1 X_1(x) + u_2 X_2(x)$ in \mathbb{R}^4 such that all Lie brackets of order > 3 vanish.

The Philip Hall basis of \mathcal{L} , the Lie algebra generated by X_1, X_2 , is

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= X_1 \\ B_2 &= X_2 \\ B_3 &= [X_1, X_2] \\ B_4 &= [X_1, [X_1, X_2]] = [B_1, B_2] \\ B_5 &= [X_2, [X_1, X_2]] = [B_2, B_3]. \end{aligned}$$

If we think of B_5 as a vector field in \mathbb{R}^4 (which we will need to do eventually), then B_5 can be expressed as a linear combination of B_1, \dots, B_4 , so we can take $v_5(t) = 0$. However, note that we cannot disregard B_5 , because we need a complete basis of \mathcal{L} in order for the algorithm to work.

Setting $s = 5$, differentiating (2), and expressing everything in terms of B_1, \dots, B_5 , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{h}_1(t) &\text{ multiplies } B_1 \\ \dot{h}_2(t) &\text{ multiplies } B_2 - h_1 B_3 + \frac{h_1^2}{2} B_4 \\ \dot{h}_3(t) &\text{ multiplies } B_3 - h_2 B_5 - h_1 B_4 \\ \dot{h}_4(t) &\text{ multiplies } B_4 \\ \dot{h}_5(t) &\text{ multiplies } B_5. \end{aligned}$$

The Chen-Fliess-Sussmann equation is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{h}_1 &= v_1 \\ \dot{h}_2 &= v_2 \\ \dot{h}_3 &= h_1 v_2 + v_3 \\ \dot{h}_4 &= \frac{h_1^2}{2} v_2 + h_1 v_3 + v_4 \\ \dot{h}_5 &= h_2 v_3 + h_1 h_2 v_2. \end{aligned}$$

Let us now assume that we would like to generate

$$S(T) = e^{\varepsilon B_5} e^{\delta B_4} e^{\gamma B_3} e^{\beta B_2} e^{\alpha B_1},$$

for some given numbers $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon$.

Remember that we only have *two inputs* available to achieve this. Denote by w_i the input that gives rise to e^{X_i} . It is easy to see that $w_1 = (1, 0)$ and $w_2 = (0, 1)$. It follows that

$\alpha w_1, \beta w_2$ generate $e^{\alpha B_1}, e^{\beta B_2}$, respectively. Denote the *concatenation* of paths by the symbol \sharp . Then

$$\alpha w_1 \sharp \beta w_2$$

generates $e^{\beta B_2} e^{\alpha B_1}$.

By the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula and nilpotency, it follows that

$$\sqrt{\gamma} w_1 \sharp \sqrt{\gamma} w_2 \sharp (-\sqrt{\gamma} w_1) \sharp (-\sqrt{\gamma} w_2)$$

generates

$$e^{\hat{\gamma} B_5} e^{\hat{\gamma} B_4} e^{\gamma B_3},$$

where $\hat{\gamma} = \frac{1}{2}\gamma^{3/2}$. It remains to generate $e^{\varepsilon B_5} e^{\delta B_4} e^{-\hat{\gamma} B_4} e^{\hat{\gamma} B_5}$.

Let $\rho = (\delta - \hat{\gamma})^{1/3}$ and $\sigma = (\varepsilon + \hat{\gamma})^{1/3}$. A long and tedious calculation (which we omit) shows that

$$\rho w_1 \sharp \rho w_1 \sharp \rho w_2 \sharp (-\rho w_1) \sharp (-\rho w_2) \sharp (-\rho w_1) \sharp \rho w_2 \sharp \rho w_1 \sharp (-\rho w_2) \sharp (-\rho w_1) \quad (5)$$

$$\sharp \sigma w_2 \sharp \sigma w_1 \sharp \sigma w_2 \sharp (-\sigma w_1) \sharp (-\sigma w_2) \sharp (-\sigma w_2) \sharp \sigma w_2 \sharp \sigma w_1 \sharp (-\sigma w_2) \sharp (-\sigma w_1). \quad (6)$$

Concatenating the above four pieces together, we obtain a control consisting of **26 pieces**. \square

What if the Lie algebra generated by the control vector fields is not nilpotent? Then there are at least two possibilities:

- (a) We can steer approximately using the above algorithm, or
- (b) We can try to *nilpotentize* the system, i.e., reparametrize it so that the new system (more precisely, the corresponding Lie algebra) becomes nilpotent.

Here is an example how the latter.

3.3. Example (Model of a unicycle). Consider the following model of a unicycle:

$$\dot{p} = u_1 X_1(p) + u_2 X_2(p),$$

with $p = (x, y, z)$, where $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is the *position* of the unicycle and $z \in [0, 2\pi]$ is the *angle* between the wheel and the positive x -axis. The control vector fields are

$$X_1(p) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos z \\ \sin z \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad X_2(p) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is not hard to check that the Lie algebra generated by X_1, X_2 is not nilpotent. However, if $|z| < \pi/2$, we can reparametrize the system using the following *feedback transformation*:

$$u_1 = \frac{1}{\cos z} v_1, \quad u_2 = (\cos^2 z) v_2.$$

We obtain a new system,

$$\dot{p} = v_1 Y_1(p) + v_2 Y_2(p),$$

where

$$Y_1(p) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \tan z \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \cos^2 z \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since

$$[Y_1, Y_2] = Y_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad [Y_1, Y_3] = [Y_2, Y_3] = 0,$$

the new system is indeed nilpotent of order 2. Furthermore, in the region defined by $|z| < \pi/2$, Y_1, Y_2 , and Y_3 span the tangent space. (Note that the feedback transformation did not change the bracket generating property of the control distribution.) \square

4. FURTHER READING

For a gentle and well-written introduction to smooth manifolds, I recommend Boothby's [Boo03]. The basics of nonlinear control theory can be found in [Sas99] and [NvdS90]. The former has more details on steering and an extensive bibliography. For an introduction to geometric control, see [Jur97]. An excellent introduction to sub-Riemannian geometry is [Mon02]. For details on steering (that is, motion planning), see [LS93].

REFERENCES

- [Boo03] William M. Boothby, *An Introduction to Differentiable Manifolds and Riemannian Geometry*, Academic Press, 2003.
- [Jur97] V. Jurdjevic, *Geometric control theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [LS93] Gerardo Lafferriere and Héctor J. Sussmann, *A differential geometric approach to motion planning*, in Nonholonomic Motion Planning, The Springer International Series in Engineering and Computer Science, Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [Mon02] Richard Montgomery, *A tour of subriemannian geometries, their geodesics and applications*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 91, AMS, 2002.
- [NvdS90] H. Nijmeijer and A. van der Schaft, *Nonlinear dynamical control systems*, Springer-Verlag, 1990.
- [Sas99] S. Shankar Sastry, *Nonlinear systems: analysis, stability, and control*, Springer-Verlag, 1999.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN JOSE, CA 95192-0103

Email address: slobodan.simic@sjsu.edu