

# Observability of switched differential-algebraic equations for general switching signals

Aneel Tanwani and Stephan Trenn

**Abstract**—We study observability of switched differential-algebraic equations (DAEs) for arbitrary switching. We present a characterization of observability and a related property called determinability. These characterizations utilize the results for the single-switch case recently obtained by the authors. Furthermore, we study observability conditions when only the mode sequence of the switching signal (and not the switching times) are known. This leads to necessary and sufficient conditions for observability and determinability. We illustrate the results with illustrative examples.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we study observability of a class of switched systems where the dynamical subsystems are modeled as *differential-algebraic equations* (DAEs):

$$\begin{aligned} E_\sigma \dot{x} &= A_\sigma x + B_\sigma u, \\ y &= C_\sigma x, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is the switching signal ( $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{N}$  denote the real, natural numbers, resp.), and  $E_p, A_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $B_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d_u}$ ,  $C_p \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y \times n}$ , for  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ . Usually, ordinary differential equations are used to model the dynamical behavior of a system. However, the evolution of the states in a physical system may be constrained, e.g., currents and voltages in electrical circuits due to Kirchoff's laws, or position variables in coupled mechanical systems. In the modeling of such physical systems, it is important to take into account the algebraic constraints imposed on the state variables alongside some differential equations that govern the evolution of these state variables and we therefore believe that a system's description as in (1) is important for modeling many phenomena.

This paper is a continuation of our work [1] where observability of (1) for a single switch was investigated. We are able to extend these results to the case of general switching signals and our main result is the characterization of observability of switched DAEs (1) with a fixed switching signal (Theorem 10). We also present a necessary and a sufficient condition for observability when only the mode sequence of the switching signal is known (and not the switching times). Alongside these results we also study the weaker property of determinability (called “forward observability” in [1]) which seems to be more suitable with respect to observer design (see [2] in a similar context).

Aneel Tanwani is with the Team Bipop, research centre INRIA Rhône-Alpes, France, email: aneel.tanwani@inria.fr

Stephan Trenn is with the Technomathematics group, University of Kaiserslautern, Germany, email: trenn@mathematik.uni-kl.de

For a more detailed literature review, we refer the reader to the introduction of [1].

## II. PRELIMINARIES

In the following, we collect important properties and definitions for a matrix pair  $(E, A)$ . We only consider *regular* matrix pairs, i.e. for which the polynomial  $\det(sE - A)$  is not the zero polynomial. A very useful characterization of regularity is the following well-known result.

*Proposition 1 (Regularity and quasi-Weierstrass form):*

A matrix pair  $(E, A) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is regular if, and only if, there exist invertible matrices  $S, T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  such that

$$(SET, SAT) = \left( \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & N \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad (2)$$

where  $J \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$ ,  $0 \leq n_1 \leq n$ , is some matrix and  $N \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$ ,  $n_2 := n - n_1$ , is a nilpotent matrix.  $\triangleleft$

In view of [3], we call the decomposition (2) *quasi-Weierstrass form*. An easy way to calculate the transformation matrices  $S$  and  $T$  for (2) is to use the following so-called *Wong sequences* [4], [3]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_0 &:= \mathbb{R}^n, & \mathcal{V}_{i+1} &:= A^{-1}(E\mathcal{V}_i), & i &= 0, 1, \dots \\ \mathcal{W}_0 &:= \{0\}, & \mathcal{W}_{i+1} &:= E^{-1}(A\mathcal{W}_i), & i &= 0, 1, \dots \end{aligned}$$

The Wong sequences are nested and get stationary after finitely many steps. The limiting subspaces are defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{V}^* := \bigcap_i \mathcal{V}_i, \quad \mathcal{W}^* := \bigcup_i \mathcal{W}_i.$$

For any full (column) rank matrices  $V, W$  with  $\text{im } V = \mathcal{V}^*$  and  $\text{im } W = \mathcal{W}^*$ , the matrices  $T := [V, W]$  and  $S := [EV, AW]^{-1}$  are invertible and (2) holds.

Based on (2) we define the following “projectors”.

*Definition 2 (Consistency, differential and impulse projectors):* Consider the regular matrix pair  $(E, A)$  with corresponding quasi-Weierstrass form (2). The *consistency projector* of  $(E, A)$  is given by

$$\Pi_{(E,A)} = T \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} T^{-1},$$

the *differential projector* is given by

$$\Pi_{(E,A)}^{\text{diff}} = T \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} S,$$

and the *impulse projector* is given by

$$\Pi_{(E,A)}^{\text{imp}} = T \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} S,$$

where the block sizes correspond to the ones in (2).  $\triangleleft$

Note that only the consistency projector is a projector in the usual sense (i.e.  $\Pi_{(E,A)}$  is an idempotent matrix); whereas  $\Pi_{(E,A)}^{\text{diff}}$  and  $\Pi_{(E,A)}^{\text{imp}}$  are not projectors because, in general,  $\Pi_{(E,A)}^{\text{diff}} \Pi_{(E,A)}^{\text{diff}} \neq \Pi_{(E,A)}^{\text{diff}}$  and the same holds for  $\Pi_{(E,A)}^{\text{imp}}$ . Let

$$\mathfrak{C}_{(E,A)} := \{ x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists x \in \mathcal{C}^1 : E\dot{x} = Ax \wedge x(0) = x_0 \}$$

be the *consistency space* of the DAE  $E\dot{x} = Ax$ , where  $\mathcal{C}^1$  is the space of differentiable functions  $x : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then the following observations hold [3]:

- 1) All solutions  $x \in \mathcal{C}^1$  of  $E\dot{x} = Ax$  evolve within  $\mathfrak{C}_{(E,A)}$ ,
- 2)  $\mathfrak{C}_{(E,A)} = \mathcal{V}^*$ , i.e. the first Wong-sequence converges to the consistency space,
- 3)  $\text{im } \Pi_{(E,A)} = \mathcal{V}^* = \mathfrak{C}_{(E,A)}$  and  $\ker \Pi_{(E,A)} = \mathcal{W}^*$ , i.e. the consistency projector maps onto the consistency space along  $\mathcal{W}^*$ .

The following lemma motivates the name of the differential projector.

*Lemma 3 ([1, Lem. 3]):* Consider the DAE  $E\dot{x} = Ax$  with regular matrix pair  $(E, A)$ . Then any solution  $x \in \mathcal{C}^1$  of  $E\dot{x} = Ax$  fulfills

$$\dot{x} = \Pi_{(E,A)}^{\text{diff}} Ax =: A^{\text{diff}} x. \quad \triangleleft$$

For understanding the role of the consistency projector and for studying impulsive solutions, we consider the space of *piecewise-smooth distributions*  $\mathbb{D}_{\text{pw}\mathcal{C}^\infty}$  from [5] as the solution space; that is, we seek a solution  $x \in (\mathbb{D}_{\text{pw}\mathcal{C}^\infty})^n$  to the following initial-trajectory problem (ITP):

$$\begin{aligned} x_{(-\infty,0)} &= x_{(-\infty,0)}^0 \\ (E\dot{x})_{[0,\infty)} &= (Ax)_{[0,\infty)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $x^0 \in (\mathbb{D}_{\text{pw}\mathcal{C}^\infty})^n$  is some initial trajectory, and  $f_{\mathcal{I}}$  denotes the restriction of a piecewise-smooth distribution  $f$  to an interval  $\mathcal{I}$ . In [5], [6] it is shown that the ITP (3) has a unique solution for any initial trajectory if, and only if, the matrix pair  $(E, A)$  is regular. In particular, the following result concerning the consistency projector holds.

*Lemma 4 (Role of consistency projector; [6, Thm. 4.2.8]):* Consider the ITP (3) with regular matrix pair  $(E, A)$  and with arbitrary initial trajectory  $x^0 \in (\mathbb{D}_{\text{pw}\mathcal{C}^\infty})^n$ . Let  $\Pi_{(E,A)}$  be the consistency projector of  $(E, A)$ , then there exists a unique solution  $x \in (\mathbb{D}_{\text{pw}\mathcal{C}^\infty})^n$  and

$$x(0+) = \Pi_{(E,A)} x(0-). \quad \triangleleft$$

Finally, the role of the impulsive projector becomes clear when expressing the impulsive part, denoted by  $x[0]$ , of the distributional solution  $x$  of the ITP (3).

*Lemma 5 ([1, Cor. 5]):* Consider the ITP (3) with regular matrix pair  $(E, A)$  and corresponding impulse and consistency projectors  $\Pi_{(E,A)}^{\text{imp}}$ ,  $\Pi_{(E,A)}$ . Let  $E^{\text{imp}} := \Pi_{(E,A)}^{\text{imp}} E$  then, for the unique solution  $x \in (\mathbb{D}_{\text{pw}\mathcal{C}^\infty})^n$ ,

$$x[0] = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (E^{\text{imp}})^{i+1} (\Pi_{(E,A)} - I) x(0-) \delta_0^{(i)},$$

where  $\delta_0^{(i)}$  denotes the  $i$ -th (distributional) derivative of the Dirac-impulse  $\delta_0$  at  $t = 0$ .  $\triangleleft$

Altogether, invoking an inductive argument, these results guarantee existence and uniqueness of (distributional) solutions of the switched DAE (1) provided each matrix pair  $(E_p, A_p)$  is regular and the switching signal does not have a finite accumulation point of switching times [6].

### III. OBSERVABILITY CONDITIONS

The concepts introduced in the previous section are now utilized to obtain necessary and sufficient conditions for observability and determinability of switched DAEs.

#### A. Observability definitions

*Definition 6 (Observability):* The switched DAE (1) with some fixed switching signal  $\sigma$ , is called (*globally*) *observable* if for every pair of inputs and outputs  $(y, u) \in (\mathbb{D}_{\text{pw}\mathcal{C}^\infty})^{d_y+d_u}$  there exists at most one  $x \in (\mathbb{D}_{\text{pw}\mathcal{C}^\infty})^n$  which solves (1).  $\triangleleft$

The following result will be helpful for simplifying the analysis.

*Lemma 7 (Observability of zero, [1, Prop. 7]):* The switched DAE (1) is observable if, and only if,  $y \equiv 0$  and  $u \equiv 0$  implies  $x \equiv 0$ .  $\triangleleft$

The above result justifies that we can ignore the input when studying observability of (1); hence in what follows, we can restrict our attention to the homogeneous switched DAE:

$$E_\sigma \dot{x} = A_\sigma x, \quad y = C_\sigma x. \quad (4)$$

The above observability definition aims at recovering the state also in the past, however in certain applications (e.g. observer design) one might only be interested in determining the state from some time onwards. This motivates the following definition.

