

Do What You Know: Coupling Knowledge with Action in Discrete-Event Systems

K. Ritsuka  Karen Rudie 

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract An epistemic model for decentralized discrete-event systems with non-binary control is presented. This framework combines existing work on conditional control decisions with existing work on formal reasoning about knowledge in discrete-event systems. The novelty in the model presented is that the necessary and sufficient conditions for problem solvability encapsulate the actions that supervisors must take. This direct coupling between knowledge and action—in a formalism that mimics natural language—makes it easier, when the problem conditions fail, to determine how the problem requirements should be revised.

Keywords Discrete-Event Systems Supervisory Control Epistemic Logic

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020) 93A14 93A16 93B07 93C65

1 Introduction

The recent emergence of the Internet of things, including smart vehicles, home automation, and wearables has raised the need for decentralized supervisory control: the concept that the control is performed by not a monolithic, but many individual entities—or agents—separated by the environment. This paper focuses on systems modelled as discrete-event systems (DES).

This work was financially supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) through a Collaborative Research and Development Grant together with General Dynamics Land Systems–Canada and Defence Research and Development Canada (K. Ritsuka) and an NSERC Discovery Grant (K. Rudie).

K. Ritsuka
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Ingenuity Labs Research Institute,
Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada K7L 3N6
E-mail: Ritsuka314@queensu.ca

Karen Rudie
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Ingenuity Labs Research Institute,
Queen's University, Kingston, ON, Canada K7L 3N6
E-mail: karen.rudie@queensu.ca

With control actions performed jointly, a mechanism—called a fusion rule—is needed to combine control decisions of the agents. Decentralized control of discrete-event systems under partial observations began with allowing only Boolean control decisions, and synthesis of the control policy has been studied when the fusion rule is conjunctive (Cieslak et al., 1988; Rudie and Wonham, 1992), and later generalized to other fusion rules (Yoo and Lafortune, 2002). Further work by Yoo and Lafortune (2004) extended the approach to allow non-binary control decisions with a more sophisticated fusion rule, so that supervisors can “conditionally” turn on/off events based on the actions of other supervisors. Yoo and Lafortune gave necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of supervisors (Yoo and Lafortune, 2004) and a realization of the supervisors (Yoo and Lafortune, 2005).

With a different approach, Ricker and Rudie (2007) gave an epistemic interpretation of the work of Yoo and Lafortune (2004), where the use of the formal language of epistemic logic enabled one to discuss the supervisory control in an anthropomorphic manner, which gives a more intuitive understanding for how control decisions are made. The epistemic logic model developed by Ricker and Rudie (2007) resolves the first drawback of the linguistic approach listed above, namely the meaning of an epistemic expression is immediately understandable at a glance, so that an expression of the form $K_1(\)$ means “Supervisor 1 knows $\$ ”. However, even in the earlier epistemic logic reformulation of DES problems, there is a tenuous connection between the solvability conditions and the actions to be prescribed for supervisors in a construction that exploits the conditions.

This paper extends our earlier work (Ean and Rudie, 2022), in which we gave epistemic logical characterizations to architectures by Cieslak et al. (1988), Rudie and Wonham (1992), and Yoo and Lafortune (2002). Following the same methodology, we demonstrate and prove that a standard and representative result (Yoo and Lafortune, 2004) in decentralized DES can not only be cast as epistemic logic but also in a way that results in a direct link between the condition that must hold for a solution to exist and the control protocol that must be followed when the condition holds. In particular, we provide a line-by-line correspondence between the expressions of the knowledge the supervisors must possess and the actions they must take.

We also point out that epistemic expressions could facilitate simpler formal discussions. The verification of supervisor existence, and the algorithm of supervisor synthesis, are described by a single proof which also demonstrates their correctness. The two processes, together with that of partitioning controllable events, run as a coroutine.

We provide more comprehensive intuition for the necessary and sufficient conditions for the solvability and solution to a decentralized control problem, including an analysis of why supervisors issuing **don’t know** decisions nonetheless might still “know” something, and thus again demonstrate how the use of epistemic logic provides a better understanding of the decentralized DES control problem.

Our treatment of the problem involves demonstrating that if the control problems discussed here are solvable by supervisors of any flavour, the problems must also be solvable by our knowledge-based supervisors. This fact suggests that although the supervisors we construct are algorithmic, since the algorithm is described in epistemic terms, they reflect human-like reasoning.

2 Preliminaries

To lay a foundation for the discussion, we recall the definition of discrete-event systems, in particular that of the Decentralized Supervisory Control and Observation Problem, then that of epistemic logic and its use in expressing inference-observability. In this section we recall the methodology we used in our previous work (Ean and Rudie, 2022).

2.1 Discrete Event Systems

The systems under consideration in this work are discrete-event systems. A discrete-event system is a system with a discrete state space, where actions or event occurrences may cause the system to change state. We consider the system's behaviours to be all finite sequences of events the system can generate from its initial state.

