

# Eco-driving under localization uncertainty for connected vehicles on Urban roads: Data-driven approach and Experiment verification

Eunhyek Joa      Eric Yongkeun Choi      Francesco Borrelli

**Abstract**—This paper addresses the eco-driving problem for connected vehicles on urban roads, considering localization uncertainty. Eco-driving is defined as longitudinal speed planning and control on roads with the presence of a sequence of traffic lights. We solve the problem by using a data-driven model predictive control (MPC) strategy. This approach involves learning a cost-to-go function and constraints from state-input data. The cost-to-go function represents the remaining energy-to-spend from the given state, and the constraints ensure that the controlled vehicle passes the upcoming traffic light timely while obeying traffic laws. The resulting convex optimization problem has a short horizon and is amenable for real-time implementations. We demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach through real-world vehicle experiments. Our method demonstrates 12% improvement in energy efficiency compared to the traditional approaches, which plan longitudinal speed by solving a long-horizon optimal control problem and track the planned speed using another controller, as evidenced by vehicle experiments.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the emerging era of smart cities, connected and automated vehicle (CAVs) technology offers significant advantages for daily driving and urban transportation [1]. Recognizing its potential, extensive research efforts have been dedicated to advancing CAV technology, which promises to enhance road utilization, vehicle energy efficiency, and traffic safety [2]–[4]. These improvements are largely attributable to reducing human errors and integrating comprehensive traffic information provided by connectivity technologies.

In this paper, we focus on the aspect of vehicle energy efficiency among the benefits of CAV technology, addressing what is commonly referred to as eco-driving problems [5]. Optimization-based algorithms have become the cornerstone for addressing eco-driving problems, and the primary objective of these algorithms is to minimize stops, along with unnecessary acceleration and deceleration, thereby significantly enhancing energy efficiency [6]. This goal is pursued by developing optimal control problems that incorporate both vehicle and powertrain dynamics, as well as the surrounding traffic agents such as surrounding vehicles and traffic lights.

Recent research has explored a two-level control architecture to address eco-driving challenges, effectively reducing model complexity by splitting the optimization problem into two manageable sub-problems. This approach has been employed in various optimization control methods, including Dynamic Programming (DP) [7], [8], Pontryagin’s Minimum

Principle (PMP) [9], [10], and Model Predictive Control (MPC) [11], which all aid in lessening the computational load for easier implementation. However, this bifurcation into sub-problems often results in sub-optimal outcomes and issues such as delay and latency. To address these drawbacks, there have been initiatives to resolve the problem within a singular control layer using deep reinforcement learning (DRL) [12]–[14]. Despite its promise, the sensitivity of DRL to parameter tuning and safety guarantees poses significant difficulties when applied in practical, real-world applications.

In practice, most eco-driving experiments leverage the two-level control architecture for the reasons mentioned above. However, as we approach the real-world application of connected and automated vehicles (CAVs), two primary issues arise. Firstly, the two-layer control architecture may introduce additional challenges beyond sub-optimality. Delays and latency discrepancies between the two layers can result in spatial and temporal misalignments, leading to conflicting control layer decisions. Furthermore, since each layer may prioritize different objectives (such as traffic light distance, speed limits, etc.), this can lead to the different tuning of controllers and thus varying vehicle performance. Secondly, the issue of vehicle localization uncertainty poses a challenge. Most existing studies presume the availability of precise position information, an assumption that may not hold in real-world scenarios. Upcoming CAV applications might have to rely on localization modules with lower accuracy, introducing non-negligible uncertainties, especially in scenarios like eco-approach at signalized intersections. Additionally, the computing power of most commercial vehicles is often insufficient for processing complex algorithms in real-time.

To address these challenges, we have developed a data-driven approach tailored to CAV eco-driving scenarios. This approach is designed to be computationally feasible and robust against localization uncertainties, offering a practical solution for the next imminent generation of CAV eco-driving technologies. Our contributions are summarized as:

- We propose a novel real-time, data-driven MPC to approximately solve an eco-driving problem under localization uncertainty for connected vehicles.
- The proposed MPC can ensure the controlled vehicle’s timely crossing of traffic lights within a user-defined duration in closed-loop, distinguishing it from previous research [7]–[9], which could only ensure such crossings in open-loop or during the planning phase.
- The proposed MPC is a convex optimization problem that can be solved using an off-the-shelf solver.
- We experimentally demonstrate the energy saving of the

The authors are with the Model Predictive Control Lab, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of California at Berkeley (e-mail: e.joa@berkeley.edu; yk90@berkeley.edu; fborrelli@berkeley.edu).

proposed algorithm through vehicle tests where the actual test vehicle is controlled to finish the given route under localization uncertainty while interacting with virtual, deterministic traffic lights.

*Notation:* Throughout the paper, we use the following notation.  $\mathbf{0}^{n \times m}$  represents an  $n$ -by- $m$  zero matrix. The positive semi-definite matrix  $P$  is denoted as  $P \geq 0$ . The Minkowski sum of two sets is denoted as  $\mathcal{X} \oplus \mathcal{Y} = \{x + y : x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ . The Pontryagin difference between two sets is defined as  $\mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{Y} = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : x + y \in \mathcal{X}, \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$ . The  $m$ -th column vector of a matrix  $H$  is denoted as  $[H]_m$ . The  $m$ -th component of a vector  $h$  is  $[h]_m$ . The notation  $x_{l:m}$  means the sequence of the variable  $x$  from time step  $l$  to time step  $m$ .

## II. PROBLEM SETUP

In this section, we formulate the problem of eco-driving for connected vehicles on urban roads under localization uncertainty. We assume that a route from a starting point A to a goal point B is given. Moreover, we assume that traffic light cycles are deterministic, and the road grade is small enough to neglect the gravitational potential energy in energy consumption.

### A. Route segmentation

Our route segmentation strategy is illustrated in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. The given route is a series of multiple, parameterized road segments.

We define a road segment as the combined section comprising a traffic light and the connected road. The parameters defining this segment are the current traffic light signal, a traffic light cycle, the remaining time of the current traffic light signal, and the distance to the traffic light. When considering the route from point A to point B in urban road driving, we consider it as a series of multiple road segments, each distinguished by varying parameters.

