

# Conformal Data-driven Control of Stochastic Multi-Agent Systems under Collaborative Signal Temporal Logic Specifications

Eleftherios E. Vlahakis<sup>1</sup>, Lars Lindemann<sup>2</sup> and Dimos V. Dimarogonas<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract**—We study the control of stochastic discrete-time linear multi-agent systems (MAS) subject to additive stochastic noise and collaborative signal temporal logic (STL) specifications to be satisfied with a desired probability. Given available disturbance datasets, we leverage conformal prediction (CP) to address the underlying chance-constrained multi-agent STL synthesis problem in a distribution-free manner. By introducing nonconformity scores as functions of prediction regions (PRs) of error trajectories, we develop an iterative PR-scaling and disturbance-feedback synthesis approach to bound training error trajectory samples. These bounds are then calibrated using a separate dataset, providing probabilistic guarantees via CP. Subsequently, we relax the underlying stochastic optimal control problem by tightening the robustness functions of collaborative tasks based on their Lipschitz constants and the computed error bounds. To address scalability, we exploit the compositional structure of the multi-agent STL formula and propose a model-predictive-control-like algorithm, where agent-level problems are solved in a distributed fashion. Lastly, we showcase the benefits of the proposed method in comparison with [1] via an illustrative example.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Multi-agent systems (MAS) arise in various applications, including robotics and cyber-physical systems, where multiple agents collaborate to accomplish a global objective. We use signal temporal logic (STL) to define MAS specifications, leveraging Boolean and temporal operators for precise spatio-temporal constraints [2], [3]. Under stochastic uncertainty, STL specifications are typically formulated as chance constraints, making STL control synthesis challenging, as chance-constrained problems are generally nonconvex and intractable [4]. Existing methods rely on constraint tightening [4]–[6] or analytic techniques [7], [8] to provide probabilistic guarantees. These approaches may be limited to Gaussian settings [7], computationally expensive [5], or rely on conservative concentration inequalities and union bounds [1], making them unsuitable for general MAS. In this work, we propose a tractable data-driven approach for STL synthesis of stochastic MAS under individual and collaborative STL tasks with probabilistic guarantees.

Data-driven methods can be flexible in relaxing probabilistic constraints by leveraging available samples and providing guarantees based on statistical tools such as conformal

prediction (CP). Originally introduced by Vovk and Shafer [9], CP uses a calibration dataset to infer prediction regions for a test point with a specified probability in a distribution-free manner. CP has recently been applied in control settings [10], and in the STL framework, for runtime verification problems, employing surrogate models for STL robustness, dynamic models, and conformal quantile regression [11]–[13] in single-agent formulations. Single-agent STL control synthesis under uncontrollable agents has been explored in [14] with probabilistic guarantees via CP, while a MAS reinforcement learning problem has been studied in [15] using CP, albeit without clear probabilistic guarantees.

In this paper, leveraging CP’s distribution independence, we address optimal task planning for stochastic MAS under collaborative STL specifications with data-driven noise information. Using cliques from graph theory, we define collaborative tasks for arbitrary agent groups, enabling a compositional structure of the multi-agent STL formula. Given disturbance sample datasets for each agent, we use CP to provide a distribution-free solution to the underlying multi-agent uncertainty quantification problem. To this end, we introduce nonconformity scores as functions of prediction regions (PRs) of aggregate error trajectories to capture uncertainty in collaborative tasks. We develop an iterative PR-scaling and disturbance-feedback synthesis approach bounding training error trajectory samples, subsequently calibrated on separate datasets to ensure probabilistic guarantees via CP. This approach yields tighter bounds than union-bound-based methods or approaches guided by the STL structure, which can be excessively conservative in MAS settings [1], [4]. The stochastic optimal control problem is then relaxed by tightening robustness functions of collaborative tasks based on their Lipschitz constants and computed error bounds. Finally, exploiting the compositional structure of the multi-agent STL formula, we propose a model-predictive-control-like algorithm, solving agent-level problems in a distributed fashion to improve scalability.

In the remainder of the paper, preliminaries and the problem setup are in Sec. II. Uncertainty quantification, feedback design, and probabilistic guarantees are in Sec. III, while STL control synthesis and distributed implementation are in Sec. IV. An illustrative numerical example is in Sec. V, whereas concluding remarks are discussed in Sec. VI.

## II. PROBLEM SETUP

### A. Notation and Preliminaries

The sets of real numbers and nonnegative integers are  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{N}$ , respectively. Let  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then,  $\mathbb{N}_{[0,N]} =$

This work was supported by the Swedish Research Council (VR), the Knut & Alice Wallenberg Foundation (KAW), the Horizon Europe Grant SymAware and the ERC Consolidator Grant LEAFHOUND. <sup>1</sup>Division of Decision and Control Systems, School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 10044, Stockholm, Sweden. Email: {vlahakis, dimos}@kth.se. <sup>2</sup>Thomas Lord Department of Computer Science, Viterbi School of Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 90089, CA, USA. Email: llindema@usc.edu.

$\{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ . Let  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  be vectors. Then,  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) = [x_1^\top \ \dots \ x_n^\top]^\top$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{x}(a : b) = (x(a), \dots, x(b))$  an aggregate vector consisting of  $x(t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{[a,b]}$ , representing a trajectory. When  $x(t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{[a,b]}$ , are random vectors,  $\mathbf{x}(a : b) = (x(a), \dots, x(b))$  is a random process. Let  $x_i(t)$ , for  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,N]}$  and  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{[1,M]}$ . Then,  $\mathbf{x}(0 : N) = (x(0), \dots, x(N))$  denotes an aggregate trajectory when  $x(t) = (x_1(t), \dots, x_M(t))$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,N]}$ . A random variable (vector)  $w$  following a distribution  $\mathcal{D}_w$  is denoted as  $w \sim \mathcal{D}_w$  and the expected value of  $w$  is  $\mathbb{E}(w)$ . The probability of event  $Y$  is  $\Pr\{Y\}$ .  $Q_\delta(\mathcal{D})$  is the  $\delta$ -th quantile of a distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , i.e., for  $Z \sim \mathcal{D}$ ,  $Q_\delta(\mathcal{D}) = \inf\{z : \Pr\{Z \leq z\} \geq \delta\}$ . The ceiling operator is  $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ . The cardinality of a set  $\mathcal{V}$  is  $|\mathcal{V}|$ . The symbol  $\otimes$  denotes the Kronecker product.

**Conformal Prediction:** Let  $\mathcal{R}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}$  be samples of an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variable  $\mathcal{R}$ . We will refer to  $\mathcal{R}^{(\varsigma)}$ ,  $\varsigma \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,k]}$ , as a nonconformity score. Given a failure probability  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , one wishes to obtain a bound  $q \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $\mathcal{R}^{(0)}$ , which we call test point, so that

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{R}^{(0)} \leq q\} \geq 1 - \theta, \quad (1)$$

where  $q$  is computed from the samples  $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}$ , which we call calibration dataset. Specifically,  $q$  may be attained as  $q = Q_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}, \infty)$ , which is the  $(1 - \theta)$ th quantile of the empirical distribution  $\{\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}, \infty\}$ . Assuming  $\mathcal{R}^{(1)} \leq \dots \leq \mathcal{R}^{(k)}$ , one can pick  $q = \mathcal{R}^{(p)}$ , where  $p = \lceil (k+1)(1-\theta) \rceil$ , which indicates the  $p$ th smallest nonconformity score. Note that  $q$  is finite with  $p \in \mathbb{N}_{[1,k]}$  if  $k \geq \lceil (k+1)(1-\theta) \rceil$ . This choice of  $q$  ensures that (1) holds since test point  $\mathcal{R}^{(0)}$  and calibration data  $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}$  are i.i.d. [16]. This is summarized below.

