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Abstract: A control technique for counter-current and co-current guidance of underactuated marine vehicles is revisited and improved. The control system is based on a pure integral guidance law and two feedback controllers, in a cascaded configuration. The sway component of the ocean current in the body frame is viewed as the error signal of the guidance law instead of the absolute sway velocity, as done in the original approach. This makes the vessel search for the two possible yaw angles giving zero current component in sway: the counter-current direction and the co-current direction. The closed loop system has multiple equilibria where the two mentioned directions represent a set of stable equilibrium points and a set of unstable equilibrium points, respectively. Compared to the approach based on the absolute sway velocity, it is possible to achieve stronger stability properties. In particular, while the previous guidance approach considered a simplified model and yielded local exponential stability only, the complete model is analyzed in this paper and uniform semiglobal asymptotic stability as well as uniform local exponential stability are proven. The theoretical results are supported by simulations.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Remote sensing and automation of operations at sea represent present and future challenges the offshore and maritime industry is facing worldwide. Any improvements in these fields can significantly increase reliability, safety, sustainability and effectiveness of activities such as offshore hydrocarbon production and exploration, fishing, offshore wind power production, shipping and environmental monitoring. In particular, such activities are significantly affected by wind, waves and sea currents, and hence maneuverability of the ships and vehicles involved can be seriously affected. As a result, the field of marine control has delivered valuable solutions and ideas on how to handle and reduce sea loads. In particular, effective disturbance estimation techniques and reliable compensation strategies have been introduced.

Due to their significant effect on marine operations, handling ocean currents has attracted significant attention and many researchers have developed current observers and adaptive techniques to compensate for the disturbances, often embedded into more advanced guidance and control schemes. Such control approaches are introduced for fully actuated as well as underactuated marine vessels and underwater vehicles in Encarnação et al. (2000); Do et al. (2004);Refsnes et al. (2007); Antonelli (2007); Batista et al. (2012); Indiveri et al. (2012) to compensate for the drift in path following and navigation tasks. To render the popular line-of-sight (LOS) guidance law robust with respect to ocean currents, Aguiar and Pascoal (1997) propose a modification based on measurements of the vehicle velocity and integral action is added to the LOS reference generator in Borhaug et al. (2008); Breivik and Fossen (2009); Caharija et al. (2012a,c). Furthermore, the use of predictive ocean models embedded into the mission planning strategy of the vehicle for current compensation/exploitation is discussed in Smith et al. (2011) and Jouffroy et al. (2011).

In this paper the problem of steering a marine vessel against the ocean current or with the ocean current is addressed. This is indeed an interesting problem since an autonomous marine vehicle capable to sense the current and follow the flow could exploit the drift when exact positioning is not as critical as energy efficiency (Smith et al., 2011). In fact, such guidance law makes the vehicle determine the direction that guarantees the minimum energy consumption for a given absolute speed. Moreover, an underwater vehicle that can turn against the flow could, for instance, help locate a hydrothermal vent Yoerger et al. (2007) or detect hydrocarbon leaks from subsea oil and gas installations. Furthermore, a control law for counter-current guidance can be integrated into more complex weather optimal heading/positioning control systems (WOHC-WOPC) since it is meant to steer the vessel against the disturbance. The WOHC and WOPC concepts are thoroughly defined by Fossen and Strand (2001) and enhanced with a geometrically motivated update law in Kjerstad and Breivik (2010) for fully actuated as well as underactuated vessels.
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This paper aims at improving the counter-current/co-current guidance for underactuated autonomous marine vehicles in 3 degrees of freedom (DOF) developed in Caharija et al. (2013). In Caharija et al. (2013) the absolute sway velocity is integrated and represents the actual error signal. This leads to a closed loop pendulum-like system with multiple equilibrium points, where one of the two mentioned directions represent a set of stable equilibrium points and the other a set of unstable equilibrium points. The closed-loop analysis of Caharija et al. (2013), based on Lyapunov perturbation theory, shows only local exponential stability for the stable direction, and neglects the perturbing dynamics of the vessel autopilot. In this paper the component of the ocean current acting in the sway direction is chosen as the integrated error signal, instead of the absolute sway velocity. It is shown that this separates the underactuated sway dynamics from the closed loop guidance dynamics. This simplifies the control system. Moreover, the sway subsystem is shown to be input-to-state stable (ISS). Again, the closed loop system reveals multiple stable/unstable equilibrium points, corresponding to the counter-current/co-current directions, respectively. The sign of a gain parameter selects which of the two courses is the stable one. Compared to Caharija et al. (2013), the complete cascaded closed loop system is considered and uniform semiglobal asymptotic stability (USAS), in addition to uniform local exponential stability (ULES), is shown. The proposed solution performs counter-current or co-current guidance in presence of constant and irrotational ocean currents, acting in any direction of the inertial frame. Lyapunov theory (Khalil, 2000) and nonlinear control theory of cascades (Grotli et al., 2008; Chailliet and Loria, 2006, 2008) are used in the proof.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the control plant model of the vehicle, Section 3 identifies the control objective and Section 4 presents the strategy that solves the control task. The main result is stated in Section 5 and proven in Section 6. Simulation results and conclusions are given in Section 7 and Section 8, respectively.