*Definition 8 (Determinability):* The switched DAE (1) is called *determinable* if for every pair of triplets  $(x_1, u_1, y_1), (x_2, u_2, y_2) \in (\mathbb{D}_{\text{pw}\mathcal{C}^\infty})^{n+d_u+d_y}$  which solve (1) there exists  $t \geq 0$  such that the implication  $(u_1, y_1) = (u_2, y_2) \Rightarrow x_{1(t,\infty)} = x_{2(t,\infty)}$  holds.  $\triangleleft$

Similar to observability we can restrict our attention to zero-determinability.

*Proposition 9 (Determinability of zero):* The switched DAE (1) is determinable if, and only if,  $y \equiv 0$  and  $u \equiv 0$  implies  $x_{(t,\infty)} \equiv 0$  for some  $t \geq 0$ .  $\triangleleft$

*Proof:* Necessity is obvious. Assume now (1) is not determinable, i.e. there exist external signals  $u$  and  $y$  and corresponding solutions  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  with  $(x_1 - x_2)_{(t,\infty)} \neq 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . By linearity,  $x := x_1 - x_2$  solves  $E_\sigma \dot{x} = A_\sigma x$  and  $C_\sigma x = C_\sigma x_1 - C_\sigma x_2 = y - y = 0$ , hence  $y \equiv 0$  and  $u \equiv 0$  does not imply  $x_{(t,\infty)} = 0$  for any  $t \geq 0$ .  $\blacksquare$

#### B. The single switch case

We recapitulate the result of [1] on the single switch case which are essential for the results on arbitrary switching. Therefore, we consider in this subsection the switching signal

$$\sigma(t) = 0 \text{ for } t < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(t) = 1 \text{ for } t \geq 0. \quad (5)$$

That is, we only consider one switch from some initial subsystem given by  $(C_-, E_-, A_-) := (C_0, E_0, A_0)$  – active before the switch – to some other subsystem given by  $(C_+, E_+, A_+) := (C_1, E_1, A_1)$  that is active after the switch. By regularity of the matrix pairs  $(E_{\pm}, A_{\pm})$ , it is easily seen that for any solution  $x \in (\mathbb{D}_{\text{pw}C^\infty})^n$  of the switched DAE (4) with the single switch switching signal (5) the following equivalence holds:

$$x \equiv 0 \iff x(0-) = 0.$$

For the characterization of observability and determinability for the single switch case, the following four subspaces play an essential role:

**Consistency space.** Independently of the observed output it holds that  $x(0-) \in \mathfrak{C}_-$ , where  $\mathfrak{C}_- := \mathfrak{C}_{(E_-, A_-)}$  denotes the consistency space of the DAE corresponding to the matrix pair  $(E_-, A_-)$ .

**Left-unobservable space.** If  $y_{(-\infty, 0)} \equiv 0$  then  $y^{(i)}(0-) = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , hence, invoking Lemma 3, we have  $x(0-) \in \ker O_-$ , where<sup>1</sup>

$$O_- := [C_- / C_- A_-^{\text{diff}} / \dots / C_- (A_-^{\text{diff}})^{n-1}], \quad (6)$$

and  $\ker O_-$  denotes the unobservable space of the ODE  $\dot{x} = A_-^{\text{diff}} x$ ,  $y = C_- x$ .

**Projected right-unobservable space.** Analogously as above, if  $y_{(0, \infty)} \equiv 0$  then  $x(0+) \in \ker O_+$ , where  $O_+$  is defined as in (6). Due to Lemma 4, we obtain  $x(0-) \in \ker O_+$ , where

$$O_+ := O_+ \Pi_{(E_+, A_+)}.$$

**Impulse unobservable space.** Finally, due to Lemma 5, from the equality  $0 = y[0] = C_+ x[0]$  it follows that  $x(0-) \in \ker O_+^{\text{imp-}}$ , where

$$O_+^{\text{imp-}} := O_+^{\text{imp}} (\Pi_{(E_+, A_+)} - I)$$

and

$$O_+^{\text{imp}} := [C_+ E_+^{\text{imp}} / C_+ (E_+^{\text{imp}})^2 / \dots / C_+ (E_+^{\text{imp}})^{n_2-1}].$$

With these four subspaces, a complete characterization of observability is possible.

*Theorem 10 (Single switch result [1, Cor. 13]):*

Consider the switched DAE (4) and the single switch switching signal (5). Then the unobservable subspace for  $x(0-)$  is given by

$$\mathcal{M} := \mathfrak{C}_- \cap \ker O_- \cap \ker O_+^- \cap \ker O_+^{\text{imp-}},$$

i.e., the following equivalence holds for all solutions  $x \in (\mathbb{D}_{\text{pw}C^\infty})^n$  of (4):

$$y \equiv 0 \iff x(0-) \in \mathcal{M}.$$

In particular, the switched DAE (1) is observable if, and only if,  $\mathcal{M} = \{0\}$ . Furthermore, (1) is determinable if, and only if,  $\Pi_{(E_+, A_+)} \mathcal{M} = \{0\}$ .  $\triangleleft$

<sup>1</sup>By  $[M_1/M_2/\dots/M_k]$  we denote the matrix which is obtained by stacking the matrices  $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_k$  (with the same number of columns) over each other.