### B. Vehicle Model, Measurement Model, and Observer

We model vehicle longitudinal dynamics as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}(t) &= [s(t) \quad v_x(t)]^\top, \quad u(t) = a_x(t), \\ \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} u(t), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the state  $s$  represents a relative longitudinal position along the centerline of the given route, and  $v_x$  and  $a_x$  are vehicle longitudinal speed and acceleration, respectively. Throughout the paper, we will refer to  $s$  as the position for brevity. Forces due to road grade, air drag, and rolling resistance are not included in (1) because  $a_x$  is net longitudinal

acceleration. We regard controlling the vehicle under those forces as the task of the actuator-level controller.

We discretize the dynamics (1) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_k &= [s_k \quad v_{x,k}]^\top, \quad u_k = a_{x,k}, \\ \mathbf{x}_{k+1} &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{B}u_k, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_k$  denotes the state, and  $u_k$  denotes the input at time step  $k$ .  $s_k$  represents the position, while  $v_x$  and  $a_x$  correspond to the vehicle's longitudinal speed and acceleration at time step  $k$ . The discretization sampling time  $T_s$  is 1 sec.

At time step  $k$ , we measure the states from sensors as:

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{D}w_k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_k + \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} w_k, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{y}_k$  denotes sensor measurements at time step  $k$ . The position  $s$  is measured by localization modules and  $w$  represents its localization uncertainty. The speed  $v_x$  is measured by vehicle wheel encoders, We assume vehicle speed measurement noises are small enough to neglect them. We assume that the localization uncertainty  $w$  is a random variable with distribution  $p(w)$  and bounded convex polytope  $\mathcal{W}$  as follows:

$$w_k \sim p(w), \quad w_k \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (4)$$

In practice, the localization uncertainty may be designed as a Gaussian distribution, which is not bounded. In this case, a high confidence interval can be used to approximate  $\mathcal{W}$ .

We design a discrete state observer [15] with a predictor to estimate the state  $\mathbf{x}_k$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 &= \mathbf{y}_0, \\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} &= \mathbf{A}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k + \mathbf{B}u_k + \begin{bmatrix} L & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \left( \mathbf{y}_{k+1} - \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{A}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k + \mathbf{B}u_k) \right), \\ &= \mathbf{A}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k + \mathbf{B}u_k + \mathbf{F}n_k, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $L$  is an observer gain,  $\mathbf{F} = [1 \quad 0]^\top$ , and  $n_k = L(s_k - \hat{s}_k) + Lw_{k+1}$ , which is a lumped noise. Note that as the speed measurement is accurate, the observer (5) is designed to set the current speed estimate to the current speed measurement, i.e.,  $\hat{v}_{x,k} = [0 \quad 1]y_k$ . On the other hand, as the position measurement is not accurate, the observer (5) is designed to suppress the localization uncertainty.

*Proposition 1:* Let  $\Delta s_k = s_k - \hat{s}_k$ . Then,  $\Delta s_k \in \mathcal{W}$  and  $n_k \in 2L\mathcal{W}$  for all realizations of noise that satisfies (4).

*Proof:* From (2) and (5), we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}_0 &= [1 \quad 0]y_0, \quad \Delta s_0 = -w_0, \\ \Delta s_{k+1} &= (1 - L)\Delta s_k - Lw_{k+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

*Proof by induction.* First,  $\Delta s_0 = -w_0 \in \mathcal{W}$ . Now, let  $\Delta s_k \in \mathcal{W}$ . Since  $\Delta s_{k+1} = (1 - L)\Delta s_k - Lw_{k+1} \in (1 - L)\mathcal{W} \oplus L\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}$ ,  $\Delta s_{k+1} \in \mathcal{W}$ . Thus,  $\Delta s_k \in \mathcal{W}$  for all  $k \geq 0$  by induction. Furthermore,  $n_k = L\Delta s_k + Lw_{k+1} \in L\mathcal{W} \oplus L\mathcal{W} = 2L\mathcal{W}$ . ■

The lumped noise  $n_k$  is a random variable with distribution  $q(n)$  and bounded support  $2L\mathcal{W}$  as follows:

$$n_k \sim q(n), \quad n_k \in 2L\mathcal{W}. \quad (7)$$

$q(n)$  can be explicitly calculated by following [16, eq. (14), (15)] when  $p(w)$  is Gaussian. In practice, differential GPS, which offers centimeter-level accuracy in positioning, can be used to calculate  $n_k$  and approximate its density function  $q(n)$ .

### C. Energy Consumption Stage Cost

We define the energy  $E$  as the sum of the energy stored in battery and/or fuel tank  $E_{\text{stor}}$  and the kinetic energy  $E_{\text{kin}}$  as:

$$E(t) = E_{\text{stor}}(t) + E_{\text{kin}}(t). \quad (8)$$

The energy consumption at time step  $k$  is defined as the change in energy between time step  $k$  and  $k + 1$  as follows:

$$\Delta E_k = E(kT_s) - E((k + 1)T_s). \quad (9)$$

*Remark 1:* As the energy in (8) represents the total energy of the vehicle, which is the closed-system, the value of the total energy always decreases over time. Thus, the energy consumption in (9) is nonnegative for all time step  $k \geq 0$ .

We solve the following regression problem to obtain the parameterized energy consumption cost  $\ell(\mathbf{x}_k, u_k)$  given data:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}} \sum_{k=0}^{T_{\text{data}}} \|\Delta E_k - \ell(\mathbf{x}_k, u_k)\|_2^2 \\ \text{s.t., } \ell(\mathbf{x}_k, u_k) = [v_{x,k} \quad u_k \quad 1] \mathbf{P} \begin{bmatrix} v_{x,k} \\ u_k \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{P} \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $T_{\text{data}}$  is the end time of the data, and  $\mathbf{P}$  is a positive semi-definite matrix. The parametrized cost is designed to be nonnegative as the energy consumption (9) is nonnegative. It is noteworthy that our parameterized cost does not depend on the position whose actual value cannot be obtained. Thus, the following holds:

$$\ell(\mathbf{x}_k, u_k) = \ell(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k, u_k). \quad (11)$$

We collected the energy consumption data for our electric test vehicle using equipped sensors and solved the regression problem (10). The energy consumption measurement data used for the regression was collected from 3.9 km of city driving scenarios at a testing track. The comparison between the data and the regressed model is given in Fig. 2. The regression results show that the energy consumption calculated from the regressed model is non-negative and, the error of the total energy consumption is below 1%. The regression model validation results are presented in section IV.