2. THE VEHICLE MODEL

2.1 Model Assumptions

Assumption 1. The motion of the vehicle is described in 3 degrees of freedom, that is surge, sway and yaw.

Assumption 2. The vehicle is port-starboard symmetric.

Assumption 3. The body-fixed coordinate frame $b$ is considered located at a point $(x_b^*\, 0\, 0)$ from the vehicle’s center of gravity (CG) along the center-line of the vessel, where $x_b^*$ is to be defined later.

Remark 1. The body-fixed coordinate system can always be translated to the required location $x_b^*$ Fossen (2011).

Assumption 4. Damping is considered linear.

Remark 2. Nonlinear damping is not considered in order to reduce the complexity of the controllers. However, the passive nature of the non-linear hydrodynamic damping forces should enhance the directional stability of the vessel.

Assumption 5. The ocean current in the inertial frame $i$, $V_c = [V_x, V_y]^T$, is constant, irrotational and bounded. Hence, there exists a constant $V_{max} > 0$ such that $V_{max} > \sqrt{V_x^2 + V_y^2}$.

2.2 The Control Model

The state of the vessel is given by the vector $[p^T, \nu^T]^T$ where $p \triangleq [x, y, \psi]^T$ describes the position and the orientation of the vehicle with respect to the inertial frame $i$. The vector $\nu \triangleq [u, v, r]^T$ contains the linear and angular velocities of the vessel defined in the body-fixed frame $b$, where $u$ is the surge velocity, $v$ is the sway velocity and $r$ is the yaw rate. The ocean current velocity in the body frame $b$, $\nu_c = [u_c, v_c, 0]^T$, is obtained from $\nu_c = R(\psi)[V_x, V_y, 0]^T$ where $R(\psi)$ is the rotation matrix from $b$ to $i$. $R(\psi)$ is defined in (4) using the $xyz$ convention. The ocean current is constant and irrotational in $i$, i.e. $\dot{V}_c = 0$ and therefore:

$$\dot{\nu}_c = [v_c, -ru_c, 0]^T .$$

In navigation problems involving ocean currents it is useful to introduce the relative velocity:

$$\nu_r = \nu - \nu_c = [u_r, v_r, r]^T.$$ The vector $\nu_r$ is defined in $b$, where $u_r$ is the relative surge velocity and $v_r$ is the relative sway velocity.

In this paper, the class of marine vehicles described by the following 3-DOF maneuvering model are considered Fossen (2011):

$$\dot{p} = R(\psi)\nu_r + [V_x, V_y]^T,$$  
$$M\ddot{\nu}_r + C(\nu_r)\nu_r + D\nu_r = Bf .$$

Remark 3. It is shown in Fossen (2011) that since the current is constant and irrotational in $i$, the 3-DOF maneuvering model of the vehicle can be formulated as (2-3).

The vector $f \triangleq [T_u, T_r]^T$ is the control input vector, containing the surge thrust $T_u$ and the rudder angle $T_r$. Notice that the model (3) is underactuated in its configuration space. The matrix $M = MT > 0$ is the mass and inertia matrix, and includes hydrodynamic added mass. The matrix $C$ is the Coriolis and centripetal matrix, $D > 0$ is the hydrodynamic damping matrix and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 2}$ is the actuator configuration matrix. For manoeuvring control purposes, the matrices $M, D$ and $B$ can be considered as having the following structure:

$$R(\psi) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
\cos(\psi) & -\sin(\psi) & 0 \\
\sin(\psi) & \cos(\psi) & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix},$$
$$M \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
m_{11} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & m_{22} & m_{23} \\
0 & m_{32} & m_{33}
\end{bmatrix},$$
$$D \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
d_{11} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & d_{22} & d_{23} \\
0 & d_{32} & d_{33}
\end{bmatrix},$$
$$B \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
b_1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & b_2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & b_3
\end{bmatrix}.$$

The particular structure of $M$ and $D$ is justified by Assumptions 1-4. The actuator configuration matrix $B$ has full column rank and maps the control inputs $T_u$ and $T_r$ into forces and moments acting on the vessel. The Coriolis and centripetal matrix $C$ is obtained from $M$ as shown in Fossen (2011):

$$C(\nu_r) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & -m_{23}\nu_r - m_{31}\nu_c \\
0 & 0 & -m_{32}\nu_r - m_{13}\nu_c \\
m_{12}\nu_r + m_{23}\nu_r - m_{13}\nu_c & 0
\end{bmatrix}.$$  

Finally, $x_b^*$ from Assumption 3 is chosen so that $M^{-1}Bf = [t_u, 0, t_r]^T$. The point $(x_b^*, 0)$ exists for all port-starboard symmetric vehicles (Caharija et al., 2012b).

