SYMMETRY-CONSTRAINED FORMATION MANEUVERING

WORKSHOP: GSC 2025

Zamir Martinez and Daniel Zelazo

Technion - Israel Institute of Technology,
Department of Aerospace Engineering

13.07.2025

CONNECT LAB
Cooperative Networks and Controls

Distributed coordination schemes have many practical applications:

- UAVs
    - Surveillance and reconnaissance
    - Mapping
    - Aerial transportation
    - Mobile communication networks
    - Coordinated maneuvering

- Spacecraft
    - Interferometric arrays
   - Constellations for sensing

Given a team of agents able to sense/communicate *only* with neighboring agents:

Formation Acquisition

Formation Maneuvering

Given a team of agents able to sense/communicate *only* with neighboring agents:

Formation Acquisition

- Overview of classic distance constrained formation Control
- Introduction of a novel control strategy for symmetry constrained formations


Formation Maneuvering

Given a team of agents able to sense/communicate *only* with neighboring agents:

Formation Acquisition

- Overview of classic distance constrained formation Control
- Introduction of a novel control strategy for symmetry constrained formations


Formation Maneuvering

Design a control strategy that enables symmetry-constrained formations to maneuver through space as a cohesive rigid body

3

- A team of n agents interact according to an information exchange graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$

- A team of n agents interact according to an information exchange graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$

- The graph can be embedded in Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$ as a framework $(\mathcal{G}, p)$. The position of the i-th agent is given by $p_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$

- By implementing distance
  constraints, the desired formation
  can be defined as a framework $(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{p}^\star)$

- By implementing distance constraints, the desired formation can be defined as a framework $(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{p}^\star)$

- Rotations and translations of this configuration result in some congruent framework $(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{q}^\star)$ that also satisfies the constraints

- The desired formation is characterized by a set of M constraints, encoded in the function $F : \mathbb{R}^{nd} \to \mathbb{R}^M$, and a configuration $\mathbf{p}^\star$ satisfying the constraints
- The set of all feasible formations is

$$\mathcal{F}(p) = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^{nd} \mid F(p) = F(\mathbf{p}^\star)\}$$

Formation Control Objective

For an ensemble of n agents with dynamics

$$\dot{p}_i = u_i,$$

with $p_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, an information exchange graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, and formation constraint function $F : \mathbb{R}^{nd} \to \mathbb{R}^M$, design a distributed control law for each agent $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that the set

$$\mathcal{F}(p) = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^{nd} \mid F(p) = F(\mathbf{p}^\star)\},$$

is asymptotically stable.

Theorem [Krick 2009]

Consider the potential function

$$F_f(p) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{ij \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\|p_i(t) - p_j(t)\|^2 - (d_{ij}^\star)^2 \right)^2$$

and assume the desired distances $d_{ij}^\star$ correspond to a feasible formation. Then the gradient dynamical system

$$\dot{p}_i = u_i = -\nabla_{p_i} F_f(p) = \sum_{ij \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\|p_i - p_j\|^2 - (d_{ij}^\star)^2 \right) (p_j - p_i)$$

asymptotically converges to the critical points of the potential function, i.e., $\frac{\partial F_f(p)}{\partial p} = 0$.

Theorem

Consider the potential function

$$F_f(p) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{ij \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\|p_i(t) - p_j(t)\|^2 - (d_{ij}^\star)^2 \right)^2$$

and assume the desired distances $d_{ij}^\star$ correspond to a feasible formation. Then the gradient dynamical system

$$\dot{p}_i = u_i = -\nabla_{p_i} F_f(p) = \sum_{ij \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\|p_i - p_j\|^2 - (d_{ij}^\star)^2 \right) (p_j - p_i)$$

asymptotically converges to the critical points of the potential function, i.e., $\frac{\partial F_f(p)}{\partial p} = 0$.

How do we define shapes ?

Rigidity Theory allows us to determine:

- the number of constraints required to ensure the desired shape
- how the constraints should be distributed on the network

Rigidity Theory allows us to determine:

- the number of constraints required to ensure the desired shape
- how the constraints should be distributed on the network

Rigidity Matrix $R(\mathcal{G}, p)$

$$R(p) = \frac{\partial F(p)}{\partial p} = \text{diag}(p_i - p_j)(E^T \otimes I_d)$$

The rigidity matrix helps us determine whether a framework $(\mathcal{G}, p)$ is **infinitesimally rigid**.