### D. Constraints

System (2) is subject to the following constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_k \in \mathcal{X} = \{\mathbf{x} \mid 0 \leq [0 \quad 1] \mathbf{x} \leq v_{x,\text{max}}\}, \\ u_k \in \mathcal{U} = \{u \mid a_{x,\text{min}} \leq u \leq a_{x,\text{max}}\}, \\ \forall k \geq 0, \forall w_k \in \mathcal{W}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $v_{x,\text{max}}$  is the maximum allowable speed, and  $a_{x,\text{min,max}}$  is the minimum/maximum acceleration.  $\mathcal{X}$  is




Fig. 2. Comparison: Vehicle energy measurement data and Simulated energy consumption

a convex polyhedron, and  $\mathcal{U}$  is a polytope. As the state constraints are imposed on the vehicle speed,  $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathcal{X}$  is identical to  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k \in \mathcal{X}$ .

### E. Eco-Driving Problem for Connected Vehicles under Localization Uncertainty

The eco-driving problem for connected vehicles under localization uncertainty is a stochastic optimization problem due to stochastic localization uncertainty (4). Specifically, it can be formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J^*(\mathbf{x}_S) = \\ \min_{\Pi(\cdot)} \mathbb{E}_{w_0:T_f} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^{T_f} \ell(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k, \pi_k(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k)) \right] \\ \text{s.t., } \mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{B}\pi_k(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k), \\ \mathbf{y}_k = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{D}w_k, w_k \sim p(w), \\ \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k + \mathbf{B}u_k \\ + \begin{bmatrix} L & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \left( \mathbf{y}_{k+1} - \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{A}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k + \mathbf{B}u_k) \right), \\ \mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}_S, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 = \mathbf{y}_0, \\ \mathbf{x}_k \in \mathcal{X}, \pi_k(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k) \in \mathcal{U}, \forall w_k \in \mathcal{W}, \\ \mathbf{x}_{T_f} \in \mathcal{X}_f, \\ k = 0, \dots, T_f - 1, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $T_f \gg 0$  is the task horizon and  $\mathcal{X}_f$  represents the region beyond the goal point. The cost function is an expected sum of the regressed energy consumption state cost  $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$  in (10) evaluated for the estimated state trajectory. From (11), this cost is identical to the cost evaluated for the actual state trajectory. The system (2) should satisfy the state and input constraints (12) while minimizing the expected sum of costs. Solving this problem in real-time is challenging due to the long time horizon required to complete the given route and the presence of stochastic elements.

### F. Solution approach to the problem

We take three approaches to solve this problem, namely:

- (i) We consider the problem of crossing the current road segment within a specified time only at each step until the vehicle reaches goal point B.

- (ii) We solve a simpler constrained optimal control problem (OCP) with a short prediction horizon  $N \ll T_f$  in a receding horizon fashion.
- (iii) We approximate the expected cost in (13) with a sample mean.

(i) and (ii) are to alleviate computational costs due to the long time horizon required to complete the given route, while (iii) is to reformulate the expectation into a tractable term.

When we only consider the current road segment (as specified in (i)), the solution will not be necessarily relevant to the optimal solution of (13). To alleviate this issue, we utilize a high-level green wave search module such as in [8], [17], [18], which provides specific times for passing upcoming traffic lights without stopping.

When the horizon  $N$  is restricted (as specified in (ii)), it might result in a prediction horizon that does not cover the entire current road segment. This limitation could lead to myopic behavior, as the optimization process focuses solely on the costs within the  $N$  horizon stages. To prevent this myopic behavior arising from the limited prediction horizon, we design terminal constraints and a terminal cost function  $V(\cdot)$ . In this paper, we take a data-driven approach to obtain them.

### III. METHOD

In this section, we introduce the data-driven approach to calculate the terminal constraints and a terminal cost function  $V(\cdot)$  and present the proposed MPC.

#### A. Data: State-Input pairs

We generate the data set for the data-driven algorithm through two processes, initialization and augmentation.

*Remark 2:* In this paper at Sec. IV-C, the data set is generated through simulation. However, it is worth mentioning that data generation is not exclusively tied to simulation; it can also be accomplished through closed-loop testing.

To initialize the data set, we design a cruise control algorithm [19, Sec. IV. C], which satisfies the constraints (12). We collect state-input pairs while running the cruise control algorithm multiple times and construct the initial data set as follows:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_d, u_d)\}_{d=0}^{N_{\text{data}}^0} \quad (14)$$

where  $N_{\text{data}}^0$  represents the number of the data points after the initialization process.

We recursively augment the data set starting from the initial data set (14). We describe one iteration of the data augmentation process below. Using the provided data, we construct two sets to ensure passing the traffic light within the specific time while obeying the traffic light as per Sec. III-B. Later, an intersection of these two sets is utilized to define the terminal constraint. Moreover, we construct the terminal cost function as per Sec. III-C. We design the proposed MPC by imposing the terminal constraint on its terminal state and adding the terminal cost as per Sec. III-D. Subsequently, we run the proposed MPC. During this procedure, the proposed MPC can be infeasible when a set that satisfies the terminal

constraints is empty due to an insufficient amount of data. In this case, we employ the cruise control algorithm [19, Sec. IV. C] as a backup controller, which ensures the recursive feasibility of the proposed control algorithm. We collect state-input pairs at each time step, and augment the data set as follows:

$$\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \mathcal{D} \cup \{(\mathbf{x}_d, u_d)\}_{d=0}^{N_{\text{data}}^a}, \quad (15)$$

where  $N_{\text{data}}^a$  represents the number of augmenting data points. This data augmentation process iterates until the closed-loop performance is settled, which will be shown in Sec. IV-C.

#### B. Learning the terminal constraint

In this section, we design two sets in a data-driven way, and the intersection of these two sets will define the terminal constraint of the proposed MPC in Sec. III-D

We adopt the notion of *Robust Controllable Set* to design these two sets. A set is  $N$ -step *Robust Controllable*, if all states belonging to the set can be robustly driven against additive noises, through a time-varying control law, to the target set in  $N$ -step [20, Def.10.18]. We design two *Robust Controllable Sets* against additive lumped noise  $n$  (7):

- 1)  $\mathcal{S}_{t_{\text{red}}}$ :  $t_{\text{red}}$ -step Robust Controllable Set where the target set is the region before the traffic light, i.e.,  $\mathcal{T}_s = \{\mathbf{x} \mid [1 \ 0] \mathbf{x} \leq s_{\text{tl}}\}$ .
- 2)  $\mathcal{P}_{t_{\text{green}}}$ :  $t_{\text{green}}$ -step Robust Controllable Set where the target set is the region after the traffic light, i.e.,  $\mathcal{T}_p = \{\mathbf{x} \mid [1 \ 0] \mathbf{x} \geq s_{\text{tl}}\}$ .