2.3 The Model in Component Form

To solve nonlinear underactuated control design problems it is useful to expand (2-3) into:
\[ \dot{x} = u_r \cos(\psi) - v_r \sin(\psi) + V_x, \]  
\[ \dot{y} = u_r \sin(\psi) + v_r \cos(\psi) + V_y, \]  
\[ \dot{\psi} = r, \]  
\[ \dot{u}_r = F_{ur}(v_r, r) - \frac{d_{11}}{m_{11}} u_r + \tau_u, \]  
\[ \dot{v}_r = X(u_r)r + Y(u_r)v_r, \]  
\[ \dot{r} = F_r(u_r, v_r, r) + \tau_r. \]  

The expressions for \( F_r(u_r, v_r, r) \), \( F_{ur}(v_r, r) \), \( X(u_r) \) and \( Y(u_r) \) are given in Appendix B. Notice that the functions \( Y(u_r) \) and \( X(u_r) \) are bounded for bounded arguments and thus the following notation is used: 

\[ X_{\text{max}} \triangleq \max_{\Omega} |X(u_r)|, \]  

where \( \Omega \triangleq \{ -V_{\text{max}} \leq u_r \leq U_{rd} + V_{\text{max}} \} \) and the following assumption is introduced: 

**Assumption 6.** The function \( Y(u_r) \) satisfies 

\[ Y(u_r) \leq -Y_{\text{min}} < 0, \quad \forall u_r \in \Omega. \]  

**Remark 4.** Assumption 6 is justified by a contradiction: \( Y(u_r) \geq 0 \) would imply a nominally unstable vehicle in sway which is not the case for commercial vessels by design. Furthermore, notice that no bounds are implied on \( u_r \). The constant \( U_{rd} > 0 \) is a design parameter and is defined in Section 3.

**3. THE CONTROL OBJECTIVE**

This section formalizes the control problem solved in this paper: the control system should make the vessel turn against the current, or follow the current, in the complementary case. In addition, the vehicle should also maintain a desired constant surge relative velocity \( U_{rd} > 0 \). The ocean current is considered constant and unknown. The case of a marine vehicle moving at constant speed and holding a constant course \( \psi_c \), in presence of ocean currents, should be considered first to properly define the control objectives. This case has been addressed in Borhaug et al. (2008), Caharja et al. (2012a) and Caharja et al. (2012c), where it has been proven that the relative sway velocity of the vessel, \( v_s \), decays exponentially to zero due to Assumption 6. Furthermore it can be seen that the current component acting in the sway direction \( v_s \) becomes \( v_s \rightarrow v_{c,s,s} \triangleq -V_x \sin(\psi_c) + V_y \cos(\psi_c), \) exponentially. Therefore, in presence of constant irrotational ocean current, \( v_s \rightarrow 0 \) and \( v_s \rightarrow v_{c,s,s} \), at steady state.

To achieve counter-current guidance as well as co-current guidance, the vessel is required to align its relative velocity vector \( \nu_r \) with the current vector \( \nu_c \) to perform counter-current or co-current guidance.

![Fig. 1. The vehicle has to align its relative velocity vector \( \nu_r \) with the current vector \( \nu_c \) to perform counter-current or co-current guidance.](image-url)

To achieve counter-current guidance as well as co-current guidance, the vessel is required to align its relative velocity vector \( \nu_r \) with the current vector \( \nu_c \), as shown in Figure 1. At steady state, when the two vectors are parallel, the current vector \( \nu_c \) has clearly its sway component \( v_{c,s,s} = 0 \). It is trivial to show that \( v_{c,s,s} = 0 \) if and only if the vessel is pointing against the current or going with the current, i.e. if and only if \( \psi_c = \text{atan}2(V_y, V_x) + k\pi, \) \( k \in \mathbb{Z} \). Hence, the objectives the control system should pursue can be formalized as follows:

\[ \lim_{t \to \infty} v_c(t) = 0, \]  
\[ \lim_{t \to \infty} \psi(t) = \text{atan}2(V_y, V_x) + k\pi, \]  
\[ k \in \{0, 1\}, \]  
\[ \lim_{t \to \infty} u_r(t) = U_{rd}, \]  

where \( k = 0 \) identifies the co-current guidance and \( k = 1 \) identifies the counter-current guidance. Finally, the following assumption allows the vessel to move against sea currents acting in any directions of the plane:

**Assumption 7.** The propulsion system is rated with power and thrust capacity such that \( U_{rd} \) satisfies \( U_{rd} > V_{\text{max}} \).

**Remark 5.** For most marine vehicles Assumption 7 is easy to meet since their propulsion systems are typically designed to give more than \( 2 - 3 \) [m/s] of relative speed \( U_{rd} \). The ocean current has usually an intensity of less than 1 [m/s].