- E is the incidence matrix of $\mathcal{G}$
- Infinitesimal rigidity ensures that the shape is uniquely determined in a local sense, except from translations and rotations
- A framework is infinitesimally rigid if and only if $\text{rk} R(p) = 2n - 3$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$

The state-space representation of the distance constrained formation control:

$$\dot{p} = -\nabla_p F_f(p) = -R^T(p)\left(R(p)p - (d^\star)^2\right)$$

[Krick 2009]

The state-space representation of the distance constrained formation control:

$$\dot{p} = -\nabla_p F_f(p) = -R^T(p)\left(R(p)p - (d^\star)^2\right)$$

[Krick 2009]

- Local convergence to the desired formation shape is guaranteed if and only if the framework is infinitesimally rigid
- This leads to a minimal architectural requirement that ensures convergence to the correct formation. Equivalent to:

$$\text{rk } R(p) = 2|\mathcal{V}| - 3 \text{ and } |\mathcal{E}| = 2|\mathcal{V}| - 3 \quad (\text{in } \mathbb{R}^2)$$

The state-space representation of the distance constrained formation control:

$$\dot{p} = -\nabla_p F_f(p) = -R^T(p)\left(R(p)p - (d^\star)^2\right)$$

[Krick 2009]

- Local convergence to the desired formation shape is guaranteed if and only if the framework is infinitesimally rigid
- This leads to a minimal architectural requirement that ensures convergence to the correct formation. Equivalent to:

$$\text{rk } R(p) = 2|\mathcal{V}| - 3 \text{ and } |\mathcal{E}| = 2|\mathcal{V}| - 3 \quad (\text{in } \mathbb{R}^2)$$

Q: Can the problem be solved with fewer constraints?

The state-space representation of the distance constrained formation control:

$$\dot{p} = -\nabla_p F_f(p) = -R^T(p)\left(R(p)p - (d^\star)^2\right)$$

[Krick 2009]

- Local convergence to the desired formation shape is guaranteed if and only if the framework is infinitesimally rigid
- This leads to a minimal architectural requirement that ensures convergence to the correct formation. Equivalent to:

$$\text{rk } R(p) = 2|\mathcal{V}| - 3 \text{ and } |\mathcal{E}| = 2|\mathcal{V}| - 3 \quad (\text{in } \mathbb{R}^2)$$

Q: Can the problem be solved with fewer constraints?

A: Yes, by leveraging the inherent symmetry in certain formations!

Rotation symmetry

- The "classic" distance based formation control strategy requires at least 21 edges

- Incorporating symmetry constraints lowers the number of required edges to 11

Automorphisms encode graph symmetries

Graph Automorphism

An automorphism of the graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is a permutation $\psi : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{V}$ of its vertex set such that

$$\{v_i, v_j\} \in \mathcal{E} \Leftrightarrow \{\psi(v_i), \psi(v_j)\} \in \mathcal{E}$$

Identity:
$$\text{Id} = \left(\begin{array}{cccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \end{array} \right)$$

clock-wise $90°$ rotation:
$$\psi_1 = \left(\begin{array}{cccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 3 & 4 & 1 \end{array} \right)$$

reflection:
$$\psi_2 = \left(\begin{array}{cccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 1 & 4 & 3 \end{array} \right)$$

11

- Additional permutations can be found for the given graph considering all possible reflections and rotations

- The set of all automorphisms of $\mathcal{G}$ form a *group* - $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$
    - $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{G}) = \{\mathrm{Id}, \psi_1, \psi_2, ...\}$

- For any subgroup $\Gamma \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$, we say that $\mathcal{G}$ is Γ-symmetric, which define specific symmetries in $\mathcal{G}$

Certain nodes are equivalent to each other and can be grouped together.

consider $\Gamma = \{\mathrm{Id}, \psi_2\}$ (reflection about mirror **S**)

- **Vertex Orbit:**
  $$\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2 = \{1, 2\}, \ \Gamma_3 = \Gamma_4 = \{3, 4\}$$

- **Edge Orbit:**
 $$\Gamma_{e_1} = \{e_1\}, \ \Gamma_{e_3} = \{e_2\}, \ \Gamma_{e_2} = \Gamma_{e_4} = \{e_2, e_4\}$$