### C. Multiple switching main results

So far, we have studied switched DAEs with a single switching instant. For switched DAEs (4) with more than two subsystems and multiple switchings, we build on the results of the previous subsection to obtain a characterization for the general case. For notational convenience, we assume that the switching signal  $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}$  is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(t) &= -1 \quad \text{for } t < t_0 := 0, \\ \sigma(t) &= k \quad \text{on } [t_k, t_{k+1}), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $t_k \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , denote the (ordered) switching times of  $\sigma$  with  $t_k \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . In particular, we assume that  $\sigma$  has no switches before the initial time  $t_0 := 0$ . The latter is a slight restriction of generality as we do not allow accumulation of switching times towards  $-\infty$ . Otherwise this is not a restriction of generality as we do of course allow  $(E_k, A_k, C_k) = (E_l, A_l, C_l)$  for any  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Adopting the notation from the previous section we let, for  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{C}_k &:= \mathfrak{C}_{(E_k, A_k)}, \\ O_k &:= [C_k / C_k A_k^{\text{diff}} / \dots / C_k (A_k^{\text{diff}})^{n-1}], \\ O_k^{\text{imp}} &:= [C_k E_k^{\text{imp}} / C_k (E_k^{\text{imp}})^2 / \dots / C_k (E_k^{\text{imp}})^{n_2-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

With  $O_k^- := O_k \Pi_k$ , and  $O_k^{\text{imp-}} := O_k^{\text{imp}} (\Pi_k - I)$ , where  $\Pi_k := \Pi_{(E_k, A_k)}$  is the consistency projector of the  $k$ -th subsystem, we define  $\mathcal{M}_k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , as:

$$\mathcal{M}_k := \mathfrak{C}_{k-1} \cap \ker O_{k-1} \cap \ker O_k^- \cap \ker O_k^{\text{imp-}},$$

According to Theorem 10 we call  $\mathcal{M}_k$  the *locally unobservable subspace* at the  $k$ -th switching instance. The following example shows that the existence of  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\mathcal{M}_k = \{0\}$ , i.e. local observability, is not necessary for (global) observability.

*Example 11 ( $\mathcal{M}_k = \{0\}$  not necessary, [1, Ex. 20]):*

Consider a switched DAE (4) excited by the switching signal

$$\sigma(t) = \begin{cases} -1, & t \in (-\infty, 0), \\ 0, & t \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}), \\ 1, & t \in [\frac{\pi}{2}, \infty), \end{cases}$$

with modes given by the following matrices  $E_{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $A_{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $C_{-1} = [0 \ 0 \ 1]$ ,  $E_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $A_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $C_0 = [0 \ 0 \ 1]$  and  $(E_1, A_1, C_1) = (E_{-1}, A_{-1}, C_{-1})$ .

Letting  $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$  denote the natural basis vectors for  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , it can be verified that (for details see [1])

$$\mathcal{M}_0 = \mathcal{M}_1 = \text{span}\{e_2\}.$$

However, this switched DAE is observable as can be seen from the explicit solution given by, for some  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1(t) &= a \sin t \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[0, \frac{\pi}{2})}, \\ x_2(t) &= a e^{2t} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, 0)} + a \cos t \cdot \mathbb{1}_{[0, \frac{\pi}{2})}, \\ x_3(t) &= -a \delta_{\frac{\pi}{2}} = y(t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{I}}$  denotes the indicator function of the interval  $\mathcal{I}$ . For an identically zero output, the impulsive part of the output at the second switching instant enforces  $a = 0$  and this makes  $x \equiv 0$ .  $\triangleleft$

Concerning the sufficiency of  $\mathcal{M}_k = \{0\}$  for observability, observe first that clearly  $\mathcal{M}_0 = \{0\}$  makes the whole switched DAE observable as  $x(0-)$  can be deduced from the information at the first switch alone. On the other hand  $\mathcal{M}_k = \{0\}$ ,  $k > 0$ , only guarantees that  $x(t_k-)$  can be deduced from the  $k$ -th switch but, in general, this does not allow for the deduction of  $x(0-)$ .

To use the information obtained by each individual switch given by  $\mathcal{M}_k$ , we will use the following iteration,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $k = m - 1, \dots, 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_m^m &:= \mathcal{M}_m, \\ \mathcal{N}_k^m &:= \mathcal{M}_k \cap \Pi_k^{-1}(e^{-A_k^{\text{diff}} \tau_k} \mathcal{N}_{k+1}^m), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\tau_k := t_{k+1} - t_k$  is the duration of mode  $k$ . The intuition is that  $\mathcal{N}_k^m$ ,  $k < m$ , is the unobservable subspace for  $x(t_k-)$  based on the knowledge of the observed output at the switching time  $t_k$ , given by  $\mathcal{M}_k$  and the information obtained from the future switching times up to  $t_m$  given by  $\mathcal{N}_{k+1}^m$  together with the known flow on the interval  $[t_k, t_{k+1})$  and the consistency projector  $\Pi_k$  at  $t_k$ . With this subspace iteration we can now characterize observability of switched DAEs.