**Remark 6.** Notice that Assumption 7 is strictly necessary for the vessel to be able to move against the current.

**Remark 7.** It is trivial to show that the absolute sway velocity \( v \rightarrow 0 \) when the control objectives (9-10) are achieved since \( v = v_s + v_c \). This property is exploited in Caharja et al. (2013) to search for the current direction. In this paper the signal \( v_c \) represent the error signal instead.

**4. THE CONTROL SYSTEM**

A control system that solves the control problem defined in Section 3 is presented. First the guidance system is introduced, and then the surge and yaw controllers are added in a cascaded configuration.

**4.1 THE GUIDANCE STRATEGY**

The following heading reference is proposed to achieve counter-current guidance, or alternatively co-current guidance:

\[ \psi_G \triangleq -\sigma \nu_{\text{int}}, \quad \sigma \neq 0, \]  
\[ \nu_{\text{int}} \equiv v_c, \]  

where \( \sigma > 0 \) makes the vehicle turn against the flow and \( \sigma < 0 \) makes the vehicle follow the flow. The integral effect (12b) forces the vessel to search for the two directions having zero current component in the sway direction \( v_s \) at steady state, while the sign of the gain \( \sigma \) defines whether the counter-current course or the co-current course is the stable equilibrium point of the closed loop system. This paper shows how the simple and intuitive guidance system (12) performs counter-current guidance, or co-current guidance, with stronger stability properties than Caharja et al. (2013). Notice that alternative integral laws, such as the one introduced in Borhaug et al. (2008), can be used to improve the performance of (12).
Remark 8. The error signal in (12b) is the current component acting in the sway direction. This component can be measured or estimated using DVL devices or other sensor fusion techniques (Morgado et al., 2011; Fossen, 2011).

4.2 Surge and Yaw Controllers

According to (11), \( u_s(t) \) should follow the desired value \( u_{rd}(t) \triangleq U_{rd} > 0 \). To this end the following controller is used:

\[
\tau_u = -F_{u_s} (v_r, r) + \frac{d_{11}}{m_{11}} u_{rd} + u_{rd} - k_u u_s (u_r - u_{rd}).
\]  

(13)

The gain \( k_u > 0 \) is constant. The controller (13) is a feedback linearizing P-controller and guarantees exponential tracking of \( u_{rd}(t) \) (cf. Eq. (15) below). Note that part of the damping is not canceled in order to guarantee some robustness with respect to model uncertainties. The following controller can be used to track the desired yaw angle \( \psi_d \triangleq \psi_G \):

\[
\tau_r = -F_r (v_r, r) + \dot{\psi}_d - k_\psi (\psi - \psi_d) - k_\sigma (\dot{\psi} - \dot{\psi}_d),
\]  

(14)

where \( k_\sigma, k_\psi > 0 \) are constant gains. The controller (14) is a feedback linearizing PD controller and makes sure that \( \psi \) and \( r \) exponentially track \( \psi_d \) and \( \dot{\psi}_d \) (cf. Eq. (16) below).

Remark 9. Notice that \( \psi_d \) and \( \dot{\psi}_d \) are well defined if \( \psi_d \triangleq \psi_G \) since (1) is a consequence of Assumption 5.

5. MAIN RESULT

This section presents the conditions under which the proposed control system achieves the objectives (9-11). The counter-current guidance case \((\sigma > 0)\) is considered only. However, the same derivations and conclusions can be drawn for the co-current case \((\sigma < 0)\).

Theorem 1. Given an underactuated marine vehicle described by the dynamical system (7). If Assumptions 1-7 hold, the controllers (13-14), with \( k_u, k_\psi, k_\sigma > 0, u_{rd} \triangleq U_{rd} \) and \( \psi_d \triangleq \psi_G \), guarantee achievement of the control objectives (9-11) with USAS and ULES properties. The USAS properties hold on the parameter set \( \Theta \triangleq \{ \sigma > 0 \} \).

Proof. The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section 6. □

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

The actuated surge and yaw dynamics of the vehicle are considered first. The closed loop surge subsystem is obtained combining (7d) with (13) and given \( \ddot{u}_s \triangleq u_r - U_{rd} \), the \( \ddot{u}_s \) dynamics become:

\[
\ddot{u}_s = -\left( \frac{d_{11}}{m_{11}} + k_u \right) \ddot{u}_s,
\]  

(15)

where \( d_{11}, m_{11}, k_u > 0 \). The \( \ddot{u}_s \) subsystem is clearly uniformly globally exponentially stable (UGES). Therefore, the control goal (11) is achieved exponentially in any ball of initial conditions.

The yaw \( \psi, r \) subsystem is obtained from (7c) and (7f) in closed loop configuration with (14). Given the error variables \( \hat{\psi} \triangleq \psi - \psi_d \) and \( \hat{r} \triangleq r - \psi_d \), the dynamics of \( \hat{\psi} \) and \( \hat{r} \) are:

\[
\ddot{\xi} = \left[ - k_\psi - k_\sigma \right] \xi \triangleq \Sigma \xi,
\]  

(16)

where \( \xi \triangleq [\hat{\psi}, \hat{r}]^T \). The system (16) is linear and time-invariant. Furthermore, since the gains \( k_\psi, k_\sigma \) are strictly positive, the system matrix \( \Sigma \) is Hurwitz and hence the origin \( \xi = 0 \) is UGES.