**Lemma 1** [16, Lemma 1] *If  $\mathcal{R}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}$  are i.i.d. random variables, then for any  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ , we have*

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{R}^{(0)} \leq Q_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}, \infty)\} \geq 1 - \theta. \quad (2)$$

**Remark 1** *The coverage guarantees in (2) are marginal as the probability is defined over the randomness in the draw of test and calibration points  $\mathcal{R}^{(0)}, \mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}$ . Conditional coverage guarantees of the form  $\Pr\{\mathcal{R}^{(0)} \leq C \mid \mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}\}$  are unfortunately not possible to obtain. However, one can show that the conditional probability is a random variable following a beta distribution centered at  $1 - \theta$  regardless of  $k$  [10], [17]. Notably, probably approximately correct coverage guarantees  $\Pr_c\{\Pr\{\mathcal{R}^{(0)} \leq Q_{1-\hat{\theta}}(\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}, \infty)\} \geq 1 - \theta\} \geq 1 - \beta$  can be obtained by setting  $\hat{\theta} = \theta - \sqrt{\frac{\ln(1/\beta)}{2k}}$ , with the ‘‘outer’’ probability  $\Pr_c$  taken with respect to the randomness in the draw of the calibration data  $\mathcal{R}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{R}^{(k)}$ , and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  [18].*

**Conditional value at risk (CVaR):** For a random variable  $\mathcal{R} \sim \mathcal{D}$  and confidence level  $(1 - \theta)$ ,  $\text{VaR}_{1-\theta}$  is defined as

$$\text{VaR}_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R}) := \inf\{\eta \in \mathbb{R} \mid \Pr\{\mathcal{R} \leq \eta\} \geq 1 - \theta\},$$

that is  $\text{VaR}_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R}) = Q_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{D})$ . Then, one can show that

$$\text{VaR}_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R}) \leq q \Leftrightarrow \Pr\{\mathcal{R} \leq q\} \geq 1 - \theta, \quad (3)$$

where a bound  $q$  can be obtained in a data-driven fashion as in (2). Let  $\mathcal{R}(M) : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a random variable. Unfortunately, optimizing  $\text{VaR}_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R}(M))$  is challenging since VaR is typically nonconvex in  $M$  even if  $\mathcal{R}(M)$  is a convex function. Alternatively, CVaR of  $\mathcal{R}$  with a confidence level of  $(1 - \theta)$ , denoted as  $\text{CVaR}_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R})$ , measures the expected value of  $\mathcal{R}$  in the  $\theta$ -tail exceeding the threshold  $\text{VaR}_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R})$ , i.e.,

$$\text{CVaR}_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R}) := \mathbb{E}(\mathcal{R} \mid \text{VaR}_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R}) \leq \mathcal{R}).$$

CVaR can be formulated as

$$\text{CVaR}_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R}) = \min_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}\left(\eta + \frac{1}{\theta}(\mathcal{R} - \eta)_+\right), \quad (4)$$

where  $(\cdot)_+ = \max\{0, \cdot\}$  [19]. Since CVaR is a coherent risk measure that satisfies conditions such as convexity and monotonicity [19], it is possible to optimize CVaR instead of VaR, using standard convex and linear programming techniques, relying on the fact that CVaR provides a tight upper bound for  $\text{VaR}_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R})$  [19], that is,

$$\text{VaR}_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R}) \leq \text{CVaR}_{1-\theta}(\mathcal{R}).$$

**Signal temporal logic:** We consider STL formulas with standard syntax

$$\varphi := \top \mid \pi \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \mid \phi_1 U_{[t_1, t_2]} \phi_2, \quad (5)$$

where  $\pi := (\mu(x) \geq 0)$  is a predicate,  $\mu(x) : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a predicate function of  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ , and  $\phi, \phi_1$ , and  $\phi_2$  are STL formulas, which are built recursively using predicates  $\pi$ , logical operators  $\neg$  and  $\wedge$ , and the *until* temporal operator  $U$ , with  $[t_1, t_2] \equiv \mathbb{N}_{[t_1, t_2]}$ . We omit  $\vee$  (*or*),  $\diamond$  (*eventually*) and  $\square$  (*always*) operators from (5) and the sequel, as these may be defined by (5), e.g.,  $\phi_1 \vee \phi_2 = \neg(\neg\phi_1 \wedge \neg\phi_2)$ ,  $\diamond_{[t_1, t_2]} \phi = \top U_{[t_1, t_2]} \phi$ , and  $\square_{[t_1, t_2]} \phi = \neg \diamond_{[t_1, t_2]} \neg \phi$ .

Let  $\pi$  be a predicate and  $\phi$  an STL formula. We denote by  $\mathbf{x}(t) \models \phi$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , the satisfaction of  $\phi$ , verified over  $\mathbf{x}(t) = (x(t), x(t+1), \dots)$ . The validity of a formula  $\phi$  can be verified using Boolean semantics:  $\mathbf{x}(t) \models \pi \Leftrightarrow \mu(x(t)) \geq 0$ ,  $\mathbf{x}(t) \models \neg\phi \Leftrightarrow \neg(\mathbf{x}(t) \models \phi)$ ,  $\mathbf{x}(t) \models \phi_1 \wedge \phi_2 \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{x}(t) \models \phi_1 \wedge \mathbf{x}(t) \models \phi_2$ ,  $\mathbf{x}(t) \models \phi_1 U_{[a,b]} \phi_2 \Leftrightarrow \exists \tau \in t \oplus \mathbb{N}_{[a,b]}$ , s.t.  $\mathbf{x}(\tau) \models \phi_2 \wedge \forall \tau' \in \mathbb{N}_{[t, \tau]}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}(\tau') \models \phi_1$ . Based on the Boolean semantics, the horizon of a formula is recursively defined as [2]:  $N^\pi = 0$ ,  $N^{\neg\phi} = N^\phi$ ,  $N^{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2} = \max(N^{\phi_1}, N^{\phi_2})$ ,  $N^{\phi_1 U_{[a,b]} \phi_2} = b + \max(N^{\phi_1}, N^{\phi_2})$ .

STL is endowed with quantitative semantics [3]: A scalar-valued function  $\rho^\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of a signal indicates how robustly a signal  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  satisfies a formula  $\phi$ . The robustness function is defined recursively as follows:  $\rho^\pi(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \mu(x(t))$ ,  $\rho^{\neg\phi}(\mathbf{x}(t)) = -\rho^\phi(\mathbf{x}(t))$ ,  $\rho^{\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2}(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \min(\rho^{\phi_1}(\mathbf{x}(t)), \rho^{\phi_2}(\mathbf{x}(t)))$ , and  $\rho^{\phi_1 U_{[a,b]} \phi_2}(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \max_{\tau \in t \oplus \mathbb{N}_{[a,b]}} (\min(Y_1(\tau), Y_2(\tau)))$ , with  $Y_1(\tau) = \rho^{\phi_1}(\mathbf{x}(\tau))$ ,  $Y_2(\tau) = \min_{\tau' \in \mathbb{N}_{[t, \tau]}} \rho^{\phi_2}(\mathbf{x}(\tau'))$ ,  $\pi$  being a predicate, and  $\phi, \phi_1$ , and  $\phi_2$  being STL formulas.

To facilitate the definition of joint STL formulas for agents involved in collaborative tasks, we borrow the concept of cliques from graph theory to represent groups of agents engaged in the same STL task. The definition of cliques is provided next.

**Definition 1** Let  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  be an undirected graph potentially containing self-loops and multiple edges with node set  $\mathcal{V}$ , cardinality  $M = |\mathcal{V}|$ , and edge set  $\mathcal{E}$ . Let also  $\mathcal{V}' \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ , with  $|\mathcal{V}'| \geq 1$ , and define  $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{V}'} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$  as the set of edges connecting the nodes  $\mathcal{V}'$ . Then,  $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{V}', \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{V}'})$  is a clique [20], if  $\mathcal{G}'$  is a complete graph. The set of cliques of  $\mathcal{G}$  is defined as  $\mathcal{K} = \{\nu \subseteq \mathcal{V} \mid (\nu, \mathcal{E}_\nu) \text{ is a complete subgraph of } \mathcal{G}\}$ .