*Theorem 12 (Observability characterization):* Consider the switched DAE (1) with switching signal  $\sigma$  as in (7). For each positive integer  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , define the sequence  $\mathcal{N}_k^m$ , for  $0 \leq k \leq m$ , according to (8). The switched system is globally observable if, and only if, there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\mathcal{N}_0^m = \{0\}. \quad (9)$$

*Proof: Sufficiency.* We show that the identically zero output can only be produced by  $x \equiv 0$ . Fix  $m$  such that (9) holds. Assume that  $y \equiv 0$  on  $(-\infty, \infty)$ ; then according to Theorem 10,  $x(t_m-) \in \mathcal{M}_m = \mathcal{N}_m^m$ . We next apply the inductive argument to show that  $x(t_k-) \in \mathcal{N}_k^m$  for  $0 \leq k \leq m$ . Assume that  $x(t_k-) \in \mathcal{N}_k^m$ ; then, invoking Lemma 3,  $x(t_{k-1}+) \in e^{(-A_k^{\text{diff}} \tau_k)} \mathcal{N}_k^m$ . This implies that  $x(t_{k-1}-) \in \Pi_k^{-1} e^{(-A_k^{\text{diff}} \tau_k)} \mathcal{N}_k^m$ . Zero output on the interval  $(t_{k-2}, t_k)$  implies that  $x(t_{k-1}-) \in \mathcal{M}_{k-1}$  and thus  $x(t_{k-1}-) \in \mathcal{M}_{k-1} \cap \Pi_k^{-1} e^{(-A_k^{\text{diff}} \tau_k)} \mathcal{N}_k^m = \mathcal{N}_{k-1}^m$ . As a result,  $x(0-) \in \mathcal{N}_0^m = \{0\}$ , i.e.,  $x(0-) = 0$ ; regularity of the matrix pairs  $(E_k, A_k)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}$  implies that  $x \equiv 0$ .

*Necessity.* Assume that  $\mathcal{N}_0^m \neq \{0\}$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $\mathcal{N}_m^{m+1} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_m^m$  it follows that  $\mathcal{N}_k^{m+1} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_k^m$  for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 \leq k \leq m$ . Let  $\mathcal{N}_k := \bigcap_{m \geq k} \mathcal{N}_k^m$ , then, by finite dimensionality of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\mathcal{N}_0 \neq \{0\}.$$

We will show that for all initial values  $x^0 \in \mathcal{N}_0$  the unique non-zero solution  $x \in (\mathbb{D}_{\text{pwc}\infty})^n$  of the switched DAE

$$E_\sigma \dot{x} = A_\sigma x, \quad x(0-) = x^0$$

fulfills  $y = C_\sigma x = 0$ , which implies unobservability. To this end, we first show the following implication,  $0 \leq k \leq m$ :

$$x(t_k-) \in \mathcal{N}_k \Rightarrow x(t_{k+1}-) \in \mathcal{N}_{k+1}. \quad (10)$$

Assume  $x(t_k-) \in \mathcal{N}_k$ . Since  $x(t_{k+1}-) = \Pi_{k+1} x(t_k-)$  and  $x(t_k-) \in \mathcal{N}_k^m$  for any  $m \geq k+1$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} x(t_{k+1}-) &= e^{A_k^{\text{diff}} \tau_k} x(t_k+) = e^{A_k^{\text{diff}} \tau_k} \Pi_k x(t_k-) \\ &\in e^{A_k^{\text{diff}} \tau_k} \Pi_k \mathcal{N}_k^m \\ &\subseteq e^{A_k^{\text{diff}} \tau_k} \left( \Pi_k \mathcal{M}_k \cap e^{-A_k^{\text{diff}} \tau_k} \mathcal{N}_{k+1}^m \right) \\ &\subseteq \mathcal{N}_{k+1}^m. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, implication (10) is shown and an inductive argument gives  $x(t_k-) \in \mathcal{N}_k$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

For all  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}$ ,  $x(t_{k+1}-) \in \mathcal{N}_{k+1} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{k+1} \subseteq \ker O_k$ , i.e.  $x$  evolves on  $(t_k, t_{k+1})$  within the unobservable space of the  $k$ -th mode, where  $t_{-1} := -\infty$ . This implies  $y_{(t_k, t_{k+1})} \equiv 0$ . Finally,  $y[t_k] = 0$  because  $x(t_k-) \in \mathcal{N}_k \subseteq \mathcal{M}_k \subseteq \ker O_k^{\text{imp-}}$ . Altogether, we have shown that  $x^0 \in \mathcal{N}_0$  implies  $y \equiv 0$  which concludes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

*Remark 13 (Finite number of modes):* Note that even in the case that there are only finitely many possible modes for the switched DAE (1), there is no upper bound on  $m$  (independent of the switching signal) for condition (9), because the ‘‘essential’’ mode which makes the whole switched DAE observable might appear arbitrarily late.