The guidance system (12) is considered next. Since \( v_c = R \psi V_c \) (see Section 2) and \( \hat{\psi} \triangleq \psi - \psi_d \), the integrator (12b) can be written as:

\[
\dot{v}_{int} = -V_c \sin(\psi_d + \hat{\psi}) + V_y \cos(\psi_d + \hat{\psi}),
\]  

(17)

where \( \psi_d = -\sigma v_{int} \). The interconnected dynamics of \( v_{int} \) are given combining (17) with (16):

\[
\dot{v}_{int} = V_c \sin(\sigma v_{int}) + V_y \cos(\sigma v_{int}) + H_v(v_{int}, \xi)\xi,
\]  

(18a)

where \( H_v(v_{int}, \xi) \triangleq [h_{v_{int}}(v_{int}, \hat{\psi})] \) and the function \( h_{v_{int}}(v_{int}, \hat{\psi}) \) is given in Appendix B. The system (18) is a cascaded system where the linear UGES system (18b) perturbs the dynamics (18a) through the interconnection term \( H_v \).

Remark 10. Compared to Caharjia et al. (2013), the relative sway velocity \( \psi \) does not show up in (18). This is due to the choice of \( v_c \) instead of \( \psi \) as the error signal in (12). Complexity of the closed loop stability analysis is therefore reduced.

Analyzing (18) at equilibrium shows that \( \xi^eq = 0 \) and:

\[
V_c \sin(\sigma v_{int}^eq) + V_y \cos(\sigma v_{int}^eq) = 0,
\]  

(19)

therefore:

\[
v_{int,k}^eq = -(1/\sigma) \left( \text{atan2}(V_y, V_c) + k\pi \right), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}.
\]  

(20)

The system (18) has multiple equilibrium points that identify two physical directions: the counter-current direction and the co-current direction. This is clearly seen if the course held by the ship at equilibrium is calculated:

\[
\psi_k^eq = \text{atan2}(V_y, V_c) + k\pi,
\]  

(21)

where the equilibrium points with \( k = 1 + 2n, n \in \mathbb{Z} \) correspond to the counter-current direction, while the equilibrium points identified by \( k = 2n, n \in \mathbb{Z} \) correspond to the co-current direction. In particular, the equilibrium point with \( k = 1 \) that corresponds to the counter-current course, \( v_{int,1} \), is considered.

Remark 11. The equilibrium point having \( k = 1 \) is equivalent to all the counter-current equilibrium points identified by \( k = 1 + 2n, n \in \mathbb{Z} \), hence their analysis is identical.

The variable \( e \triangleq v_{int}^eq - v_{int,1} \) is introduced to move the equilibrium point to the origin. This is in fact a rotation of the inertial frame \( i \) for an angle \( \psi_1^eq \). The cascaded system (18) can be then rewritten in the following form:

\[
\dot{e} = -V_c \sin(\sigma e) + H_e(e, \xi)\xi,
\]  

(22a)

where \( V_c > 0 \) is the magnitude of the ocean current, \( V_c \triangleq \sqrt{V_x^2 + V_y^2} \), and \( H_e \triangleq [h_e(e, \psi)] \). The function \( h_e(e, \psi) \) is given in Appendix B. The following nominal system is analyzed first to assess the stability properties of the cascade (22):

\[
\dot{e} = -V_c \sin(\sigma e).
\]  

(23)

The following lemma states uniform semiglobal exponential stability (USES) for (23).
Lemma 2. Under the conditions of Theorem 1, the system (23) is USES.

Proof. Consider the quadratic Lyapunov function candidate $V_1 = (1/2)e^2$. In any ball $B_{1/e^2} \subseteq \{e \leq 1/e\}$, the time-derivative of $V_1$ satisfies the following bound:

$$\dot{V}_1 = -V_e \sigma |e| - \frac{1}{2}V_e \sigma |e| = -V_e \sigma V_1.$$ (24)

Notice that the tuning parameter $\sigma > 0$ can be chosen arbitrarily small and that $V_1$ is independent of $e$. This shows exponential stability on a domain of attraction that can be made arbitrarily large by picking $\sigma$ small enough. Therefore, according to Theorem 2 in Grotli et al. (2008), it is possible to conclude uniform semiglobal exponential stability on the parameter set $\Theta = \{\sigma > 0\}$ for the nominal system (23). □

Remark 12. Notice that USES implies USAS. Precise definitions of the USAS and USES properties are given in Grotli et al. (2008) (Definition 1) and in Chaillot and Loria (2006) (Definition 2.2), respectively.