In this work, we use the formalisms of discrete-event systems found in Wonham and Cai (2018) and Cassandras and Lafortune (2007).

Definition 2.1

We model a plant G as a finite state automaton (FSA)

$$G = (\Sigma; Q; \delta; q_0)$$

where Σ is a finite set of events, Q a finite set of states, δ the transition function, and $q_0 \in Q$ the initial state.

When more than one automaton is under discussion, we put the name of the automaton as a superscript in the components, e.g., we use Q^G to refer to the state set of G .

The language generated by G is defined as

$$L(G) = \{s \in \Sigma^* \mid \delta(q_0, s) \text{ is defined}\}$$

We interpret $L(G)$ as the set of physically possible behaviours of G .

A language L is prefix-closed whenever for all strings $s \in L$, it is always the case that $s' \in L$. By definition, $L(G)$ is always prefix-closed.

2.2 Decentralized Supervisory Control with Partial Observations

When the behaviour of a discrete-event system plant's is not desirable, we constrain its behaviours through supervisory control. We will allow an arbitrary number of supervisors to jointly perform the control, where each supervisor observes and controls a subset of events, and may issue a control decision for a given event. Decentralized control has been examined by many DES researchers. For a more extensive discussion, see the decentralized control section in Cassandras and Lafortune (2007).

Because multiple supervisors may act on any given event, we require a mechanism to combine the (potentially conflicting or differing) control decisions of the different supervisors. Prosser et al. (1997) named such mechanisms fusion rules. Subsequent work by Yoo and Lafortune (2002) recognized that fusion rules for each event can be chosen separately and independently.

Formally, we define the decentralized supervisory architecture as follows.

Definition 2.2

Let CD be a set of supervisory control decisions. Let $N = \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ be a finite set of n supervisors for plant G . For simplicity, we will write i instead of f_i when referring to the supervisor.

For each supervisor $i \in N$, let $i; c$; $i; o$ be the sets of controllable and observable events for supervisor i , resp. Let $P_i : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ be the usual projection function to capture a supervisor i 's observation, i.e., if a plant generates a sequence of events s , supervisor i will only see $P_i(s)$. Denote the set of events controlled by some supervisors $c = \bigcup_{i \in N} i; c$, and the set of events not controlled by any supervisor $uc = \Sigma - c$. Hence we have $uc = \Sigma - c$. The sets o and uo are defined similarly. Let $N = \{i \in N \mid i; c \neq \emptyset\}$ be the set of supervisors that can control c .

With a slight abuse of notation, we use $P_i(G)$ to denote the automaton constructed by replacing all transitions labelled by an unobservable event with ϵ and determinized, so that $P_i(G)$ recognizes the language $P_i L(G)$.

Now supervisors can be prescribed by $f_i : P_i L(G) \rightarrow CD$ for all $f_i \in N$. Specifying that supervisors take arguments from $P_i L(G)$ instead of $L(G)$ implicitly encodes requirements traditionally referred to as feasibility and validity, i.e., a supervisor must make consistent decisions for strings $s; s^0$ that look alike to that supervisor, i.e., such that $P_i(s) = P_i(s^0)$. We focus only on FSA-based supervisors. That is, a supervisor f_i can be realized as a Moore machine $(S_i; f_i^0)$ such that $f_i(s; \epsilon) = f_i^0(i(s; q_{i;0}))$, where S_i is an FSA $(Q_i; i; q_{i;0})$, and $f_i^0 : Q_i \rightarrow CD$. We will refer to f_i^0 simply as f_i when convenient.

For each controllable event c , let cd_N denote the collection of control decisions issued by supervisors $i \in N$, hence cd_N has exactly $|N|$ elements. Let CD_N be the collection of all such cd_N 's. Let $FD = \{ \text{enable}, \text{disable} \}$ be the set of fused decisions. Let $f : CD_N \rightarrow FD$ be the fusion functions chosen separately for each $c \in \Sigma$, and the joint supervision $f_N : L(G) \rightarrow FD$ be defined as $f_N(s; \epsilon) = f(f_i(P_i(s); \epsilon)_{i \in N})$. Consequently, only decisions issued by supervisors $i \in N$ are fused, and decisions of supervisors not controlling event c are ignored.

The closed-loop behaviour of the plant under joint supervision is denoted by $L(f_N = G)$, and defined inductively as the smallest set such that:

- $\epsilon \in L(f_N = G)$
- $s \in L(f_N = G) \wedge s \in L(G) \wedge \exists c \in c \wedge f_N(s; \epsilon) = \text{enable} \Rightarrow s \in L(f_N = G)$
- $s \in L(f_N = G) \wedge s \in L(G) \wedge \exists c \in uc \wedge f_N(s; \epsilon) = \text{disable} \Rightarrow s \in L(f_N = G)$

The second bullet point in the definition of closed-loop behaviour encodes the requirement traditionally referred to as completeness: a physically possible event that is not controllable by any supervisor must be allowed to occur under supervision. The third bullet point says that a physically possible event that is controllable and for which the fused decision is **enable** must be allowed to occur under supervision.