*Example 14 (Example 11 revisited):* Consider again the switched DAE from Example 11. We calculate

$$\mathcal{N}_1^1 = \mathcal{M}_1 = \text{span}\{e_2\}$$

and, invoking  $A_0^{\text{diff}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $e^{-A_0^{\text{diff}} \frac{\pi}{2}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  as well as  $\Pi_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_0^1 &= \mathcal{M}_0 \cap \Pi_0^{-1}(e^{-A_0^{\text{diff}} \frac{\pi}{2}}) \mathcal{N}_1^1 \\ &= \text{span}\{e_2\} \cap \text{span}\{e_1, e_3\} = \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, condition (9) holds and we can verify that the switched DAE is observable without analyzing the explicit solution formulas.  $\triangleleft$

Note that, although Theorem 12 gives a characterization of observability, it might not be so useful in practice as one does not know a priori how many switches are needed for observability. In particular, if the switched system is unobservable the check for unobservability runs indefinitely as  $\mathcal{N}_0^m \neq \{0\}$  for all  $m$ . Furthermore, for large  $m$  the calculation of  $\mathcal{N}_0^m$  via (8) might take very long as one always has to start with  $\mathcal{N}_m^m = \mathcal{M}_m$  and has to iterate backwards from  $m$  to zero for each  $m$ . As already mentioned in Section III-A observability basically aims at reconstructing  $x(0-)$  from the observed output which explains why at each new switching instance the obtained information must be iterated back to the initial switch at  $t = 0$ . If one only aims at determining the state in the future, then the situation improves significantly. Towards this end, consider the following sequence of subspaces:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}^0 &:= \Pi_0 \mathcal{M}_0, \\ \mathcal{Q}^{k+1} &:= \Pi_{k+1}(\mathcal{M}_{k+1} \cap e^{A_k^{\text{diff}} \tau_k} \mathcal{Q}^k), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The intuition behind this sequence of subspaces is as follows: The subspace  $\mathcal{Q}^k$  contains all undeterminable states at the  $k$ -th switching instance where we use all the knowledge up to the  $k$ -th switching instance. At the next switching instance we propagate forward the information from  $\mathcal{Q}^k$  and intersect this with the locally unobservable subspace  $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}$ . Using then the consistency projector  $\Pi_{k+1}$  gives the next undeterminable subspace  $\mathcal{Q}^{k+1}$ . This procedure is significantly different to the subspace iteration in (8) as it is not necessary to iterate back in time. We can now characterize determinability with the help of the subspace iteration (11).

*Theorem 15 (Determinability characterization):*

Consider the switched DAE (1) with switching signal  $\sigma$  as in (7). For each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  define  $\mathcal{Q}^m$  according to (11). The switched system is determinable if, and only if, there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\mathcal{Q}^m = \{0\}. \quad (12)$$

*Proof:* Due to Proposition 9, it suffices to consider (4) with a zero output.

*Sufficiency.* We will show that a zero output implies  $x(t_{m+}) = 0$  hence, due to regularity of the involved matrix pairs,  $x(t_{m,\infty}) \equiv 0$ . To this end, let  $x \in (\mathbb{D}_{\text{pwc}^\infty})^n$  be a solution of (4) with zero output. Then Theorem 10 ensures that  $x(0+) \in \mathcal{Q}^0$ . We will inductively show that  $x(t_{k+}) \in \mathcal{Q}^k$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , i.e. assume the latter for some  $k$ . As  $x(t_{k+1}-) = e^{A_k^{\text{diff}} \tau_k} x(t_{k+})$  it follows that  $x(t_{k+1}-) \in e^{A_k^{\text{diff}} \tau_k} \mathcal{Q}^k$ . Theorem 10 yields that  $x(t_{k+1}-) \in \mathcal{M}_{k+1}$  hence we have shown that  $x(t_{k+1}+) = \Pi_{k+1} x(t_{k+1}-) \in \mathcal{Q}^{k+1}$ . In particular,  $x(t_{m+}) \in \mathcal{Q}^m = \{0\}$ .

*Necessity.* Determinability implies existence of  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x(t_{m+}) = 0$  for all solution  $x$  of (4) with zero output. Without restricting generality, we can assume that there are no further switches after  $t_m$ . Seeking a contradiction, assume that  $\mathcal{Q}^m \neq \{0\}$ . We will now construct a solution  $x$  such that its corresponding output is zero and  $x(t_{m+}) \neq 0$ , contradicting determinability. Choose  $x_+^m \in \mathcal{Q}^m \setminus \{0\}$ , then by definition there exists  $x_-^m \in \mathcal{M}_m \cap e^{A_{m-1}^{\text{diff}} \tau_{m-1}} \mathcal{Q}^{m-1}$  such that  $x_+^m = \Pi_m x_-^m$ . Let  $x_+^{m-1} := e^{-A_{m-1}^{\text{diff}} \tau_{m-1}} x_-^m$  then  $x_+^{m-1} \in \mathcal{Q}^{m-1}$ . We can repeat this procedure inductively to obtain  $x_\pm^0, x_\pm^1, \dots, x_\pm^m \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $x_+^k \in \mathcal{Q}^k$ ,  $x_-^k \in \mathcal{M}_k$ ,  $x_+^k = \Pi_k x_-^k$  for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$  and  $x_-^k = e^{A_{k-1}^{\text{diff}} \tau_{k-1}} x_+^{k-1}$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$ . Let  $x$  be the unique solution of (4) with initial condition  $x(0-) = x_-^0$ . By construction,  $x(t_{k\pm}) = x_\pm^k$  for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$ , in particular  $x(t_{k-}) \in \mathcal{M}_k$  which, by Theorem 10, ensures zero output on  $(-\infty, t_1)$ ,  $(t_{k-1}, t_{k+1})$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, m-1$ , and  $(t_{m-1}, \infty)$ ; in particular,  $y[t_k] = 0$ , for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$ . Hence we have obtained the sought contradiction as the constructed  $x$  produces a zero output but  $x(t_{m+}) = x_+^m \neq 0$ . ■