Remark 13. Even though the equilibria of (22) are multiple, they can all be separated by an arbitrarily large distance by picking $\sigma > 0$ small enough. This explains intuitively why the stability properties of (23) hold semiglobally.

The next lemma shows uniform boundedness (UB) for (22).

Lemma 3. Under the conditions of Theorem 1, the solutions of (22) are uniformly and ultimately bounded.

Proof. The proof of Lemma 3 is given in Appendix A. □

Lemma 4 proves USAS stability for the cascade (22).

Lemma 4. Under the conditions of Theorem 1, the cascaded system (22) is USAS.

Proof. Theorem 18 from Chaillot and Loria (2008) is applied to show USAS stability of the cascade (22). In particular, Assumptions 16, 19, 20 and 21 from Chaillot and Loria (2008) need to be satisfied:

- [Interconnection] It can be shown that the interconnection term in (22a) satisfies the following bound and hence Assumption 16 of Chaillot and Loria (2008) is satisfied:

$$H_e(e, \xi) = \tilde{h}_e(e, \tilde{\psi}) < 2V_{\max} \tilde{\psi}.$$ (25)

- [USAS of (22b)] As shown at the beginning of this section, the perturbing system is UGES and thus Assumption 19 of Chaillot and Loria (2008) is trivially satisfied.

- [USAS of (23)] Lemma 2 shows USAS on $\sigma > 0$ for the nominal system (23). It is straightforward to show that Assumption 20 of Chaillot and Loria (2008) is fulfilled since $V_1$ is independent of $e$.

- [UB of (22)] Lemma 3 proves uniform ultimate boundedness of the solutions of (22). The bounds (A.7) and (A.8) are linearly dependent on $1/\sigma$, and hence it can be seen that Assumption 21 of Chaillot and Loria (2008) is satisfied as well.

This, according to Theorem 18 of Chaillot and Loria (2008), concludes USAS on the parameter set $\Theta = \{\sigma > 0\}$ of the cascaded system (22). □

In addition to USAS, uniform local exponential stability (ULES) of (22) is shown by linearizations:

$$\dot{\chi} = -\chi V_e \sigma - \sigma \tilde{h}_e(e, \tilde{\psi}) + \tilde{r},$$ (29)

and it can be shown that:

$$|f(\chi)| < g(||\chi||) \leq \kappa||e|| + ||\tilde{\psi}|| + ||\tilde{r}||,$$ (29)

for some $\kappa > 0$. Notice that $\chi(t)$ perturbs the sway subsystem and that $f(0) = 0$. The unforced sway subsystem is $\tilde{r} = Y(u_r)e_r$. Applying (29) and Assumption 6 to the time derivative of the quadratic function $V_2 = (1/2)v_r^2$ yields the following bound:

$$\dot{V}_2 = Y(u_r) v_r + X(u_r) f(\chi) v_r \leq -Y_{\max} v_r^2 + X_{\max} g(||\chi||) ||v_r||.$$ (30)

Given $0 < \theta < 1$, (30) becomes:

$$\dot{V}_2 \leq -(1 - \theta) v_{\max}^2, \forall ||v_r|| \geq \frac{1}{\theta} \max g(||\chi||) > 0.$$ (31)

Hence, following Theorem 4.19 in Khalil (2000), the sway subsystem (7e) is ISS with respect to $\chi$. □

Remark 14. The use of Assumption 6 in the proof of Lemma 5 is justified by the fact that $u_r$ is bounded, as clearly shown at the beginning of this section. See Borhaug et al. (2008); Cuhadarja et al. (2012c) for similar arguments.

To conclude, the controllers (13-14) guarantee USAS on the parameter set $\Theta = \{\sigma > 0\}$ as well as ULES of the counter-current equilibrium points $(k = 1 + 2n, n \in Z)$, of the closed loop system (22). Hence, for any ball of initial conditions $X_0$, there exists a small enough $\sigma > 0$ such that the objectives (9-11) are achieved asymptotically. Locally, (9-11) are achieved exponentially for all $\sigma > 0$.

7. SIMULATIONS

In this section results from numerical simulations are presented. The developed guidance law is applied to an underactuated supply vessel. The model parameters of the ship are given in Fredriksen and Pettersen (2004) and the objective is to make the vessel move against the sea current or, complementary, to follow the sea current. The ship should also hold a desired surge relative speed $U_{rd} = 2$ [m/s]. Notice that the guidance law sets the heading of the vessel only, while its position is unconstrained. The intensity of the current is $|V_c| = 1/\sqrt{2}$ [m/s] and its direction is randomly generated. In this case, its components are
V_x = 0.2209 [m/s] and V_y = −0.6717 [m/s], giving a direction of −71.8°. Thus, Assumptions 5 and 7 are fulfilled with V_{max} = 0.71 [m/s]. Furthermore, it can be verified that Assumption 6 is satisfied with Y_{min} = 0.3494 [s^{-1}] and X_{max} = 1.5340 [m/s].