Consider a graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  with clique set  $\mathcal{K}$ , a clique  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}$ , with  $\nu = (i_1, \dots, i_{|\nu|})$ , and vectors  $x_{i_j}(t)$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, |\nu|]}$ , with  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then,  $x_\nu(t) = (x_{i_1}(t), \dots, x_{i_{|\nu|}}(t))$  is an aggregate vector. We denote by  $x_\nu(t) \models \phi$  the validity of an STL formula defined over the aggregate trajectory  $x_\nu(t) = (x_\nu(t), x_\nu(t+1), \dots)$ , which verifies that  $\rho^\phi(x_\nu(t)) \geq 0$ .

## B. Multi-agent system

1) *Dynamics*: We consider  $M$  agents with dynamics

$$x_i(t+1) = A_i x_i(t) + B_i u_i(t) + w_i(t), \quad (6)$$

where  $x_i(t) \in \mathcal{X}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ ,  $u_i \in \mathcal{U}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ , and  $w_i(t) \in \mathcal{W}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ ,  $w_i(0 : N-1) \sim \mathcal{D}_{w_i}$  are the state, input and disturbance vectors, respectively, the initial condition,  $x_i(0)$ , is known,  $(A_i, B_i)$  is a stabilizable pair, with  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ ,  $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times m_i}$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, M]}$ , and  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\nu = (i_1, \dots, i_{|\nu|})$ , where  $i_j \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, M]}$ , with  $j \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, |\nu|]}$ . By collecting individual state, input, and disturbance vectors, as  $x_\nu(t) = (x_{i_1}(t), \dots, x_{i_{|\nu|}}(t)) \in \mathcal{X}_\nu \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\nu}$ ,  $u_\nu(t) = (u_{i_1}(t), \dots, u_{i_{|\nu|}}(t)) \in \mathcal{U}_\nu \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m_\nu}$ , and  $w_\nu(t) = (w_{i_1}(t), \dots, w_{i_{|\nu|}}(t)) \in \mathcal{W}_\nu \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\nu}$ , respectively, we write the aggregate dynamics of  $|\nu|$  agents as

$$x_\nu(t+1) = A_\nu x_\nu(t) + B_\nu u_\nu(t) + w_\nu(t), \quad (7)$$

where  $A_\nu = \text{diag}(A_{i_1}, \dots, A_{i_{|\nu|}})$ ,  $B_\nu = \text{diag}(B_{i_1}, \dots, B_{i_{|\nu|}})$ , and the state, input, and disturbance sets are  $\mathcal{X}_\nu = \mathcal{X}_{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_{i_{|\nu|}}$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_\nu = \mathcal{U}_{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{U}_{i_{|\nu|}}$ , and  $\mathcal{W}_\nu = \mathcal{W}_{i_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{W}_{i_{|\nu|}}$ , respectively. When  $\nu = (1, \dots, M)$ , the aggregate dynamics of the entire MAS are written as

$$x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + w(t), \quad (8)$$

where  $A = \text{diag}(A_1, \dots, A_M)$  and  $B = \text{diag}(B_1, \dots, B_M)$ . Next, we define  $\nu$  as a clique indicating a group of agents (or an individual agent) involved in a collaborative (or an individual) STL task.

2) *STL specification*: Let  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, M\}$  denote the set of indices of all agents in MAS. The MAS is subject to a conjunctive STL formula, given by

$$\phi = \bigwedge_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi} \phi_\nu, \quad (9)$$

where each conjunct  $\phi_\nu$  follows the syntax in (5) and represents a formula that involves a group of agents  $\nu$ , which we call a clique indicating all agents in  $\nu$  can interact with each other. The set  $\mathcal{K}_\phi$  collects all these cliques induced by  $\phi$ , and may include individual agents ( $|\nu| = 1$ ) or group of agents ( $1 < |\nu| \leq |\mathcal{V}|$ ).

The structure of  $\phi$  in (9) induces an interaction graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ , where  $\mathcal{V}$  is the set of nodes, and  $\mathcal{E} = \{(\nu_i, \nu_j) \mid \nu_i, \nu_j \in \nu, \nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi\}$  is the set of edges. Note that  $\mathcal{E}$  may include self loops (indicating individual tasks) and multiple edges (indicating that two agents may be jointly involved in more than one collaborative task).

Next, let  $\pi := (\mu(y) \geq 0)$  be a predicate in  $\phi$ , where  $\mu(y) : \mathbb{R}^{n_y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . The vector  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$  can represent either an individual state vector  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ , where  $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ , or an aggregate state vector  $x_\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\nu}$  that collects the states of agents in clique  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$ .

3) *Disturbance*: Let  $w_i(0:N-1) = \{w_i(0), w_i(1), \dots, w_i(N-1)\}$  denote the disturbance sequence for the  $i$ th agent. We assume that the joint distribution  $\mathcal{D}_{w_i}$  of the random vectors  $w_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{[0, N-1]}$ , is unknown, and instead that a disturbance dataset,  $\mathcal{D}^{w_i} = \{w_i^{(0)}, \dots, w_i^{(k)}\}$ , of  $k+1$  samples is available, with  $w_i^{(\varsigma)} = (w_i^{(\varsigma)}(0), \dots, w_i^{(\varsigma)}(N-1))$ ,  $\varsigma \in \mathbb{N}_{[0, k]}$ . We assume that the disturbance sequence samples in  $\mathcal{D}^{w_i}$  are independent, where each sample represents one realization of the process. We also assume that trajectory samples  $w_i^{(\varsigma)}$  are independent agent-wise, that is  $w_i^{(\varsigma)}$ ,  $w_j^{(\varsigma)}$  are independent for all  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, M]}$  and  $\varsigma \in \mathbb{N}_{[0, k]}$ . Note that although  $w_i^{(\varsigma)}$ ,  $\varsigma \in \mathbb{N}_{[0, k]}$ , are assumed to be independent, the random vectors  $w_i(t)$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{[0, N-1]}$ , may be correlated across time for the  $i$ th agent. We partition  $\mathcal{D}^{w_i}$  into training and calibration datasets,  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{w_i} = \{w_i^{(k_1+1)}, \dots, w_i^{(k)}\}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cal}}^{w_i} = \{w_i^{(1)}, \dots, w_i^{(k_1)}\}$ , where  $k_1 + 1 < k$ .

## C. Problem statement

We wish to solve the stochastic optimal control problem

$$\underset{\mathbf{x}(0:N-1)}{\text{Min.}} \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{i=1}^M \left( \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} (\ell_i(x_i(t), u_i(t))) + V_{f,i}(x_i(N)) \right) \right)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + w(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{N}_{[0, N]},$$

$$\Pr \{x(0 : N) \models \phi\} \geq 1 - \theta, \quad \text{with } x(0) = x_0, \quad (10)$$

where  $\ell_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $V_{f,i} : \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the optimization variables are  $\mathbf{u}(0:N-1) = (u(0), \dots, u(N-1))$ ,  $\mathbf{x}(0:N) = (x(0), \dots, x(N))$ , with  $u(t) = (u_1(t), \dots, u_M(t))$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{[0, N-1]}$ , and  $x(t) = (x_1(t), \dots, x_M(t))$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{[0, N]}$ , respectively,  $\phi$  is a multi-agent STL formula, with structure as in (9) and syntax as in (5), to be satisfied by  $\mathbf{x}(0:N)$  with a probability  $1 - \theta$ , where  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $x_0$  is a known initial condition of the MAS, and  $N$  is the horizon of  $\phi$ . Solving the problem directly is challenging due to the probabilistic constraint, the expectation operator in the cost function, the lack of information on the distribution of the disturbance  $w(t)$ , and the growing complexity with the number of agents. Note

that based on the multi-agent STL formula in (9), the STL chance constraint in (10) is equivalently written as

$$\Pr\{\mathbf{x}_\nu(0:N) \models \phi_\nu, \forall \nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi\} \geq 1 - \theta. \quad (11)$$