$s_{\text{tl}}$  is the location of the upcoming traffic light.  $t_{\text{red}}$  and  $t_{\text{green}}$  are defined in Fig. 3 where  $k_{\text{pass}}$  denote the time to pass the traffic light specified by the high-level module.

The intersection of these two sets,  $\mathcal{S}_{t_{\text{red}}} \cap \mathcal{P}_{t_{\text{green}}}$ , is utilized to define the terminal constraint. Let  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k}$  denotes a predicted estimated state at time step  $k+N$  calculated from the current estimate  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k$ , i.e., a terminal state. Then, the terminal constraint,  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} \in \mathcal{S}_{t_{\text{red}}} \cap \mathcal{P}_{t_{\text{green}}}$ , enforces not to pass the traffic light before it turns green while guaranteeing that the vehicle crosses the traffic light within the time specified by the high-level module. Fig. 4 illustrates the terminal constraints.




Fig. 3. Definition of  $t_{\text{red}}$  and  $t_{\text{green}}$

In this paper, the sets  $\mathcal{S}_{t_{\text{red}}}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{t_{\text{green}}}$  are calculated in a data-driven way by Algorithm 1. The data  $\mathcal{D}$  in this algorithm are feasible state-input pairs  $\{(\mathbf{x}_d, u_d)\}_{d=0}^{N_{\text{data}}}$ , meaning that  $\mathbf{x}_d \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $u_d \in \mathcal{U}$  for all  $d \in \{0, \dots, N_{\text{data}}\}$ .  $\mathcal{R}_{i-1}$  represents  $i-1$ -step robust controllable set, which is initialized with to the target set  $\mathcal{T}$  at line 2. Line 6 at the iteration  $i$  checks whether the state  $\mathbf{x}_d$  of the system (5) can be robustly steered to  $\mathcal{R}_{i-1}$ . If the condition is satisfied, the state  $\mathbf{x}_d$  is included in a set  $\mathbb{X}$ . At the end of the iteration  $i$  (line 9),  $\mathcal{R}_i$  is set as the convex hull of the set  $\mathbb{X}$ .




Fig. 4. Illustration of the terminal constraints  $\mathcal{S}_{t_{\text{red}}}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{t_{\text{green}}}$ : the constraint  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} \in \mathcal{S}_{t_{\text{red}}}$  is to ensure that the vehicle stays behind the traffic light until  $t_{\text{red}} + N$  steps, while the constraint  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} \in \mathcal{P}_{t_{\text{green}}}$  is to ensure that the vehicle passes the traffic light within  $t_{\text{green}} + N$  steps.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Data-driven computation of  $t$ -step Robust Controllable Set  $\mathcal{R}_t$

---

**Input** : Data of feasible pairs  $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_d, u_d)\}_{d=0}^{N_{\text{data}}}$ ,  
Remaining steps  $t$ , Target convex set  $\mathcal{T}$ ,  
System parameters  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{W}, L$

**Output**:  $t$ -step Robust Controllable Set  $\mathcal{R}_t$

- 1  $\mathcal{R}_0 \leftarrow \mathcal{T}$
- 2 **for**  $i \leftarrow 1$  **to**  $t$  **do**
- 3      $\mathbb{X} \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 4     **for**  $j \leftarrow 0$  **to**  $N_{\text{data}}$  **do**
- 5         **if**  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_j + \mathbf{B}u_j \in \mathcal{R}_{i-1} \ominus 2LFW$  **then**
- 6              $\mathbb{X} \leftarrow \mathbb{X} \cup \{\mathbf{x}_j\}$
- 7         **end if**
- 8     **end for**
- 9      $\mathcal{R}_i \leftarrow \text{conv}(\mathbb{X})$
- 10 **end for**
- 11 **return**  $\mathcal{R}_t$

---

By the following theorem, the output of the Algorithm 1 is a  $t$ -step robust controllable set for a given target convex set  $\mathcal{T}$ .

*Theorem 1:* The output of Algorithm 1  $\mathcal{R}_t$  is  $t$ -step robust controllable set of the system (5) perturbed by the noise (7) for a given target convex set  $\mathcal{T}$  subject to the constraints (12).

*Proof:* See Appendix. ■

### C. Learning the terminal cost $V(\cdot)$

The terminal cost  $V(\cdot)$  of the proposed MPC in Sec. III-D represents the cost-to-go (or remaining energy-to-spend) function. The classical way to solve this problem is dynamic programming [21]–[23] which requires gridding the state and input space. Due to this gridding, the control input is restricted to elements of the discrete inputs, which is not desirable for automated vehicles where the passengers' comfort is also a major concern [24]. Moreover, as the size of the grid decreases, its computational cost exponentially increases. To resolve this issue, we modify and employ a data-driven method in [25], which does not require gridding and provides continuous inputs.

Given the data set  $\mathcal{D}$ , we calculate the cost-to-go values for all data points in backward from the set  $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathbf{x} \mid [1 \ 0] \mathbf{x} \geq s_{\text{tl}}\}$ , where the cost-to-go value of every point is zero.

Subsequently, the terminal cost  $V(\cdot)$  is calculated as a convex combination of the calculated cost-to-go values. Specifically, Algorithm 2 is employed to calculate the terminal cost. Note that  $\mathbf{J}_k$  declared in line 5 contains the cost-to-go values of the data points  $\{(\mathbf{x}_d, u_d)\}_{d=0}^{N_{\text{data}}}$  calculated until  $k$  iterations of while loop.  $\Delta$  in line 14 is a set of convex coefficients, i.e.,  $\Delta = \{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_{\text{data}} \times 1} \mid \boldsymbol{\lambda} \geq \mathbf{0}^{N_{\text{data}} \times 1}, \mathbf{1}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda} = 1\}$  where  $\mathbf{1}$  is an  $N_{\text{data}} \times 1$  vector filled with ones. The expectation in line 8 is approximated with a sample mean of its value.