The chosen values for the gain σ in the counter-current case and in the co-current case are 0.01 [m⁻¹] and −0.01 [m⁻¹], respectively. Choosing too high values for σ may induce chattering due to saturation in the magnitude and the turning rate of the rudder actuators. The linearized system (26) shows that the convergence rate of the guidance law is in first approximation dependent on the constant σV_c. Given that V_c = 1/√2 [m/s] and |σ| = 0.01 [m⁻¹], this gives a time constant of 141[s].

In particular, the restoring term V_c sin(σv) is strongest at the origin, thus the guidance dynamics are faster close to the stable equilibrium point. The internal controllers (13-14) are implemented with the following gains: k_u = 0.1, k_p = 0.04 and k_θ = 0.9. Hence, the u_r first order closed loop system (15) has a time constant of 8.8 [s] while the ψ second order closed loop system (16) is overdamped with ω_0 = 0.2 [rad/s].

The ship is initially located at the origin of the inertial frame and holds zero relative velocity. Its surge axis is parallel to the x axis of the inertial frame. Figures 2 and 4 show how counter-current and co-current guidance are successfully achieved. Notice that the current is acting in the −71.8° direction and that the guidance law correctly identifies the counter-current course as well as the co-current course (Figures 3 and 5). The practical implementability of the counter-current/co-current guidance can be assessed by analyzing the rudder angle of the vessel from Figures 3 and 5. Notice that in the simulations saturation is taken into account for both the rudder and the propeller. The maximum rudder angle is 35° and the maximum rudder turning rate is 10 [°/s]. The maximum propeller force is 1600 [kN]. Figures 3 and 5 show that the controller moves the rudder smoothly without sharp variations and does not reach saturation. This illustrates that the proposed guidance is implementable as long as reliable measurements of the v_c current component are available.
8. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper an improved control strategy for counter-current and co-current guidance of underactuated unmanned marine vehicles has been presented. In particular, USES and ULES stability properties are shown for the complete multiple-equilibria closed loop system. The control system is based on an integral guidance law where the current component acting in the sway direction represents the error signal. As a result, the vessel determines the two possible directions having zero absolute sway velocity: the counter-current course and the co-current course. The two directions represent a set of stable equilibrium points and a set of unstable equilibrium points. The sign of the gain $\sigma$ defines whether the vehicle converges to the counter-current direction or to the co-current direction. Numerical simulations support the theoretical results.
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Appendix A. PROOF OF LEMMA 3

In the following discussion the notation $\lambda_m(A)$ and $\lambda_M(A)$ is introduced to denote the minimum and maximum eigenvalue, respectively, of a matrix $A$. The Euclidean norm $\| \cdot \|_2$ is used.

Given the positive definite quadratic function $V_3(\chi)$:

$$V_3 \triangleq \chi^T P \chi,$$

where $\chi \triangleq [\hat{v}, \hat{\psi}, \hat{\nu}]^T$. The matrix $P$ is defined as:

$$P \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{r} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{\kappa_y}{\kappa_x} \left(1 + \frac{V_y}{V_x}\right) & \frac{\kappa_y}{\kappa_x}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{r} & 0 \\
0 & \frac{\kappa_y}{\kappa_x} \left(1 + \frac{V_y}{V_x}\right)
\end{bmatrix},$$

where $\rho > 0$ is a constant parameter. The matrix $P$ is symmetric and positive definite. Hence, its eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ are real and positive. In particular $\lambda_1 = 1/2$ and the other two are linearly dependent on $\rho$: $\lambda_2 = c_2(k_y, k_x) \rho$ and $\lambda_3 = c_3(k_y, k_x) \rho$, where $c_2(k_y, k_x) > 0$ and $c_3(k_y, k_x) > 0$. Therefore, by choosing $\rho > 0$ large enough, it is always possible to have $\lambda_m(P) = 1/2$ and $\lambda_M(P) = \rho \max(c_2, c_3)$ independently of the constants $k_y > 0$ and $k_x > 0$. In particular, with a big enough $\rho$, the following bound holds globally:

$$\frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 \leq V_3(\chi) \leq \rho \max(c_2, c_3) \|x\|^2.$$

On the domain $D \triangleq \{ |\hat{v}| \leq 1/\sigma \}$ the following bound holds for the time derivative $\dot{V}_3$:

$$\dot{V}_3 = -\rho \dot{\psi}^2 - \rho \dot{\nu}^2 - V_c \dot{e} \sin(\sigma e) + \dot{\psi} \varepsilon h_e(e, \dot{\psi}) \\
\leq -\rho \dot{\psi}^2 - \rho \dot{\nu}^2 - V_c e^2 + \varepsilon \psi h_e(e, \dot{\psi}).$$