### III. DATA-DRIVEN UNCERTAINTY QUANTIFICATION AND FEEDBACK DESIGN

#### A. Decomposition of dynamics

Due to the linearity in (6), the state of each agent can be decomposed into a deterministic part,  $z_i(t)$ , and an error,  $e_i(t)$ , i.e.,  $x_i(t) = z_i(t) + e_i(t)$ . Consider the disturbance-feedback control policy [21]

$$u_i(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \Gamma_i^{t,k} w_i(k) + v_i(t), \quad (12)$$

which is causal, since the disturbance sequence  $\{w_i(0), \dots, w_i(t-1)\}$  is measurable at time  $t$ , with  $\Gamma_i^{t,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_i \times n_i}$ . Then,

$$z_i(t+1) = A_i z_i(t) + B_i v_i(t), \quad (13a)$$

$$e_i(t+1) = A_i e_i(t) + B_i \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \Gamma_i^{t,k} w_i(k) + w_i(t), \quad (13b)$$

where  $z_i(0) = x_i(0)$  and  $e_i(0) = 0$ . Consider a clique  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$ , where  $\nu = (i_1, \dots, i_{|\nu|})$ , let

$$\Gamma_\nu^{t,k} = \text{diag}(\Gamma_{i_1}^{t,k}, \dots, \Gamma_{i_{|\nu|}}^{t,k}), \quad (14)$$

and define the aggregate vectors  $z_\nu(t) = (z_{i_1}(t), \dots, z_{i_{|\nu|}}(t))$ ,  $e_\nu(t) = (e_{i_1}(t), \dots, e_{i_{|\nu|}}(t))$ , and  $v_\nu(t) = (v_{i_1}(t), \dots, v_{i_{|\nu|}}(t))$ . Then, the aggregate dynamics of the agents in  $\nu$  can be decomposed into

$$z_\nu(t+1) = A_\nu z_\nu(t) + B_\nu v_\nu(t), \quad (15a)$$

$$e_\nu(t+1) = A_\nu e_\nu(t) + \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \Gamma_\nu^{t,k} w_\nu(k) + w_\nu(t). \quad (15b)$$

Given particular disturbance feedback gains  $\Gamma_\nu^{t,k}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,t-1]}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{[1,H-1]}$ , the error system in (15b) can be analyzed independently of the one in (15a). The above control choice will allow us to analyze prediction regions of trajectories or the error systems in (15b). We are interested in prediction regions as defined next.

**Definition 2** Let  $\mathbf{y}(a:b) \in \mathbb{R}^{n(b-a)}$  be a random process, with  $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{[a,b]}$ . We call the ball  $\mathbb{B}(q) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n(b-a)}$  a prediction region (PR) of  $\mathbf{y}(a:b)$  at probability level  $1 - \theta$ , if  $\Pr\{\|\mathbf{y}(a:b)\| \leq q\} \geq 1 - \theta$ .

We aim to determine parameters to tighten the robustness functions of the formulas  $\phi_\nu$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$  guided by the size of PRs obtained for the error systems in (15b), in light of the probabilistic constraint in (10) or equivalently in (11). The following proposition underpins this approach.

**Proposition 1** Let  $\mathbf{x}(0:N) = \mathbf{z}(0:N) + \mathbf{e}(0:N)$ , with  $\mathbf{x}(0:N) = (x(0), \dots, x(N))$ ,  $\mathbf{z}(0:N) = (z(0), \dots, z(N))$  and  $\mathbf{e}(0:N) = (e(0), \dots, e(N))$ . Let  $q > 0$  be such that

$\Pr\{e(0:N) \in \mathbb{B}(q)\} \geq 1 - \theta$ . If  $\mathbf{z}(0:N) + \mathbf{e}(0:N) \models \phi$  for all  $e(0:N) \in \mathbb{B}(q)$ , then  $\Pr\{\mathbf{x}(0) \models \phi\} \geq 1 - \theta$ .

*Proof:* Define events  $Y_x := \mathbf{x}(0) \models \phi$ ,  $Y_e := e(0:N) \in \mathbb{B}(q)$ , and let  $Y_e'$  be the complement of  $Y_e$ . From the law of total probability, it follows that  $\Pr\{Y_x\} = \Pr\{Y_x|Y_e\}\Pr\{Y_e\} + \Pr\{Y_x|Y_e'\}\Pr\{Y_e'\} \geq 1 - \theta$ , since by assumption,  $\Pr\{Y_x|Y_e\} = 1$  and  $\Pr\{Y_e\} \geq 1 - \theta$ , and  $\Pr\{Y_x|Y_e'\}\Pr\{Y_e'\} \geq 0$ . ■

#### B. Error trajectory samples

To facilitate the proposed data-driven design approach, we construct error trajectory samples for each agent, using the available disturbance datasets and the error dynamics in (13b) with initial condition  $e_i(0) = 0$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{[1,M]}$ . Specifically, let matrices  $A_i$  and  $\Gamma_i$  be defined as

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_{n_i} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ A_i & I_{n_i} & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_i^{N-1} & A_i^{N-2} & \dots & I_{n_i} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \Gamma_i^{1,0} & 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \Gamma_i^{2,0} & \Gamma_i^{2,1} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Gamma_i^{N-1,0} & \Gamma_i^{N-1,1} & \dots & \Gamma_i^{N-1,N-2} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

respectively, and  $B_i = A_i(I_N \otimes B_i)$ . Then, for the  $i$ th agent, a dataset with error trajectory samples  $\mathbf{e}_i^{(\varsigma)}(1:N) = (e_i^{(\varsigma)}(1), \dots, e_i^{(\varsigma)}(N))$  can be constructed from disturbance samples  $\mathbf{w}_i^{(\varsigma)}(0:N-1) \in \mathcal{D}^{w_i}$  as

$$\mathcal{D}^{e_i} = \{\mathbf{e}_i^{(0)}(1:N), \dots, \mathbf{e}_i^{(k)}(1:N)\}, \quad (17a)$$

$$\mathbf{e}_i^{(\varsigma)}(1:N) = (A_i + B_i \Gamma_i) \mathbf{w}_i^{(\varsigma)}(0:N-1), \varsigma \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,k]}. \quad (17b)$$

The linear dependence of the error trajectories on the gains  $\Gamma_i$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{[1,M]}$ , facilitates the disturbance feedback design in parallel with quantification of appropriate PRs for the error trajectories. In the following, we partition  $\mathcal{D}^{e_i}$  into  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{e_i}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cal}}^{e_i}$ , where trajectory samples in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{e_i}$  are constructed by disturbance samples in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{w_i}$  and are parameterized by the disturbance feedback gains  $\Gamma_i$ , while trajectory samples in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cal}}^{e_i}$  are constructed by disturbance samples in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cal}}^{w_i}$  for fixed disturbance feedback gains. We use the  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{e_i}$  dataset for feedback design in Sec. III-C, and the  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cal}}^{e_i}$  dataset to obtain PRs with probabilistic guarantees in Sec. III-D.

#### C. Data-driven PR scaling and disturbance feedback design

Here, we present a data-driven approach to designing disturbance feedback gains  $\Gamma_i$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{[1,M]}$ , and scaling parameters  $C_\nu$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$  to weigh the size of PRs of the trajectories of the error systems in (15b) corresponding to agents involved in cliques  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$ , using the training dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{e_i}$ . To this end, we introduce nonconformity scores  $E^{(\varsigma)}(C, \Gamma)$ ,  $\varsigma \in \mathbb{N}_{[k_1+1, k]}$ , which are parameterized over the disturbance feedback gains in  $\Gamma = \{\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_M\}$  and the weights in  $C = \{C_\nu\}_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi}$ , defined as

$$E^{(\varsigma)}(C, \Gamma) = \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi} (C_\nu \|\mathbf{e}_\nu^{(\varsigma)}(1:N)\|), \quad (18)$$

where  $e_\nu^{(\varsigma)}(1 : N) = (e_\nu(1), \dots, e_\nu(N))$ , with  $\nu = (i_1, \dots, i_{|\nu|})$  and  $e_{i_j}^{(\varsigma)}(t)$  defined as in (17b), for  $j \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, |\nu|]}$ . The synthesis of disturbance feedback gains in  $\Gamma$  and weights in  $C$  is formulated by the following optimization problem

$$\text{Minimize}_{C, \Gamma} Q_{\hat{\theta}} \left( E^{(k_1+1)}(C, \Gamma), \dots, E^{(k)}(C, \Gamma) \right) \quad (19a)$$

$$\text{subject to } 0 \leq C_\nu \leq 1, \nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi, \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi} C_\nu = 1, \quad (19b)$$