Certain nodes are equivalent to each other and can be grouped together.

consider $\Gamma = \{\mathrm{Id}, \psi_2\}$ (reflection about mirror **S**)

- **Vertex Orbit:**

  $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_2 = \{1, 2\}, \ \Gamma_3 = \Gamma_4 = \{3, 4\}$

  vertices inside a vertex orbit are equivalent

  representative vertex set: $\mathcal{V}_0 = \{1, 4\}$

- **Edge Orbit:**

  $\Gamma_{e_1} = \{e_1\}, \ \Gamma_{e_3} = \{e_2\}, \ \Gamma_{e_2} = \Gamma_{e_4} = \{e_2, e_4\}$

  edges inside an edge orbit are equivalent

  representative edge set: $\mathcal{E}_0 = \{e_1, e_3, e_4\}$

Graph symmetries can be realized in Euclidean space by assigning to each element of Γ an orthogonal matrix τ representing a point group isometry.

Example

- Consider $\Gamma = \{\mathrm{Id}, \psi_2\}$ (Reflection about mirror S)

- Isometry $\tau(\psi_2) = \tau_s = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$:

$$\tau_s p_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -a \\ b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} = p_2$$

$$\tau_s p_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -a \\ b \end{bmatrix} = p_1$$

The symmetric relationship of $\tau(\Gamma)$-symmetric frameworks is only satisfied for special configurations

The symmetric relationship of $\tau(\Gamma)$-symmetric frameworks is only satisfied for special configurations

Isometries of the desired configuration coincide with symmetries of the automorphisms of $\mathcal{G}$

$$R(p) = \begin{bmatrix} (-2a \quad 0) & (2a \quad 0) & (0 \quad 0) & (0 \quad 0) \\ (0 \quad b-c) & (0 \quad 0) & (0 \quad 0) & (0 \quad c-b) \\ (0 \quad 0) & (0 \quad b-c) & (0 \quad c-b) & (0 \quad 0) \\ (0 \quad 0) & (0 \quad 0) & (-2a \quad 0) & (2a \quad 0) \end{bmatrix}$$

Due to symmetry, certain rows and columns of the rigidity matrix are redundant.

Orbit Rigidity Matrix $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}_0, p)$ [Schulze 2011]

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}_0, p) = \begin{bmatrix} (2p_1 - \tau_s p_1 - \tau_s^{-1} p_1)^T & (0 \quad 0) \\ (p_1 - p_4)^T & (p_4 - p_1)^T \\ (0 \quad 0) & (2p_4 - \tau_s p_4 - \tau_s^{-1} p_4)^T \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (-2a \quad 0) & (0 \quad 0) \\ (b-c) & (c-b) \\ (0 \quad 0) & (-2a \quad 0) \end{bmatrix}$$

Describes the $\tau(\Gamma)$-symmetric infinitesimal rigidity properties of $\tau(\Gamma)$-symmetric frameworks.

The introduction of the orbit rigidity matrix suggests a further way to exploit symmetries in formation control:

- Only representative edges are required to maintain distances
- Symmetries within vertex orbits have no need for distance constraints

Define a *symmetric formation potential*

$$F_f(p(t)) = F_e(p(t)) + F_s(p(t))$$

where

- The representative edge formation potential:

$$F_e(p(t)) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{ij \in \mathcal{E}_0} \left(\|p_i(t) - \tau(\gamma)p_j(t)\|^2 - (d^\star_{i\gamma(j)})^2 \right)^2$$

- The symmetry potential:

$$F_s(p(t)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_0} \sum_{\substack{u,v \in \Gamma_i \\ uv \in \mathcal{E}}} \|p_u(t) - \tau(\gamma_{vu})p_v(t)\|^2$$

[Zelazo 25]

17

The states are defined as $\tilde{p}(t) = Pp(t) = \begin{bmatrix} p_0^T(t) & p_f^T(t) \end{bmatrix}^T$, for some permutation matrix P.