---

**Algorithm 2:** Data-driven computation of  $V(\cdot)$

---

**Input** : Data of feasible pairs  $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_d, u_d)\}_{d=0}^{N_{\text{data}}}$ ,  
Target convex set  $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathbf{x} \mid [1 \ 0] \mathbf{x} \geq s_{\text{tl}}\}$ ,  
Parameters  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbf{W}, L, q(n)$

**Output**: The cost-to-go function  $V(x)$

- 1  $V_0(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \ \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}$
- 2  $\mathbf{J}_0 \leftarrow \mathbf{0}^{1 \times N_{\text{data}}}, k \leftarrow -1$
- 3 **repeat**
- 4      $\mathbf{J}_{k+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{0}^{1 \times N_{\text{data}}}, k \leftarrow k + 1$
- 5      $\mathcal{R}_k \leftarrow \text{Algorithm 1}(\mathcal{D}, k, \mathcal{T})$
- 6     **for**  $j \leftarrow 0$  **to**  $N_{\text{data}}$  **do**
- 7         **if**  $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_j + \mathbf{B}u_j \in \mathcal{R}_k \ominus 2LFW$  **then**
- 8              $[\mathbf{J}_{k+1}]_j \leftarrow \ell(\mathbf{x}_j, u_j) + \mathbb{E}_n[V_k(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_j + \mathbf{B}u_j + \mathbf{F}n)]$
- 9         **else**
- 10              $[\mathbf{J}_{k+1}]_j \leftarrow \infty$
- 11         **end if**
- 12     **end for**
- 13      $V_{k+1}(\mathbf{x}) \leftarrow \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Delta} \mathbf{J}_k \boldsymbol{\lambda} \text{ s.t. } \sum_{d=0}^{N_{\text{data}}} [\boldsymbol{\lambda}]_d \mathbf{x}_d = \mathbf{x}$
- 14 **until**  $\mathbf{J}_{k+1} = \mathbf{J}_k$
- 15  $V(\mathbf{x}) \leftarrow V_{k+1}(\mathbf{x})$
- 16 **return**  $V(\mathbf{x})$

---

### D. Model Predictive Control for Eco-driving

By incorporating the terminal constraints and the terminal cost function, we design an MPC controller as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{\text{MPC}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k) = & \\
\min_{\Pi(\cdot)} \mathbb{E}_{n_{0:N-1}} & \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \ell(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k}, \pi_k(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k})) + V(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k}) \right] \\
\text{s.t., } & \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i+1|k} = \mathbf{A}\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k} + \mathbf{B}\pi_k(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k}) + \mathbf{F}n_i, \\
& \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{0|k} = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k, n_i \sim q(n), \\
& \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{1|k} \oplus \mathbf{FW} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_s, \text{ if the light is red,} \\
& \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k} \in \mathcal{X}, \pi_k(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k}) \in \mathcal{U}, \forall n_i \in 2LW, \\
& \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} \oplus \mathbf{FW} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{t_{\text{red}}} \cap \mathcal{P}_{t_{\text{green}}}, \forall n_i \in 2LW, \\
& i = 0, \dots, N-1
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k}$  is a predicted state estimate at time step  $k+i$ , and  $\mathcal{T}_s = \{\mathbf{x} \mid [1 \ 0] \mathbf{x} \leq s_{\text{tl}}\}$ . Note that the estimation error  $\Delta s \in \mathcal{W}, \forall n_k \in 2LW$  from Proposition 1. Thus, the terminal constraint in (16) ensures that the predicted actual state  $\mathbf{x}_{N|k} \in \mathcal{S}_{t_{\text{red}}} \cap \mathcal{P}_{t_{\text{green}}}$ , and the constraint  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{1|k} \oplus \mathbf{FW} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_s$  ensures the vehicle stay behind the traffic light if traffic light color is red. We point out that as the system (5) is

uncertain, the optimal control problem (16) consists of finding state feedback policies  $\Pi(\cdot) = \{\pi_0(\cdot), \pi_1(\cdot), \dots, \pi_{N-1}(\cdot)\}$ . This MPC formulation is not computationally tractable as optimizing over control policies  $\{\pi_0(\cdot), \pi_1(\cdot), \dots\}$  involves an infinite-dimensional optimization.

We simplify the control policy as  $\pi_k(\cdot) = u_k$ , eliminating the need for expectations on the stage costs, and approximate the expectation of the terminal cost as a sample mean. Additionally, we reformulate the constraints on estimate states to those on nominal states<sup>1</sup>. Specifically, we design a tractable MPC controller as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{J}_{\text{MPC}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k, sn_{1:M}) = \\ & \min_{u_{0:N-1|k}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \ell(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k}, u_{i|k}) + \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M V(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} + \mathbf{F}sn_m) \\ & \text{s.t., } \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i+1|k} = \mathbf{A}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k} + \mathbf{B}u_{i|k} \\ & \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{0|k} = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k, \\ & \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{1|k} \in \mathcal{T}_s \ominus (2L+1)\mathbf{F}\mathcal{W}, \text{ if the light is red,} \\ & \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k} \in \mathcal{X}, u_{i|k} \in \mathcal{U}, \\ & \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} \in \mathcal{S}_{t_{\text{red}}} \ominus (2LN+1)\mathbf{F}\mathcal{W}, \\ & \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} \in \mathcal{P}_{t_{\text{green}}} \ominus (2LN+1)\mathbf{F}\mathcal{W}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where  $sn_{1:M}$  denotes  $M$  samples of noise derived from the random variable  $\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} n_i$ , where  $n_i$  follows a distribution  $q(w)$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k}$  is the nominal state and  $u_{i|k}$  is the input at predicted time step  $k+i$ . Note that the objective function in (17) is identical to that in (16) since the stage cost in (10) does not depend on the position and thus  $\ell(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_k, u_k) = \ell(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k, u_k)$ .

### E. Implementation

The proposed MPC (17) is a convex optimization problem. The stage cost is convex as  $\mathbf{P} \geq 0$  (10). The terminal cost  $V(\cdot)$  is convex as it is the optimal objective function of a multiparametric linear program [20, Thm 6.5] as described in line 14 of Algorithm 2. The system equation is linear, and state/input constraints (12) are convex. The set  $\mathcal{W}$  is convex polytope (4), and the sets  $\mathcal{S}_{t_{\text{red}}}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{t_{\text{green}}}$  are convex polytopes as they are calculated via convex hull operation of a finite number of points as described in line 9 of Algorithm 1. Since the Pontryagin difference between two convex polytopes is convex, the terminal constraints are convex.

To implement the proposed MPC (17), we utilize CVXPY [26] as a modeling language and MOSEK as a solver [27].