with  $\Gamma_i$  as in (16), and  $\hat{\theta} = (1 + \frac{1}{k-k_1-1})(1 - \theta)$ , where the confidence  $1 - \theta$  is replaced by  $(1 + \frac{1}{k-k_1-1})(1 - \theta)$  (see [10, Sec. 2.1] for details). Despite the linearity of error trajectories in (17b) in  $\Gamma_i$ , the nonconformity score in (18) is not jointly convex in the feedback gains in  $\Gamma$  and the weights in  $C$ . Moreover, even when the weights in  $C$  are fixed, the  $\text{VaR}_{\hat{\theta}}$  cost is not necessarily convex, and the problem in (19) can be addressed via an efficient nonlinear solver. A similar data-driven feedback synthesis problem is addressed in our previous work [22, Sec. IV], where a genetic algorithm was successfully employed in a single-agent setting. While the problem in (19) could be tackled similarly, we propose a CVaR-based iterative relaxation, which may be beneficial in our multi-agent setting, where complexity increases with the number of agents. Specifically, leveraging the bilinear dependence of the nonconformity scores in (18) on the variables in  $C$  and in  $\Gamma$ , we propose an iterative procedure to optimize sequentially over  $C$  and  $\Gamma$  by solving convex problems employing the properties of CVaR. Specifically, we define

$$P := \text{Minimize}_{\eta \geq 0, Y^{(\varsigma)}, C, \Gamma} \eta + \frac{1}{q} \sum_{\varsigma=k_1+1}^k (Y^{(\varsigma)} - \eta)_+ \text{ s. t.} \quad (20a)$$

$$Y^{(\varsigma)} \geq C_\nu \|e_\nu^{(\varsigma)}(1:N)\|, \forall \nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi, \varsigma \in \mathbb{N}_{(k_1, k]}, \quad (20b)$$

$$0 \leq C_\nu \leq 1, \nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi, \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi} C_\nu = 1, \quad (20c)$$

where  $q = (k-k_1-1)(1-\hat{\theta})$ , and the variables  $Y^{(\varsigma)}$  are introduced to address the max operator in (18) by the constraints in (20b). Next, we denote by  $P(C)$  the optimization in (20) for fixed weights in  $C$  and by  $P(\Gamma)$  the optimization in (20) for fixed feedback gains in  $\Gamma$ . Algorithm 1 summarizes a procedure for solving (20) iteratively. We

---

**Algorithm 1** Iterative procedure for solving (20)

---

- 1: Set  $C^0 = \{C_\nu = 0 \text{ for } |\nu| > 1, C_i = \frac{1}{M} \text{ for } i \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, M]}\}$
  - 2: **for**  $\tau$  in  $1 : \tau_{\max}$  **do**
  - 3:     Solve  $P(C^{\tau-1})$  and return  $\Gamma^\tau$
  - 4:     Solve  $P(\Gamma^\tau)$  and return  $C^\tau$ .
  - 5: **return**  $(C^* \leftarrow C^{\tau_{\max}}, \Gamma^* \leftarrow \Gamma^{\tau_{\max}})$
- 

note that the optimization problems  $P(C)$  and  $P(\Gamma)$  solved at each iteration of Algorithm 1 are convex, ensuring that the algorithm can be executed efficiently. While it does not guarantee convergence to a local optimum, since  $P(C)$  and  $P(\Gamma)$  optimize over one subset of variables at a time, this

iterative technique, known as a (block-)coordinate descent algorithm, is a widely used heuristic that performs well in practice for a small number of iterations.

#### D. Error prediction regions

Given the disturbance feedback gains  $\Gamma^* = \{\Gamma_1^*, \dots, \Gamma_M^*\}$  and weights  $C^* = \{C_\nu^*\}_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi}$ , obtained either by directly solving the problem in (19) or via Algorithm 1, we now derive PRs for the error trajectories of agents in cliques  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$  with the desired confidence level as follows.

**Proposition 2** *Let  $\Gamma^*$  and  $C^*$  collect disturbance feedback gains and weights, respectively, which are feasible for the problem in (19). Construct the calibration trajectory dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cal}}^{e_i}$  as in (17), using the calibration disturbance set  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cal}}^{w_i}$  and the disturbance feedback gains in  $\Gamma^*$ , define nonconformity scores*

$$E^{(\varsigma)}(C^*, \Gamma^*) = \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi} \left( C_\nu^* \|e_\nu^{(\varsigma)}(1 : N)\| \right), \quad (21)$$

where  $\varsigma \in \mathbb{N}_{[0, k_1]}$ , and compute

$$q = Q_{1-\theta} \left( E^{(1)}(C^*, \Gamma^*), \dots, E^{(k_1)}(C^*, \Gamma^*), \infty \right). \quad (22)$$

Then,

$$\Pr \left\{ e_\nu^{(0)}(1 : N) \in \mathbb{B}(q/C_\nu^*), \forall \nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi \right\} \geq 1 - \theta, \quad (23)$$

*Proof:* Since  $\{E^{(0)}(C^*, \Gamma^*), \dots, E^{(k_1)}(C^*, \Gamma^*)\}$  is a set consisting of i.i.d. random variables, Lemma 1 implies that

$$\Pr \left\{ E^{(0)}(C^*, \Gamma^*) \leq q \right\} \geq 1 - \theta. \quad (24)$$

By the definition of  $E^{(0)}(C^*, \Gamma^*)$  in (21), this directly implies that  $\Pr \left\{ \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi} \left( C_\nu^* \|e_\nu^{(0)}(1 : N)\| \right) \leq q \right\} \geq 1 - \theta$ , or  $\Pr \left\{ \|e_\nu^{(0)}(1 : N)\| \leq q/C_\nu^*, \forall \nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi \right\} \geq 1 - \theta$ , since the max operator in (21) ensures that the bound holds uniformly for all  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$ , completing the proof. ■

## IV. STL CONTROL SYNTHESIS

### A. STL tightening

We recall that a function  $f : \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz continuous if there is  $L \geq 0$  such that for every  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{W}$ ,

$$\frac{|f(w_1) - f(w_2)|}{d_{\mathbb{W}}(w_1, w_2)} \leq L < \infty,$$

where  $d_{\mathbb{W}}$  denotes a metric on  $\mathbb{W}$ , and  $L$  is the Lipschitz constant. In the following, we tighten the robustness function of the multi-agent STL formula in (9) based on the Lipschitz constants of its subformulas. First, we state the following two lemmas, which rely on the assumption below.

**Assumption 1** *All predicate functions appearing in the multi-agent STL formula  $\phi$  are Lipschitz continuous.*

**Lemma 2** [23, Prop. 1] *For any STL specification  $\phi$  with predicate functions satisfying Assumption 1, the robustness function  $\rho^\phi(z(0:N) + e(0:N))$  is Lipschitz continuous with*

respect to  $\mathbf{e}(0:N) = (e(0), \dots, e(N))$ , with Lipschitz constant  $L_\phi$  obtained as the maximum Lipschitz constant of the predicate functions appearing in  $\phi$ .

**Lemma 3** Consider an STL formula  $\phi$  and a trajectory  $\mathbf{x}(0 : N) = \mathbf{z}(0 : N) + \mathbf{e}(0 : N)$ , where  $\mathbf{e}(0 : N) = (e(0), \dots, e(N))$ , with  $e(0) = 0$  and  $\Pr\{\mathbf{e}(0 : N) \in \mathbb{B}(q/C)\} \geq 1 - \theta$ . Let  $L_\phi$  be the Lipschitz constant of the robustness function  $\rho^\phi(\mathbf{z}(0 : N) + \mathbf{e}(0 : N))$  with respect to  $\mathbf{e}(0 : N)$ . If  $\rho^\phi(\mathbf{z}(0 : N)) \geq L_\phi \frac{q}{C}$ , then  $\Pr\{\rho^\phi(\mathbf{x}(0 : N)) \geq 0\} \geq 1 - \theta$ .