*Remark 16 (Artificial switches):* It is always possible to alter the switching signal  $\sigma$  as in (7) by adding an artificial

switch at  $t_k' \in (t_k, t_{k+1})$  between the  $k$ -th and  $(k+1)$ -th switching instants, resulting in  $\sigma'$  also given by (7) but now with different matrices describing the modes:

$$(E'_m, A'_m, C'_m) = \begin{cases} (E_m, A_m, C_m), & \text{for } m \leq k, \\ (E_{m-1}, A_{m-1}, C_{m-1}), & \text{for } m \geq k+1, \end{cases}$$

in particular,  $(E'_k, A'_k, C'_k) = (E'_{k+1}, A'_{k+1}, C'_{k+1})$ . Then, as both descriptions describe the same switched DAE, the observability conditions should not change. Indeed, with some effort, one can show that (8) and (11) are invariant with respect to adding artificial switches.

#### IV. OBSERVABILITY CONDITIONS FOR PARTLY UNKNOWN SWITCHING SIGNAL

In the previous section we presented characterizations of observability and determinability under the assumption that the switching signal is known exactly a priori. In particular, the conditions depend on the switching times and how long each mode is active. In this section we want to weaken this assumption by only assuming knowledge of the mode sequence (and not of the switching times), i.e. we only know that  $\sigma$  is a member of the set

$$\Sigma_{\text{seq}} := \left\{ \sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\} \mid \begin{array}{l} \sigma \text{ is given by (7) for} \\ \text{some switching times} \\ 0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots \end{array} \right\}$$

This will simplify the observability conditions as they will not depend on the switching times  $t_k$ . However, the price will be that we will only get a sufficient and a necessary condition for observability and we will show with examples that there is indeed a gap between these conditions. For the formulation of the results we will need the following notation.

*Definition 17 (A-invariant subspaces):* Let  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  be a matrix and  $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  some subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Let

$$\langle A \mid \mathcal{V} \rangle := \mathcal{V} + A\mathcal{V} + A^2\mathcal{V} \dots + A^{n-1}\mathcal{V}$$

be the smallest  $A$ -invariant subspace containing  $\mathcal{V}$  and let

$$\langle \mathcal{V} \mid A \rangle := \mathcal{V} \cap A^{-1}\mathcal{V} \cap A^{-2}\mathcal{V} \cap \dots \cap A^{-(n-1)}\mathcal{V}$$

be the largest  $A$ -invariant subspace contained within  $\mathcal{V}$ . ◁

*Corollary 18 (Sufficient condition for observability):*

Consider the DAE (1) with a switching signal  $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\text{seq}}$ . For each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , define the following sequence of subspaces, using the notation from Section III-A:

$$\overline{\mathcal{N}}_m^m := \mathcal{M}_m$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{N}}_{k-1}^m := \mathcal{M}_{k-1} \cap \Pi_{k-1}^{-1} \left\langle A_{k-1}^{\text{diff}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{N}}_k^m \right\rangle, \quad k = m, \dots, 1.$$

The switched DAE (1) is observable if there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\overline{\mathcal{N}}_0^m = \{0\}. \quad \triangleleft$$

*Proof:* Note that  $e^{At}\mathcal{V} \subseteq \langle A \mid \mathcal{V} \rangle$  for any matrix  $A$ , any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and any subspace  $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , hence  $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_k^m \supseteq \mathcal{N}_k^m$  for all  $m \geq k \geq 0$ . In particular,  $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_0^m = \{0\}$  implies  $\mathcal{N}_0^m = \{0\}$  and Theorem 12 ensures observability. ■

The condition in Corollary 18 is not necessary as the following (ODE) example shows:

*Example 19:* Consider a switched system with mode sequence indexed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}(E_{-1}, A_{-1}, C_{-1}) &= \left( I, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, (1, -1) \right), \\ (E_0, A_0, C_0) &= \left( I, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, (0, 0) \right), \\ (E_1, A_1, C_1) &= \left( I, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, (1, 0) \right) \\ &= (E_k, A_k, C_k), \quad k \geq 2.\end{aligned}$$

Easy calculations show that  $\mathcal{M}_0 = \text{span}\left\{\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\right\}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_1 = \text{span}\left\{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\right\} = \mathcal{M}_m$ ,  $m \geq 2$ , and  $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_0^m = \overline{\mathcal{N}}_0^m = \mathcal{M}_0 \neq 0$ . However, we will show that the switched system is observable. For that purpose, consider any solution  $x$  with zero output. Then  $x(0+) = x(0-) = (x_1^0, x_1^0)^\top$  for some  $x_1^0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Furthermore,  $x(t_1) = x(t_1-) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & t_1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} x(0+) = (x_1^0(1+t_1), x_1^0)^\top \in \mathcal{M}_1$ . Hence, either  $x_1^0 = 0$  or  $t_1 = -1$ . The latter is not possible, because we assumed that the switching times are in order, so  $x_1^0 = 0$  must hold and  $x \equiv 0$  is shown.  $\triangleleft$

The above example, however, satisfies the following necessary condition obtained as a corollary to Theorem 12.