Without any loss of generality, $\rho$ is chosen to satisfy $\rho > \max(2V_{\max}, 2V_{\max}/\sigma)$. Therefore, since $|h_e(e, \dot{\psi})| \leq 2V_{\max}$ as long as $\chi \in D$ and $\|x\| \geq \mu \triangleq \sqrt{\frac{2V_{\max}}{\rho \sigma}} > 0$ the bound (A.4) becomes:

$$\dot{V}_3 \leq -|\dot{\psi}| \left( \rho |\dot{\psi}| - 2V_{\max} |e| \right) - \rho \dot{\nu}^2 - \frac{\sigma V_c}{2} e^2 < 0.$$  \hfill (A.5)

Notice that $\rho > \max(2V_{\max}, 2V_{\max}/\sigma)$ makes also sure that the ball $B_\mu \triangleq \{\|x\| \leq \mu\} \subset D$. Finally, given the ball $B_{1/\sigma} \triangleq \{\|x\| \leq 1/\sigma\} \subset D$, where $B_\mu \subset B_{1/\sigma}$ and $B_{1/\sigma} \setminus B_\mu \neq \emptyset$, the following inequality holds:

$$\mu < \frac{1}{\sigma} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2 \rho \max(c_2, c_3)}},$$

as long as the parameter $\rho > 0$ large enough to have $\lambda_m(P) = 1/2$, $\lambda_M(P) = \rho \max(c_2, c_3)$, and $\rho > \max(2V_{\max}, 2V_{\max}/\sigma, 8V_{\max}^2 \max(c_2, c_3))$.

Therefore, according to Theorem 4.18 in Khalil (2000) or alternatively to Proposition 23 in Chaillot and Loria (2008), the solution $\chi(t)$ of cascaded system (22) is uniformly ultimately bounded, with the following ultimate bound:

$$\|\chi(t)\| \leq 2\frac{V_{\max}}{\sigma} \sqrt{\frac{\max(c_2, c_3)}{\rho}},$$

as long as the initial state $\chi_o$ satisfies:

$$\|\chi_o\| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2 \rho \max(c_2, c_3)}},$$

Notice that the ultimate bound (A.7) approaches zero as $\rho$ becomes infinitely large and that (A.7) as well as (A.8) are linearly dependent on the parameter $1/\sigma$.

Appendix B

$$F_{ux}(u_x, r) \triangleq \frac{1}{m_1} (m_{22} v_{ux} + m_{23} r),$$

$$X(u_x) \triangleq \frac{1}{m_2} m_{22} m_{33} - m_{23}^2 u_x + \frac{1}{m_2} m_{22} m_{33} - m_{23}^2,$$

$$Y(u_x) \triangleq \frac{1}{m_2} (m_{22} - m_{21} m_{33}) u_x - \frac{1}{m_2} m_{22} m_{33} - m_{23}^2,$$

$$F_c(u_x, u_y, r) \triangleq \frac{1}{m_2} m_{23} d_{22} - m_{22} d_{32} + (m_{22} - m_{21}) u_x,$$

$$+ \frac{1}{m_2} m_{23} (d_{23} + m_{13} u_z - m_{22} m_{33} - m_{23}^2) u_y,$$

$$+ \frac{1}{m_2} m_{23} (d_{23} + m_{13} u_z - m_{22} m_{33} - m_{23}^2) u_y.$$  \hfill (B.4)

The functions $h_{\nu_{int}}(\nu_{int}, \dot{\psi})$ and $h_{e}(e, \dot{\psi})$ are:

$$h_{\nu_{int}}(\nu_{int}, \dot{\psi}) \triangleq \frac{1 - \cos(\dot{\psi})}{\dot{\psi}} (V_c \sin(\sigma \nu_{int}) + V_c \cos(\sigma \nu_{int})),$$

$$\sin(\dot{\psi}) (V_c \cos(\sigma \nu_{int}) - V_c \sin(\sigma \nu_{int})),$$

$$h_{e}(e, \dot{\psi}) \triangleq V_c \left(1 - \cos(\dot{\psi})\right),$$

$$\sin(\dot{\psi}) + V_c \cos(\dot{\psi}),$$

where the limits of $h_{\nu_{int}}$ and $h_{e}$ for $\dot{\psi} \to 0$ exist and are finite. The constant $V_c > 0$ is the magnitude of the current: $V_c \triangleq \sqrt{V_x^2 + V_y^2}$.

Notice that the following identities are used when moving the equilibrium point $e_{\nu_{int}}^0$ to the origin in Section 6 (recall that $e = \nu_{int} - \nu_{int}^0$):

$$V_c \sin(\sigma \nu_{int}) + V_c \cos(\sigma \nu_{int}) = -V_c \sin(\sigma e),$$

$$V_c \cos(\sigma \nu_{int}) - V_c \sin(\sigma \nu_{int}) = V_c \cos(\dot{\psi}),$$

$$\sin(\dot{\psi}) (V_c \nu_{int} - V_c \dot{\psi}) = V_c \nu_{int},$$

$$\cos(\dot{\psi}) (V_c \nu_{int} - V_c \dot{\psi}) = V_c \dot{\psi}.$$