- $p_0(t)$ - the restriction of the configuration vector $p(t)$ to agents in the representative vertex set $\mathcal{V}_0$
- $p_f(t)$ - The remaining agents

Propose the gradient control

$$u(t) = -\nabla F_f(p(t))$$

The dynamics in state-space form become

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{p}_0(t) \\ \dot{p}_f(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathcal{O}^T(\mathcal{G}_0, p_0(t))\Big(\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}_0, p_0(t))p_0(t) - \mathbf{d}_0^2\Big) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - PQP^T \begin{bmatrix} p_0(t) \\ p_f(t) \end{bmatrix}$$

[Zelazo 25]

18

The states are defined as $\tilde{p}(t) = Pp(t) = \begin{bmatrix} p_0^T(t) & p_f^T(t) \end{bmatrix}^T$, for some permutation matrix P.

- $p_0(t)$ - the restriction of the configuration vector $p(t)$ to agents in the representative vertex set $\mathcal{V}_0$
- $p_f(t)$ - The remaining agents

Propose the gradient control

$$u(t) = -\nabla F_f(p(t))$$

The dynamics in state-space form become

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{p}_0(t) \\ \dot{p}_f(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathcal{O}^T(\mathcal{G}_0, p_0(t)) \Big(\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}_0, p_0(t))p_0(t) - \mathbf{d}_0^2 \Big) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - PQP^T \begin{bmatrix} p_0(t) \\ p_f(t) \end{bmatrix}$$

[Zelazo 25]

Compare to

$$\dot{p} = -R^T(p) \Big(R(p)p - (d^\star)^2 \Big)$$

18

Example

- $\tau(\Gamma)$-symmetric framework
 with $2\pi/6$ rotational symmetry

Example

- $\tau(\Gamma)$-symmetric framework with $2\pi/6$ rotational symmetry

- The "classic" distance based formation control strategy requires at least 21 edges

Example

- The forced symmetric formation control strategy requires only 11 edges

- Formation maneuvering aims to satisfy the formation control objective while simultaneously moving the formation through space as a rigid body

- Formation maneuvering aims to satisfy the formation control objective while simultaneously moving the formation through space as a rigid body
- Secondary objective:

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} ||\dot{p}_i(t) - v_i(t)|| = 0$$

where $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the desired rigid body velocity for each agent

- **Formation maneuvering** aims to satisfy the formation control objective while simultaneously moving the formation through space as a rigid body

- Secondary objective:

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} ||\dot{p}_i(t) - v_i(t)|| = 0$$

where $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the desired rigid body velocity for each agent

- $\tau(\Gamma)$-symmetric frameworks by definition have point-group symmetries defined with respect to some fixed inertial point

- **Formation maneuvering** aims to satisfy the formation control objective while simultaneously moving the formation through space as a rigid body

- Secondary objective:

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} ||\dot{p}_i(t) - v_i(t)|| = 0$$

where $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the desired rigid body velocity for each agent

- $\tau(\Gamma)$-symmetric frameworks by definition have point-group symmetries defined with respect to some fixed inertial point

Idea: Introduce a trajectory defined by a virtual state $r(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a time-varying rotation matrix $R(t) \in SO(d)$.

Proposition

- The shifted state

$$\bar{c}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} c_0^T(t) & c_f^T(t) \end{bmatrix}^T = P(p(t) - \mathbb{1} \otimes r(t))$$

  allows the agents to agree on a different origin defined by $r(t)$.

- For an angular velocity $\omega(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, describing the rotational dynamics of the trajectory, the time-varying rotation matrix $R(t)$ satisfies $\dot{R}(t) = R(t)\omega(t)^\wedge$, and the corresponding isometry is defined by the similarity transformation:

$$\tau_\gamma(t) = R(t)\tau(\gamma)R(t)^T$$

Proposition

- The shifted state

$$\bar{c}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} c_0^T(t) & c_f^T(t) \end{bmatrix}^T = P(p(t) - \mathbb{1} \otimes r(t))$$

allows the agents to agree on a different origin defined by $r(t)$.