*Corollary 20 (Necessary condition for observability):*

Consider the DAE (1) with a switching signal  $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\text{seq}}$ . For each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  define the following sequence of subspaces:

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\mathcal{N}}_m^m &:= \mathcal{M}_m \\ \underline{\mathcal{N}}_{k-1}^m &:= \mathcal{M}_{k-1} \cap \Pi_{k-1}^{-1} \langle \underline{\mathcal{N}}_k^m \mid A_{k-1}^{\text{diff}} \rangle, \quad k = m, \dots, 1.\end{aligned}$$

If the switched DAE (1) is observable then there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\underline{\mathcal{N}}_0^m = \{0\}.$$

*Proof:* Note that  $e^{At}\mathcal{V} \supseteq \langle \mathcal{V} \mid A \rangle$  for any matrix  $A$ , any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and any subspace  $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , hence  $\underline{\mathcal{N}}_k^m \subseteq \underline{\mathcal{N}}_k^m$  for all  $m \geq k \geq 0$ . Now observability implies the existence of some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\{0\} = \underline{\mathcal{N}}_0^m \supseteq \underline{\mathcal{N}}_0^m$ .  $\blacksquare$

In order to further illustrate the gap between the necessary condition and the sufficient condition, consider the following example where a system satisfies the necessary condition but not the sufficient condition and is unobservable.

*Example 21:* Consider a switched system with mode sequence indexed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}(E_{-1}, A_{-1}, C_{-1}) &= \left( I, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, (0, 0) \right), \\ (E_0, A_0, C_0) &= \left( I, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, (0, 0) \right), \\ (E_1, A_1, C_1) &= \left( I, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, (1, 0) \right), \\ &= (E_k, A_k, C_k), \quad k \geq 2.\end{aligned}$$

Easy calculations show that  $\mathcal{M}_0 = \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_1 = \text{span}\left\{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}\right\}$  and  $\underline{\mathcal{N}}_0^1 = \{0\}$ . However, we will show that the switched system is unobservable. Any solution  $x$  with  $x(0-) = x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$  is given by  $x(t_1) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos t_1 & \sin t_1 \\ -\sin t_1 & \cos t_1 \end{bmatrix} x^0$  on  $(0, t_1)$  and remains constant afterwards. As a zero output only constrains the first component of  $x$  on the interval

$(t_1, \infty)$ , we have the one-dimensional unobservable subspace  $\left\{ (x_1^0, x_2^0)^\top \mid x_1^0 \cos t_1 + x_2^0 \sin t_1 = 0 \right\}$  for  $x(0-)$ . Note that by making the switching signal periodic we would achieve observability. However, we haven't investigated the general implications of periodicity for the characterization of observability so far and this remains to be done in future work.  $\triangleleft$

We conclude this section with the corresponding sufficient and necessary conditions for determinability, whose proofs are analogue to the ones of Corollaries 18 and 20.

*Corollary 22 (Conditions for determinability):* Consider the switched DAE (1) with a switching signal  $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\text{seq}}$ . For each  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , define the following subspaces:

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\mathcal{Q}}^0 &:= \Pi_0 \mathcal{M}_0, \\ \overline{\mathcal{Q}}^{k+1} &:= \Pi_{k+1} \left( \mathcal{M}_{k+1} \cap \left\langle A_k^{\text{diff}} \mid \overline{\mathcal{Q}}^k \right\rangle \right), \quad k \in \mathbb{N},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\mathcal{Q}}^0 &:= \Pi_0 \mathcal{M}_0, \\ \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^{k+1} &:= \Pi_{k+1} \left( \mathcal{M}_{k+1} \cap \left\langle \underline{\mathcal{Q}}^k \mid A_k^{\text{diff}} \right\rangle \right), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.\end{aligned}$$

The switched DAE (1) is determinable if there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_0^m = \{0\}.$$

On the other hand, if the switched DAE (1) is determinable then there exists an  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\underline{\mathcal{Q}}_0^m = \{0\}. \quad \triangleleft$$

## V. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a characterization of observability and determinability of switched DAEs with known but arbitrary switching signals. We also present a sufficient and a necessary condition for observability and determinability when only the mode sequence of the switching signal (and not the switching times) is known. We have illustrated with examples that there is a gap between these conditions.

As a future direction of research, the construction of observers for switched DAEs is a topic that has not been discussed so far and could be a potential application of the results derived in this paper.

## REFERENCES

- [1] A. Tanwani and S. Trenn, "On observability of switched differential-algebraic equations," in *Proc. 49th IEEE Conf. Decis. Control, Atlanta, USA*, 2010, pp. 5656–5661.
- [2] A. Tanwani, H. Shim, and D. Liberzon, "Observability implies observer design for switched linear systems," in *Proc. ACM Conf. Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, 2011, pp. 3–12.
- [3] T. Berger, A. Ilchmann, and S. Trenn, "The quasi-Weierstraß form for regular matrix pencils," *Lin. Alg. Appl.*, vol. 436, no. 10, pp. 4052–4069, 2012.
- [4] K.-T. Wong, "The eigenvalue problem  $\lambda Tx + Sx$ ," *J. Diff. Eqns.*, vol. 16, pp. 270–280, 1974.
- [5] S. Trenn, "Regularity of distributional differential algebraic equations," *Math. Control Signals Syst.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 229–264, 2009.
- [6] —, "Distributional differential algebraic equations," Ph.D. dissertation, Institut für Mathematik, Technische Universität Ilmenau, Universitätsverlag Ilmenau, Ilmenau, Germany, 2009. [Online]. Available: <http://www.db-thueringen.de/servlets/DocumentServlet?id=13581>