## IV. VALIDATION

### A. Baseline

There are two baseline algorithms considered in this study. The first baseline algorithm is the cruise controller detailed in Section III-A. The second baseline algorithm is the algorithm introduced in [28]. The major differences between the algorithm in [28] and the proposed algorithm are:

- The algorithm in [28] disregards localization uncertainty, while the proposed algorithm addresses this uncertainty.

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix for the details of the constraint reformulation and sample mean approximation.

- The algorithm in [28] cannot ensure passing each traffic light within a specified time, whereas the proposed algorithm can do so through terminal constraints.
- The algorithm in [28] determines speed references for the entire route, while the proposed algorithm calculates speed references for a short prediction horizon, requiring less computational power.
- The algorithm in [28] uses an additional speed tracking controller, while the proposed algorithm, as an MPC controller with longitudinal acceleration input, does not.

Note that for three algorithms, there is an actuator-level controller that converts longitudinal acceleration commands into electric motor torque inputs.

### B. Localization Uncertainty and Controller Parameters

Throughout the validation, we assume that a localization module provides position information every 1sec under the following localization uncertainty  $w$ :

$$p(w) \sim U(-3, 3), \mathcal{W} = \{w \mid 3 \leq w \leq 3\}, \quad (18)$$

where  $U$  represents a uniform distribution.  $3m$  in longitudinal position error exceeds the accuracy of lane-level positioning [29], which can be achievable using off-the-shelf systems using vision [30] and V2I communication [31]. It is 95% Circle of Error Probable (CEP) for commercially available GPS [32].

We set the prediction horizon  $N = 5$ , which represents 5sec prediction as the discretization time  $T_s = 1\text{sec}$ . The observer gain  $L$  in (5) is set to  $\frac{1}{4N}$ .

### C. Data collection and Training

We collect the data from two simple scenarios using simulation. Given the simplicity of the system (2), data collection through simulation is feasible.

In the first scenario, the vehicle's initial speed is set to zero and the testing road is a single road segment with fixed parameters outlined in Table I. Essentially, the vehicle needs to pass an upcoming traffic light, situated 200m away, within a 20-second interval as directed by the high-level module.

TABLE I  
PARAMETERS FOR THE SINGLE ROAD SEGMENT SCENARIO

Parameter	Value
Current traffic signal	Green
Traffic light cycle	Green: 30s, Yellow: 5s, Red: 25s
Remaining time/distance	25s/200m
Time to pass traffic light	20s

As explained in Sec. III-A, we initialize the data set by executing the cruise controller multiple times at different speeds. Subsequently, we employ MPC (17), computing the terminal constraints from Algorithm 1 and the terminal cost from Algorithm 2. While running the MPC (17), we record the closed-loop state and input pairs. After completing each task iteration, we augment the data using these state-input pairs.

Fig. 5 illustrates the learning curve in the single road segment scenario with fixed parameters. The x-axis denotes

the number of the data augmentation process by iteratively conducting the given scenario. Due to the uncertainty described in system (2), the total energy consumption is a random variable. Therefore, we calculate the sample mean of the total energy consumption by performing 100 Monte Carlo simulations of the system (2) in closed-loop using the MPC (17) after each data augmentation process is completed. The results demonstrate 16% improvement in total energy consumption as the number of data augmentations (or task iterations) increases, eventually leading to settled performance.




Fig. 5. Total Energy Consumption Improvement with Increasing Data Size. 100 Monte Carlo simulations for each task iteration.

In the second scenario, the vehicle maneuvers on a single road segment with randomized parameters and random initial speed. To cope with realistic scenarios where the parameter values and the initial speed vary, we introduce this training process. Upon augmenting the data 10 times in this second scenario, we conclude the training process.

#### D. Test setup and scenario

Our test setup and scenario are presented in Fig. 6. We utilized the retrofitted Hyundai Ioniq 5 as the test vehicle maneuvering around the physical testing site. Additionally, along the testing route, we located four virtual traffic lights at distances  $s = [189, \text{m}, 378, \text{m}, 490, \text{m}, 553, \text{m}]$ . We designed the traffic cycle of four traffic lights such that the vehicle can pass without stopping if it maintains a constant speed of 5m/s. The specified times for passing each traffic light are  $k_{\text{pass}} = [43, \text{sec}, 81\text{sec}, 103\text{sec}, 116\text{sec}]$ . There are no surrounding vehicles to evaluate the performance under free-flow conditions.

The initial condition of the test vehicle is idle speed, meaning no driver pedal inputs. Starting from idle speed, the vehicle needs to complete the given route under localization uncertainty while crossing each traffic light within the time specified by the high-level green wave search module.




Fig. 6. Test vehicle and scenario

#### E. Test results

The reference speed of the cruise controller is set to finish the given route within 116sec, which is the specified time to pass the fourth traffic light. The regularization parameter in [28, eq. (4)] is tuned to show a similar travel time to the proposed algorithm. For each algorithm, we conduct the same scenario five times and evaluate the energy consumption in (8). The change of  $E_{\text{stor}}$  is calculated using the equipped voltage and current sensors, while the change of  $E_{\text{kin}}$  is calculated by a change in kinetic energy between the initial and the end states. Energy consumption results are described in Table II. Compared to the cruise control with constant speed reference, the proposed algorithm shows 22% improvement in average energy consumption. Compared to the algorithm in [28], the proposed algorithm shows 11.6% improvement in average energy consumption while the proposed algorithm is 14.9% faster in average travel time.

TABLE II  
CLOSED-LOOP PERFORMANCE OF ALGORITHMS.  
MEAN(MINIMUM/MAXIMUM)

Algorithm	Energy consumption[kJ]	Travel time[s]
Cruise control	260.0(239.8/285.0)	114.5(114.1/115.0)
Algorithm [28]	229.4(202.3/279.8)	133.2(132.0/136.1)
Proposed	202.7(187.4/215.1)	113.4(113.1/113.5)

The speed and the travel time profiles are presented in

Fig.7. As illustrated in Fig.7. (b), the proposed algorithm crosses each traffic light within the time specified by a high-level green wave search module. This results in the completion of the given route with small fluctuation as illustrated in Fig.7. (a). In contrast, other algorithms show larger fluctuation as the controlled vehicles encounter red light. Though the algorithm [28] ensures timely crossing of traffic lights during the planning phase, the tracking controller fails to follow the planned speed reference due to tracking error, time latency, and difference in objective.