*Proof:* By assumption we have that  $\Pr\{\|\mathbf{e}(0 : N)\| \leq \frac{q}{C}\} \geq 1 - \theta$ . Also, by the Lipschitz condition, it holds that

$$\Pr\left\{\left|\rho^\phi(\mathbf{z}(0 : N) + \mathbf{e}(0 : N)) - \rho^\phi(\mathbf{z}(0 : N))\right| \leq L_\phi \|\mathbf{e}(0 : N)\| \leq L_\phi \frac{q}{C}\right\} \geq 1 - \theta.$$

Focusing on the case where  $\rho^\phi(\mathbf{z}(0 : N) + \mathbf{e}(0 : N)) \leq \rho^\phi(\mathbf{z}(0 : N))$ , the previous Lipschitz inequality yields

$$\Pr\left\{\rho^\phi(\mathbf{x}(0 : N)) \geq \rho^\phi(\mathbf{z}(0 : N)) - L_\phi \frac{q}{C} \geq 0\right\} \geq 1 - \theta,$$

since  $\rho^\phi(\mathbf{z}(0 : N)) \geq L_\phi \frac{q}{C}$ , completing the proof.  $\blacksquare$

### B. Relaxation of the chance-constrained synthesis problem

Next, we relax the problem in (10).

**Theorem 1** Consider the MAS with dynamics in (8) subject to the STL formula in (9). Let disturbance feedback gains in  $\mathbf{\Gamma}^* = \{\mathbf{\Gamma}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{\Gamma}_M^*\}$ , weights in  $C^* = \{C_\nu^* \mid \nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi\}$  and the quantile parameter  $q$  be obtained as in Proposition 2. Denote as  $L_{\phi_\nu}$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$ , the Lipschitz constants of the robustness functions of formulas  $\phi_\nu$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$ . Let  $\mathbf{z}_\nu(0 : N)$  (and  $\mathbf{e}_\nu(0 : N)$ ),  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$ , be nominal (and error) trajectories corresponding to formulas  $\phi_\nu$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$ . Assume

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize}_{\mathbf{v}(0), \mathbf{z}(0)} \sum_{i=1}^M \left( \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} (\ell_i(z_i(t), v_i(t))) + V_{f,i}(z_i(N)) \right) \\ & \text{subject to } z(t+1) = Az(t) + Bv(t), t \in \mathbb{N}_{[0, N)}, \\ & \rho^{\phi_\nu}(\mathbf{z}_\nu(0 : N)) \geq L_{\phi_\nu} \frac{q}{C_\nu^*}, \nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

with  $z(0) = x(0)$ , has a feasible solution  $\mathbf{v}(0 : N-1) = (v(0), \dots, v(N-1))$ . Then, the multi-agent input sequence  $\mathbf{u}(0 : N-1) = (u(0), \dots, u(N-1))$ , where  $u(t) = (u_1(t), \dots, u_M(t))$ , with  $u_i(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{\Gamma}_i^{*,t,k} w_i(k) + v_i(t)$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{[0, N-1]}$  together with the corresponding random state trajectory  $\mathbf{x}(0 : N)$  is a feasible solution for (10), that is

$$\Pr\{\mathbf{x}(0 : N) \models \phi\} \geq 1 - \theta. \quad (26)$$

*Proof:* By the condition in (23) we have that  $\Pr\{\|\mathbf{e}_\nu(0:N)\| \leq q/C_\nu^*, \nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi\} \geq 1 - \theta$ , which, by Lemma 3 and the feasibility of the problem in (25), leads to  $\Pr\{\rho^{\phi_\nu}(\mathbf{x}_\nu(0:N)) \geq 0, \nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi\} \geq 1 - \theta$ , or

$\Pr(\mathbf{x}_\nu(0:N) \models \phi_\nu, \nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi) \geq 1 - \theta$ , completing the proof.  $\blacksquare$

We remark that to handle STL constraints as in (25), one can leverage existing STL methods and toolboxes that utilize either integer programming using binary variables or nonlinear solvers using log-sum-exp underapproximations of the STL robustness function [24]. Due to space limitations, we defer a detailed discussion of these technical aspects to an extended version of this work. Next, we decompose (25) into individual agent-level problems to improve tractability.

### C. Distributed control synthesis

We propose an iterative procedure that handles the complexity of (25).

1) *Decomposition of STL formula  $\phi$ :* For a node  $i$  participating in at least one clique, i.e.,  $i \in \nu$ , with  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$ , we define  $\mathcal{T}_i$  as the set of cliques containing  $i$  by

$$\mathcal{T}_i = \{\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi \mid \nu \ni i\}. \quad (27)$$

Using (27), an equivalent multi-agent STL formula to the original one in (9) is defined as  $\hat{\phi} = \bigwedge_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \hat{\phi}_i$ , where

$$\hat{\phi}_i = \bigwedge_{\nu_i \in \mathcal{T}_i} \phi_{\nu_i}. \quad (28)$$

In the following, we denote

$$\varrho^{\phi_{\nu_i}}(\mathbf{z}_{\nu_i}(0:N)) = \rho^{\phi_{\nu_i}}(\mathbf{z}_{\nu_i}(0:N)) - L_{\phi_{\nu_i}} \frac{q}{C_{\nu_i}}, \nu_i \in \mathcal{T}_i. \quad (29)$$

2) *Agent-level subproblems:* We introduce the following problems for the  $i$ th agent

$$P_i^0 := \text{Minimize}_{\mathbf{v}_i^0, \mathbf{z}_i^0} \mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{z}_i^0, \mathbf{v}_i^0) \text{ subject to} \quad (30a)$$

$$z_i^0(k+1) = A_i z_i^0(k) + B_i v_i^0(k), k \in \mathbb{N}_{[0, N)}, \quad (30b)$$

$$\varrho^{\phi_i}(\mathbf{z}_i^0) \geq 0, \text{ with } z_i^0(0) = x_i(0), \quad (30c)$$

$$P_i^t := \text{Minimize}_{\mathbf{v}_i^t, \mathbf{z}_i^t} \mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{z}_i^t, \mathbf{v}_i^t) - \Omega_i \mu_{\nu_t}^t \text{ subject to} \quad (31a)$$

$$z_i^t(k+1) = A_i z_i^t(k) + B_i v_i^t(k), k \in \mathbb{N}_{[t, N)}, \quad (31b)$$

$$\varrho^{\phi_i}(\mathbf{z}_i^t) \geq 0, \text{ with } z_i^t(t) = x_i(t), \quad (31c)$$

$$\varrho^{\phi_{\nu_t}}(\mathbf{z}_{\nu_t}^t) \geq \mu_{\nu_t}^t, \nu_t = \underset{\nu \in \mathcal{T}_i, |\nu| > 1}{\text{argmin}} \{\varrho^{\phi_\nu}(\mathbf{z}_\nu^{t-1})\}, \quad (31d)$$

$$\mu_{\nu_t}^t \geq \min(0, \varrho^{\phi_{\nu_t}}(\mathbf{z}_{\nu_t}^{t-1})), \quad (31e)$$

$$\varrho^{\phi_\nu}(\mathbf{z}_\nu^t) \geq \min(0, \varrho^{\phi_\nu}(\mathbf{z}_\nu^{t-1})), \forall \nu \in \mathcal{T}_i \setminus \{\nu_t, i\} \quad (31f)$$

where  $\Omega_i \gg 0$ ,  $z_i^t(\tau)$  denotes the prediction of  $x_i(\tau)$  carried out at time  $t$ ,  $\varrho^{\phi_\nu}(\mathbf{z}_\nu^t)$  is the robustness function of the formula  $\phi_\nu$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{T}_i$ , evaluated over the trajectory  $\mathbf{z}_\nu^t$ , and

$$\mathbf{z}_\nu^t = (x_\nu(0), \dots, x_\nu(t-1), z_\nu^t(t), \dots, z_\nu^t(N)), \quad (32)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_i^t = (v_i(0), \dots, v_i(t-1), v_i^t(t), \dots, v_i^t(N-1)), \quad (33)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_i(\mathbf{z}_i^t, \mathbf{v}_i^t) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \ell_i(z_i^t(k), v_i^t(k)) + V_{f,i}(z_i^t(N)). \quad (34)$$

In [1], we proposed an iterative procedure for solving agent-level problems  $P_i^0$  and  $P_i^t$  according to an offline-defined agent preselection schedule, ensuring consistency in

agents' trajectories for collaborative tasks. We now extend this approach to a distributed implementation, relying on coordination through interactions among agents within cliques.