- For an angular velocity $\omega(t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, describing the rotational dynamics of the trajectory, the time-varying rotation matrix $R(t)$ satisfies $\dot{R}(t) = R(t)\omega(t)^\wedge$, and the corresponding isometry is defined by the similarity transformation:

$$\tau_\gamma(t) = R(t)\tau(\gamma)R(t)^T$$

Assumption:

- The desired configuration rotates about an axis $\hat{\omega}$ that passes through both the shifter formation's centroid and the origin

Define:

- **Formation Control**

$$u(t) = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathcal{O}^T(\mathcal{G}_0, c_0(t), \tau_\gamma(t)) \left(\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}_0, c_0(t), \tau_\gamma(t)) c_0(t) - \mathbf{d}_0^2 \right) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - PQ(\tau_\gamma(t)) P^T \begin{bmatrix} c_0(t) \\ c_f(t) \end{bmatrix}$$

- **Virtual trajectory dynamics**

$$v(t) = \mathbb{1} \otimes \dot{r}(t) + \begin{bmatrix} \cdots & \omega \times c_i(t) & \cdots \end{bmatrix}^T$$

Preposition

The modified control

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{p}_0(t) & \dot{p}_f(t) \end{bmatrix}^T = u(t) = u_a(t) + v_m(t)$$

solves the formation maneuvering problem, ensuring (local) exponential stability to the desired symmetric formation shape.

Define the error system

$$\bar{e} = [\bar{\sigma}(t)^T \quad \bar{q}(t)^T]^T = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}_0, c_0(t), \tau_\gamma(t)) c_0(t) - \mathbf{d}_0^2 \\ Q(\tau_\gamma(t))\bar{c}(t) \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\bar{\sigma}(t)$ and $\bar{q}(t)$ represent the distance and symmetry errors, respectively.

Consider the Lyapunov candidate function

$$V(t) = \frac{1}{2}\bar{e}(t)^T\bar{e}(t)$$

Its time derivative satisfies

$$\dot{V}(t) = \bar{e}(t)^T \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}_0, c_0(t)) & 0 \\ \bar{E}^T(\Gamma) P^T \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \dot{\bar{c}}(t) \leq \alpha\|\bar{e}(t)\|^2, \quad \alpha < 0,$$

Since $\dot{V}(t)$ is negative definite in a neighborhood of the equilibrium, the error $\bar{e}(t)$ exponential converges to zero. Consequently, $u(t) \to v_m(t)$ as $e \to 0$.

Trajectory generated by:

$$\dot{r}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 4.5 & 3\sin(\frac{2}{3}\pi t) \end{bmatrix}^T,$$

$$r(0) = -\begin{bmatrix} 5 & 5 \end{bmatrix}^T$$

- "Classic" distance-based formation control needs a global reference agent and at least 21 edges

- The forced symmetric formation control strategy requires only 7 edges

Trajectory generated by:

$$\dot{r}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{5}{3}\cos(\pi t) & \frac{5}{3}\sin(\pi t) & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T,$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{\pi}{3} \end{bmatrix}^T$$

A single agent is subjected to a reference velocity input $v_{ref}(t)$.

Proposition

The modified control strategy including a reference model takes the form:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{p}_0(t) \\ \dot{p}_f(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathcal{O}^T(\mathcal{G}_0, c_0(t))\left(\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{G}_0, c_0(t))c_0(t) - \mathbf{d}_0^2\right) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - PQP^T \begin{bmatrix} c_0(t) \\ c_f(t) \end{bmatrix} + \dot{\bar{r}}(t)$$

The trajectory is computed distributedly based on the consensus protocol:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\bar{r}} &= -k_P \bar{L}(\mathcal{G})\bar{r} - k_I \bar{\zeta} + nB \otimes v_{ref}(t) \\ \dot{\bar{\zeta}} &= \bar{L}(\mathcal{G})\bar{r} \end{cases}$$

where:

- $L(\mathcal{G}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the Laplacian matrix of the information exchange graph $\mathcal{G}$
- $v_{ref} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the reference velocity input
- $B \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a standard base vector denoting which agent is subjected to $v_{ref}(t)$

Trajectory generated by:

$$\dot{r}(t \leq 3) = \begin{bmatrix} 5 + 2t & 2t^2 + 3 \end{bmatrix}^T,$$

$$\dot{r}(t > 3) = \begin{bmatrix} 10 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T,$$

$$r(0) = \begin{bmatrix} 10 & -10 \end{bmatrix}^T$$

Summary

- Rigid body translations and rotations can be executed while preserving point group symmetries in symmetry constrained formations
- A global velocity reference command can be applied to a single agent

Future Work

- Extend the distributed maneuvering approach to formations that undergo rotations
- Extend the approach to multi-agent systems with double integrator dynamics
- Investigate bearing rigidity extensions under symmetry constraints
- Explore distributed symmetry agreement to autonomously agree on a global symmetric configuration

Questions?