Fig. 7. Comparison: The proposed algorithm and the algorithm [28]

We further validated our regressed model in (10) with the test data. For each trial, we calculated the error in total energy consumption between the measurements and the regression model (10) as a percentage. The results are presented in Table III. Note that the value of the worst case error (6.3%) is lower than the minimum energy saving in Table II.

TABLE III  
ERROR OF THE TOTAL ENERGY CONSUMPTION (%)

Mean[%]	Standard deviation[%]	Worst case[%]
-1.06%	3.41%	-6.3%

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research work presented herein is funded by the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (ARPA-E), U.S. Department of Energy under DE-AR0000791.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] D. Elliott, W. Keen, and L. Miao, "Recent advances in connected and automated vehicles," *Journal of Traffic and Transportation Engineering (English Edition)*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 109–131, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2095756418302289>
- [2] J. Guanetti, Y. Kim, and F. Borrelli, "Control of connected and automated vehicles: State of the art and future challenges," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 45, pp. 18–40, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1367578818300336>
- [3] "Fuel consumption and transportation emissions evaluation of mixed traffic flow with connected automated vehicles and human-driven vehicles on expressway," *Energy*, vol. 230, p. 120766, 2021.
- [4] A. Karbasi and S. O'Hern, "Investigating the impact of connected and automated vehicles on signalized and unsignalized intersections safety in mixed traffic," *Future Transportation*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 24–40, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/2673-7590/2/1/2>
- [5] A. Sciarretta, G. De Nunzio, and L. L. Ojeda, "Optimal ecodriving control: Energy-efficient driving of road vehicles as an optimal control problem," *IEEE control systems magazine*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 71–90, 2015.
- [6] A. Sciarretta and A. Vahidi, *Energy-Efficient Driving of Road Vehicles: Toward Cooperative, Connected, and Automated Mobility*. Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- [7] S. Bae, Y. Choi, Y. Kim, J. Guanetti, F. Borrelli, and S. Moura, "Real-time ecological velocity planning for plug-in hybrid vehicles with partial communication to traffic lights," in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1279–1285.
- [8] C. Sun, J. Guanetti, F. Borrelli, and S. J. Moura, "Optimal eco-driving control of connected and autonomous vehicles through signalized intersections," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 3759–3773, 2020.
- [9] T. Ard, L. Guo, J. Han, Y. Jia, A. Vahidi, and D. Karbowski, "Energy-efficient driving in connected corridors via minimum principle control: Vehicle-in-the-loop experimental verification in mixed fleets," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, pp. 1–14, 2023.
- [10] J. Han, D. Shen, J. Jeong, M. D. Russo, N. Kim, J. J. Grave, D. Karbowski, A. Rousseau, and K. M. Stutenberg, "Energy impact of connecting multiple signalized intersections to energy-efficient driving: Simulation and experimental results," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 7, pp. 1297–1302, 2023.
- [11] S. K. Chada, A. Purbai, D. G6rges, A. Ebert, and R. Teutsch, "Ecological adaptive cruise control for urban environments using spat information," in *2020 IEEE Vehicle Power and Propulsion Conference (VPPC)*, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [12] V. Jayawardana and C. Wu, "Learning eco-driving strategies at signalized intersections," in *2022 European Control Conference (ECC)*, 2022, pp. 383–390.
- [13] Z. Bai, P. Hao, W. ShangGuan, B. Cai, and M. J. Barth, "Hybrid reinforcement learning-based eco-driving strategy for connected and automated vehicles at signalized intersections," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 15 850–15 863, 2022.
- [14] J. Li, X. Wu, M. Xu, and Y. Liu, "Deep reinforcement learning and reward shaping based eco-driving control for automated hevs among signalized intersections," *Energy*, vol. 251, p. 123924, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360544222008271>
- [15] K. Ogata *et al.*, *Modern control engineering*. Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2010, vol. 5.
- [16] E. Joa, M. Bujarbaruah, and F. Borrelli, "Output feedback stochastic mpc with hard input constraints," in *2023 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2023, pp. 2034–2039.
- [17] G. De Nunzio, C. C. De Wit, P. Moulin, and D. Di Domenico, "Eco-driving in urban traffic networks using traffic signals information," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 1307–1324, 2016.
- [18] N. Wan, A. Vahidi, and A. Luckow, "Optimal speed advisory for connected vehicles in arterial roads and the impact on mixed traffic," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 69, pp. 548–563, 2016.
- [19] E. Joa, H. Lee, E. Y. Choi, and F. Borrelli, "Energy-efficient lane changes planning and control for connected autonomous vehicles on urban roads," in *2023 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 2023, pp. 1–6.

- [20] F. Borrelli, A. Bemporad, and M. Morari, *Predictive control for linear and hybrid systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [21] D. Bertsekas, *Dynamic programming and optimal control: Volume I*. Athena scientific, 2012.
- [22] S. Bae, Y. Kim, Y. Choi, J. Guanetti, P. Gill, F. Borrelli, and S. J. Moura, "Ecological adaptive cruise control of plug-in hybrid electric vehicle with connected infrastructure and on-road experiments," *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control*, vol. 144, no. 1, p. 011109, 2022.
- [23] I. Yang, "A convex optimization approach to dynamic programming in continuous state and action spaces," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 187, no. 1, pp. 133–157, 2020.
- [24] D. González, J. Pérez, V. Milanés, and F. Nashashibi, "A review of motion planning techniques for automated vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on intelligent transportation systems*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 1135–1145, 2015.
- [25] E. Joa and F. Borrelli, "Approximate solution of stochastic infinite horizon optimal control problems for constrained linear uncertain systems," In preparation.
- [26] S. Diamond and S. Boyd, "CVXPY: A Python-embedded modeling language for convex optimization," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 17, no. 83, pp. 1–5, 2016.
- [27] M. ApS, *The MOSEK optimization toolbox for MATLAB manual. Version 10.0.*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://docs.mosek.com/9.0/toolbox/index.html>
- [28] S. Bae, Y. Kim, J. Guanetti, F. Borrelli, and S. Moura, "Design and implementation of ecological adaptive cruise control for autonomous driving with communication to traffic lights," in *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2019, pp. 4628–4634.
- [29] N. Williams and M. Barth, "A qualitative analysis of vehicle positioning requirements for connected vehicle applications," *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 225–242, 2020.
- [30] Mobileye. (2017) The mapping challenge. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mobileye.com/our-technology/rem/>
- [31] CohdaWireless, "White paper: V2x-locate location is everything in v2x," Tech. Rep. [Online]. Available: <https://www.cohdawireless.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/V2X-Locate-White-Paper-Final-Nov-2020.pdf>
- [32] VBOXAutomotive. Gps accuracy. [Online]. Available: <https://www.vboxautomotive.co.uk/index.php/en/products/data-loggers/28-how-does-it-work/75-gps-accuracy#>

## APPENDIX

### F. Proof of Theorem 1

All data points in  $\mathcal{D}$  satisfy the constraints (12) by construction. We prove the rest of the claim by induction

For  $i = 0$ , by definition of the robust controllable set [20, Def.10.18],  $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{T}$  is a 0-step robust controllable set of the system (5) perturbed by the noise (7) for the target convex set  $\mathcal{T}$  subject to the constraints (12).