3) *Distributed implementation:* Let

$$\mathbf{z}_i^t(x_i(t), \mathbf{v}_i^t) = (x_i(0), \dots, x_i(t), z_i^t(t+1), \dots, z_i^t(N)), \quad (35)$$

denote a trajectory where the last  $N-t$  nominal states are generated by the last  $N-t$  inputs of  $\mathbf{v}_i^t$  starting from  $x_i(t)$ . At each time  $t > 1$ , the  $i$ th agent computes the robustness functions  $\rho^{\phi_{\nu_i}}(\mathbf{z}_{\nu_i}^{t-1})$ ,  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$ , based on the knowledge about  $\mathbf{z}_{\nu_i}^{t-1} = (x_{\nu_i}(0), \dots, x_{\nu_i}(t-1), z_{\nu_i}^{t-1}(t), \dots, z_{\nu_i}^{t-1}(N))$ ,  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$ , and estimates the robustness function of  $\phi_i$  as  $r_i^t = \min_{\nu_i \in \mathcal{T}_i} (\rho^{\phi_{\nu_i}}(\mathbf{z}_{\nu_i}^{t-1}))$  based on the STL quantitative semantics. After measuring its state  $x_i(t)$ , agent- $i$  communicates  $r_i^t$  and  $\mathbf{z}_i^t(x_i(t), \mathbf{v}_i^{t-1})$  to all agents in  $\nu_i$ ,  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$  and receives the corresponding information from them. Agent- $i$  either solves  $P_i^t$  if  $r_i^t = \min_{j \in \nu_i, \nu_i \in \mathcal{T}_i} (r_j^t)$  or retains its input sequence from  $t-1$ , that is  $\mathbf{v}_i^t = \mathbf{v}_i^{t-1}$ . Alg. 2 summarizes the distributed STL control strategy, with its benefits highlighted in the following proposition.

**Proposition 3** *Suppose each agent- $i$  solves  $P_i^0$  at  $t=0$  and executes Alg. 2 at  $t=1$ . Let  $\mathcal{O}_t \subset \mathcal{V}$  collect agents' indices solving  $P_i^t$  at  $t \geq 1$ , and assume  $P_i^0$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, M]}$ ,  $P_i^t$ , with  $i \in \mathcal{O}_t$  for  $t \geq 1$ , are feasible. It holds: **a)** if  $i, j \in \mathcal{O}_t$  for some  $1 < t \leq N$ , then  $\mathcal{T}_i \cap \mathcal{T}_j = \emptyset$ , **b)**  $\Pr \{ \rho^{\phi_i}(\mathbf{x}_i(0 : N)) \geq 0 \} \geq 1 - \theta$ , and **c)** collaborative tasks are minimally violated or satisfied with probability at least  $1 - \theta$ .*

*Proof:* **a)** By assumption, at  $t \geq 1$ ,  $r_i^t < r_i^{t-1}$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{O}_t$ , where  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$ , and  $r_j^t < r_j^{t-1}$  for all  $j \in \mathcal{O}_t$ , where  $\nu_j \in \mathcal{T}_j$ . Assuming without loss of generality that  $r_i < r_j$ , if  $\exists \nu \in \mathcal{T}_i \cap \mathcal{T}_j$ , then  $j \notin \mathcal{O}_t$ , which contradicts the assumption. **b)** This follows from the recursive feasibility assumption and the tighter robustness function in (31c), and by Prop. 2. **c)** This follows from the feasibility of the constraints in (31d)–(31e), which ensures the improvement of the most violated (least robust) joint task  $\phi_{\nu_t}$ , and from the feasibility of the constraint in (31f), which ensures non-violation or improvement of other joint tasks. The probability guarantee follows from the tighter robustness functions and Prop. 2. ■

---

**Algorithm 2** Distributed STL control of agent- $i$

---

- 1: **for**  $t$  in  $1 : N$  **do**
  - 2:   **Compute**  $r_i^t = \min_{\nu_i \in \mathcal{T}_i} (\rho^{\phi_{\nu_i}}(\mathbf{z}_{\nu_i}^{t-1}))$
  - 3:   **Measure**  $x_i(t)$  and  $w_i(t-1)$
  - 4:   **Construct**  $\mathbf{z}_i^t(x_i(t), \mathbf{v}_i^{t-1})$
  - 5:   **Communicate**  $r_i^t$ ,  $\mathbf{z}_i^t(x_i(t), \mathbf{v}_i^{t-1})$  to  $j \in \nu_i$ ,  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$
  - 6:   **Receive**  $r_j^t$ ,  $\mathbf{z}_j^t(x_j(t), \mathbf{v}_j^{t-1})$  from  $j \in \nu_i$ ,  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$
  - 7:   **if**  $r_i^t < r_j^t$  for all  $j \in \nu_i$ ,  $\nu_i \in \mathcal{T}_i$  **then**
  - 8:     **Solve**  $P_i^t$  and store  $(\mathbf{v}_i^t, z_i^t)$
  - 9:   **else**
  - 10:    **Update**  $\mathbf{v}_i^t \leftarrow \mathbf{v}_i^{t-1}$  and  $z_i^t \leftarrow z_i^{t-1}(x_i(t), \mathbf{v}_i^{t-1})$
  - 11:    **Apply**  $u_i(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \Gamma_i^{t,k} w_i(k) + \mathbf{v}_i^t(t)$
- 

## V. EXAMPLE

We consider the multi-agent example from our previous work [1], where 10 agents with single-integrator dynamics are subject to individual and collaborative STL tasks, and Gaussian disturbances  $w_i(t) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.05I_2)$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, 10]}$ . Due to space limitations, we refer to [1, Sec. IV] for details. The  $i$ th STL task requires agent  $i$  to visit regions  $T_i$  and  $G_i$  within  $\mathbb{N}_{[10, 50]}$  and  $\mathbb{N}_{[70, 100]}$ , respectively, while avoiding obstacles  $O_1$ ,  $O_2$ , and  $O_3$  in workspace  $\mathcal{X}$ . The  $\nu$ th collaborative task requires all agents in clique  $\nu$  to approach each other within  $\mathbb{N}_{[0, 100]}$ . We recall the clique set  $\mathcal{K}_\phi = \{\mathbb{N}_{[1, 10]}, (1, 2, 3), (1, 5), (3, 4), (4, 5), (5, 6), (4, 7), (6, 8), (6, 9), (7, 8), (8, 10), (9, 10)\}$ . The STL specification spans 100 time steps and must be satisfied with 95% probability.

**PR-scaling and disturbance feedback design:** We generate training and calibration datasets, each containing 100 disturbance sequences of length 100. To design the PR-scaling parameters and disturbance feedback gains  $(C^*, \Gamma^*)$ , we run Alg. 1 for  $\tau_{\max} = 4$  iterations, solving the problems  $P(C)$  and  $P(\Gamma)$  using the GUROBI solver. The average solve time for  $P(C)$  and  $P(\Gamma)$  with an Intel i7-1185G7 processor and 32 GB of RAM is under 1 s and 20 m, respectively. To obtain PRs for the aggregate error trajectories of agents in cliques  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$ , we use the output of Alg. 1 and the calibration disturbance dataset, to obtain PRs  $\mathbb{B}_\infty(q/C_v^*)$ , with  $0.7398 \leq q/C_v^* \leq 0.8985$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$ , following Prop. 2.

**Distributed STL Synthesis:** To synthesize state sequences satisfying the multi-agent STL task with probability 95%, we first tighten the robustness functions of STL formulas  $\phi_\nu$ ,  $\nu \in \mathcal{K}_\phi$ , using Thm. 1 with PR bounds  $q/C_v^*$  from Alg. 1 and Prop. 2. By Lemma 2, the corresponding Lipschitz constants  $L_{\phi_\nu}$  computed wrt  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  satisfy  $0.046 \leq L_{\phi_\nu} \leq 1$ . Initially, we solve  $P_i(0)$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, 10]}$ , and then apply Alg. 2, where agents iteratively solve  $P_i^t$  for  $t \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, 100]}$ , exchanging robustness estimates within their cliques to enable distributed coordination. Problems  $P_i^0$ ,  $P_i^t$  were solved using the GUR-OB solver. Fig. 1 shows the result from 1 experiment with Alg. 2. Out of 100 experiments (results omitted for clarity), 97 satisfied the STL formula, aligning with the specified probability. The selection frequency of agents solving  $P_i^t$ , as determined by distributed coordination, is shown in Fig. 2 (right). The software for this section is available at [25].

**Comparison with [1]:** The approach in [1] uses union bounding for multi-agent uncertainty quantification, resulting in excessive conservatism. Even with full knowledge of the disturbance distribution, the specified probability is limited to at most 70%. In contrast, the proposed data-driven method achieves significantly tighter error bounds, leveraging sample availability for confidence estimation. In Fig. 2 (left), the red circle represents a bound for  $\max_{t \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, 100]}} \|e_i(t)\|_2$  with 70% probability from [1], while the blue box shows the data-driven bound for  $\max_{t \in \mathbb{N}_{[1, 100]}} \|e_i(t)\|_\infty$  with 95% probability, computed using Prop. 2 with  $10^4$  calibration samples and a tightened 97% quantile (see Remark 1), ensuring confidence over 99.9999% via computationally inexpensive operations (see (22)). Additionally, [1] assumes




Fig. 1: Simulation under Alg. 2 with  $x_i(0)$  as crosses,  $T_i$  areas as diamonds,  $G_i$  areas as boxes, and 3 brown obstacles.

fixed feedback gains and performs offline STL synthesis with agent preselection, whereas this work proposes a data-driven feedback design and fully distributed STL synthesis via Alg. 2. Future work will address real-time implementation challenges for solving  $P_i^t$  under input constraints.




Fig. 2: Left: Red circle bound for  $\|e_i(t)\|_2$  with prob. 70% (from [1] via union bounding); blue box bound for  $\|e_i(t)\|_\infty$  with prob. 95% and confidence  $\gg 99.99\%$  (via Prop. 2 & Remark 1). Right: Histogram of agent selections for the experiment in Fig. 1 under Alg. 2.

## VI. CONCLUSION

We consider stochastic linear multi-agent systems under chance-constrained collaborative STL specifications. Using conformal prediction, we develop a distribution-free framework for data-driven uncertainty quantification and probabilistic guarantees for STL task satisfaction. We show how to convert the chance-constrained optimal control problem into a deterministic one by tightening the STL robustness function using prediction regions derived from conformal prediction for the error dynamics and its Lipschitz constants with respect to error trajectories. Additionally, we decompose the large-scale problem into agent-level subproblems and propose an iterative, distributed algorithm that leverages agent coordination, improving scalability. Future work will extend these results to continuous-time stochastic MAS, providing probabilistic guarantees for STL satisfaction in continuous time.

## REFERENCES

[1] E. E. Vlahakis, L. Lindemann, P. Sotasakis, and D. V. Dimarogonas, “Probabilistic tube-based control synthesis of stochastic multi-agent systems under signal temporal logic,” in *2024 IEEE 63rd Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2024, pp. 1586–1592.

[2] O. Maler and D. Nickovic, “Monitoring Temporal Properties of Continuous Signals,” in *Formal Techniques, Modelling and Analysis of Timed and Fault-Tolerant Systems*, Y. Lakhnech and S. Yovine, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2004, pp. 152–166.

[3] A. Donzé and O. Maler, “Robust Satisfaction of Temporal Logic over Real-Valued Signals,” in *8th International Conference on Formal Modeling and Analysis of Timed Systems, FORMATS, 2010*, Klosterneuburg, Austria, 2010, pp. 92–106.

[4] S. S. Farahani, R. Majumdar, V. S. Prabhu, and S. Soudjani, “Shrinking horizon model predictive control with signal temporal logic constraints under stochastic disturbances,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 8, pp. 3324–3331, 2019.

[5] S. Safaoui, L. Lindemann, D. V. Dimarogonas, I. Shames, and T. H. Summers, “Control Design for Risk-Based Signal Temporal Logic Specifications,” *IEEE L-CSS*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 1000–1005, 2020.

[6] L. Lindemann, G. J. Pappas, and D. V. Dimarogonas, “Reactive and Risk-Aware Control for Signal Temporal Logic,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 67, no. 10, pp. 5262–5277, 2022.

[7] D. Sadigh and A. Kapoor, “Safe Control under Uncertainty with Probabilistic Signal Temporal Logic,” in *Proceedings of Robotics: Science and Systems*, jun 2016.

[8] S. Jha, V. Raman, D. Sadigh, and S. A. Seshia, “Safe Autonomy Under Perception Uncertainty Using Chance-Constrained Temporal Logic,” *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 43–62, 2018.

[9] V. Vovk, A. Gammerman, and G. Shafer, *Algorithmic Learning in a Random World*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.

[10] L. Lindemann, Y. Zhao, X. Yu, G. J. Pappas, and J. V. Deshmukh, “Formal verification and control with conformal prediction,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.00536>

[11] X. Qin, Y. Xia, A. Zutshi, C. Fan, and J. V. Deshmukh, “Statistical verification of cyber-physical systems using surrogate models and conformal inference,” in *2022 ACM/IEEE 13th International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems (ICCPs)*, 2022, pp. 116–126.

[12] L. Lindemann, X. Qin, J. V. Deshmukh, and G. J. Pappas, “Conformal prediction for stl runtime verification,” in *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 14th International Conference on Cyber-Physical Systems (with CPS-IoT Week 2023)*, ser. ICCPS ’23. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, p. 142–153.

[13] Y. Zhao, B. Hoxha, G. Fainekos, J. V. Deshmukh, and L. Lindemann, “Robust conformal prediction for stl runtime verification under distribution shift,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.09482>

[14] X. Yu, Y. Zhao, X. Yin, and L. Lindemann, “Signal temporal logic control synthesis among uncontrollable dynamic agents with conformal prediction,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.04242>

[15] T. Kuipers, R. Tumu, S. Yang, M. Kazemi, R. Mangharam, and N. Paoletti, “Conformal off-policy prediction for multi-agent systems,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.16871>

[16] R. J. Tibshirani, R. F. Barber, E. J. Candès, and A. Ramdas, “Conformal prediction under covariate shift,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.

[17] A. N. Angelopoulos and S. Bates, “A gentle introduction to conformal prediction and distribution-free uncertainty quantification,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.07511>

[18] V. Vovk, “Conditional validity of inductive conformal predictors,” in *Proc. Asian Conf. Mach. Learn.*, vol. 25, 2012, pp. 475–490.

[19] R. T. Rockafellar and S. Uryasev, “Optimization of conditional value-at risk,” *Journal of Risk*, vol. 3, pp. 21–41, 2000.

[20] J. Orlin, “Contentment in graph theory: Covering graphs with cliques,” *Indagationes Mathematicae*, vol. 80, no. 5, pp. 406–424, 1977.

[21] P. J. Goulart, E. C. Kerrigan, and J. M. Maciejowski, “Optimization over state feedback policies for robust control with constraints,” *Automatica*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 523–533, 2006.

[22] E. E. Vlahakis, L. Lindemann, P. Sotasakis, and D. V. Dimarogonas, “Conformal prediction for distribution-free optimal control of linear stochastic systems,” *IEEE L-CSS*, vol. 8, pp. 2835–2840, 2024.

[23] A. B. Kordabad, E. E. Vlahakis, L. Lindemann, S. Gros, D. V. Dimarogonas, and S. Soudjani, “Data-driven distributionally robust control for interacting agents under logical constraints,” 2025, [Online]: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.09816>.

[24] A. Donzé and V. Raman, “BluSTL: Controller synthesis from signal temporal logic specifications,” in *ARCH14-15: 1st & 2nd Int. Workshop on Appl. Verification for Cont. & Hybrid Syst.*, vol. 34. EasyChair, 2015, pp. 160–168.

[25] E. E. Vlahakis, <https://github.com/leftervisr183/CDC25>, 2025.