Suppose that for some  $i \geq 0$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_i$ , declared in line 9 at iteration  $i$ , is an  $i$ -step robust controllable set of the system (5) perturbed by the noise (7) for the target convex set  $\mathcal{T}$  subject to the constraints (12). In line 6, we find data points such that the state  $\mathbf{x}_j$  of the system (5) can be robustly steered to  $\mathcal{R}_i$ . Let  $\{(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_s, \tilde{u}_s)\}_{s=0}^{N_s}$  denote a set of the data points that satisfy the condition in line 6. By definitions [20, Def.10.15 & 18],  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_s\}_{s=0}^{N_s}$  are elements of a  $i + 1$ -step robust controllable set.

Now, we prove convex combinations of  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_s\}_{s=0}^{N_s}$  are also elements of the  $i + 1$ -step robust controllable set. First, we show that convex combinations of data points  $\{(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_s, \tilde{u}_s)\}_{s=0}^{N_s}$  satisfy the constraints (12). This is true because  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  are convex sets. Second, we prove that convex combinations of  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_s\}_{s=0}^{N_s}$  can be robustly steered to  $\mathcal{R}_i$ .  $\mathcal{R}_i$  is convex as it is constructed by the convex hull operation in line 9 at iteration

$i$ . The following holds for all  $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall s_1, s_2 \in \{0, \dots, N_s\}, \\ & \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{s_1} + \mathbf{B}\tilde{u}_{s_1} + \mathbf{F}n_{s_1} \in \mathcal{R}_i, \forall n_{s_1} \in 2LW, \\ & \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{s_2} + \mathbf{B}\tilde{u}_{s_2} + \mathbf{F}n_{s_2} \in \mathcal{R}_i, \forall n_{s_2} \in 2LW. \\ \implies & \forall s_1, s_2 \in \{0, \dots, N_s\}, \forall n_{s_1}, n_{s_2} \in 2LW, \\ & \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_c := \lambda\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{s_1} + (1 - \lambda)\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{s_2}, \\ & \tilde{u}_c := \lambda\tilde{u}_{s_1} + (1 - \lambda)\tilde{u}_{s_2}, \\ & n_c := \lambda n_{s_1} + (1 - \lambda)n_{s_2}, \\ & \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_c + \mathbf{B}\tilde{u}_c + \mathbf{F}n_c \in \mathcal{R}_i \quad (\because \mathcal{R}_i \text{ is convex}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, as  $\mathcal{W}$  is a convex set,  $n_c$  belongs to the set  $2LW$  and can represent all realizations of noise in  $2LW$ . Thus, all convex combinations of  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_s\}_{s=0}^{N_s}$  are also elements of the  $i + 1$ -step robust controllable set. Therefore,  $\mathcal{R}_{i+1}$  is an  $i + 1$ -step robust controllable set when  $\mathcal{R}_i$  is an  $i$ -step robust controllable set. By induction, the claim is proved.

### G. Constraint reformulation

First, we consider the state and input constraints (12). These constraints do not depend on the noisy position. Moreover, the speed of the nominal state propagated from  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{0|k} = \hat{\mathbf{x}}_k$  is identical to that of the estimated state. Thus, we have that:

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k} \in \mathcal{X}, u_{i|k} \in \mathcal{U} \implies \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k} \in \mathcal{X}, u_k \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Second, we reformulate the terminal constraints in (16). From the dynamics in (16), the nominal dynamics in (17), and (7), we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_{i|k} &= \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k} - \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k}, \\ \mathbf{e}_{i+1|k} &= \mathbf{A}\mathbf{e}_{i|k} + \mathbf{F}n_i, \quad n_i \sim q(n). \end{aligned}$$

From the initial constraint in (17),  $\mathbf{e}_{0|k} = 0$ . Moreover,  $\mathbf{A}^i \mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}$ . Thus, we have that:

$$\mathbf{e}_{N|k} = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \mathbf{A}^i \mathbf{F} n_i = \mathbf{F} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} n_i. \quad (19)$$

From (7), we have that  $\mathbf{e}_{N|k} \in 2LNF\mathcal{W}$  which implies:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} \in \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} \oplus 2LNF\mathcal{W}, \quad \forall n_k \in 2LW.$$

Then, we have the following:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} + \mathbf{F}\mathcal{W} \in \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} \oplus 2LNF\mathcal{W} \oplus \mathbf{F}\mathcal{W}, \quad \forall n_k \in 2LW.$$

Thus, the terminal constraint on the nominal state in (17) is a necessary condition to the terminal constraint in (16).

Third, we reformulate the red light constraint in (16). Similar to the terminal constraint reformulation, we have that:

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{1|k} \oplus \mathbf{F}\mathcal{W} \in \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{1|k} \oplus 2LFW \oplus \mathbf{F}\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_s. \quad (20)$$

Thus, the red light constraint on the nominal state in (17) is a necessary condition to the red light constraint in (16).

### H. Sample Mean Approximation

From (19), the expectation of the terminal cost in (16) can be reformulated as follows:

$$\mathbb{E}_{w_0:N-1}[V(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k})] = \mathbb{E}_{n_0:N-1} \left[ V \left( \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} + \mathbf{F} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} n_i \right) \right].$$

Considering that  $sn_{1:M}$  denotes  $M$  samples of noise derived from the random variable  $\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} n_i$ , where  $n_i$  follows a distribution  $q(w)$ , we approximate the expectation with its sample mean as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{n_0:N-1} \left[ V \left( \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} + \mathbf{F} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} n_i \right) \right] \\ & \simeq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M V(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{N|k} + \mathbf{F} sn_m). \end{aligned}$$