Whereas the fusion function f can be seen as an n -ary operation on supervisory control decisions CD , there is no operation over the fused decision set FD , since elements in this set are to be interpreted as fused decisions and should be regarded as final. In particular, whereas we may take $CD = FD$ as Boolean values and f as a Boolean function as existing works commonly do when it is convenient (Rudie and Wonham, 1992; Yoo and Lafortune, 2002), when moving to non-binary control

decisions (Yoo and Lafortune, 2005), we clearly separate the two sets and hence FD should not be considered as Boolean values (although still binary). For this reason, we also do not use the two symbols 0; 1 for elements of either set.

The sets CD and FD being disjoint also simplifies discussion: we can now refer to an element of either set without explicitly stating from which set it comes. We also refer to a particular element of either set simply as a decision when no confusion would arise.

Remark 2.3

Whereas the set CD determines the number of distinct control decisions available to the supervisors, what those decisions mean—their semantics—is given by the fusion rule f . Nonetheless, although the symbols we choose for control decisions may be formally meaningless, we will still choose them with the intended fusion rule in mind. For example, in what follows, we will use the symbol **on** (resp., **off**) as an element of CD with the intended meaning that some supervisor's decision is that an event should be allowed to occur (resp., not allowed to occur). I

Constructing multiple supervisors jointly restricting a plant's behaviours will be called the Decentralized Supervisory Control and Observation Problem (DSCOP). We will use the term “condition” (without qualification) to refer to the necessary and sufficient condition needed to solve DSCOP.

For the sake of comparison, we will use the following generic definition of DSCOP as a common ground for subsequent discussions.

Problem 2.4 (Decentralized Supervisory Control and Observation Problem, DSCOP)

Given a plant G , a subautomaton¹ E of G , and n pairs of controllable/observable event sets, choose an appropriate set of control decisions CD , and a fusion rule f , and synthesize a set N of supervisors, such that $L(f_N = G) = L(E)$. I

We usually study the condition for a class of DSCOP for CD and f that are fixed a priori. See also Rmk. 2.3. In particular, CD and f should be independent of any specific G and E . In practice, one may choose whatever CD and f necessary to solve the problem at hand. Fixing CD and f allows us to classify pairs of G and E according to the CD and f sufficient for the decentralized control problem to be solvable, and thus allows comparison among pairs of CD and f .

2.3 Epistemic Logic

Ricker and Rudie (2007, 2000) observed that reasoning about the decision-making of decentralized supervisors could be facilitated using formal reasoning about knowledge, via epistemic logic. Although formal conditions for solving DSCOP can be described using conditions on strings in languages, and hence do not require a formal logic description, epistemic logic provides a natural modelling paradigm that parallels natural languages, thus giving better intuition into the reasoning behind the decisions that supervisors make. Specifically, the epistemic operator in the language expresses concepts such as “agent i knows that a certain event must be disabled”. Imbuing supervisors with such anthropomorphic capabilities sets the stage for decision-making

¹ Our formulation is not restricted by requiring that E is a subautomaton of G , since given an arbitrary G^0 and E^0 where $L(E^0) \subseteq L(G^0)$, one can always find language-equivalent G and E such that $L(G) = L(G^0)$ and $L(E) = L(E^0)$ and E is a subautomaton of G .

to be linked to “knowledge” that the agents Have—much as humans base their decision-making on what they know or don’t know about a certain situation. The work in Ricker and Rudie (2007, 2000) uses epistemic logic as a way to speak about what knowledge supervisors must possess for a problem to be solvable, but it does not capitalize on the link between knowledge and action to relate a supervisor’s decision-making directly to its knowledge in an immediately apparent way.

Epistemic logic as used in distributed computing problems was first presented by Halpern and Moses (1990). See Fagin et al. (2004) for more details. We provide in the remainder of this section the concepts from epistemic logic needed to understand our work.

Definition 2.5

For a fixed set V of variables, where v denotes some element of V , and a fixed finite set N of agents, where i denotes some element of N , the set of epistemic modal formulae is defined inductively by the following grammar:

$S; T ::= (v)$	propositional variable v
$j (\neg S)$	negation of S
$j (S \wedge T)$	conjunction of S, T
$j (K_i S)$	agent i knows S

Definition 2.6

It is conventional to define other connectives from the primitive ones above:

- $(\neg S) =_{df} \neg (S)$
- $(S \vee T) =_{df} \neg (\neg S \wedge \neg T)$

Where convenient, we use the connectives defined above to express ideas, but when reasoning about epistemic formulae, we assume that the connectives of Definition 2.6 have all been syntactically expanded, so that we only have to deal with primitive ones.

We omit parentheses according to the following precedence convention: unary operators $\neg; K_i$ bind tightest, then $\wedge; \vee$.

The semantics of epistemic formulae are given through the use of a structure called a Kripke structure.

Definition 2.7

For some V and N , a Kripke structure, or simply a frame I is

$$(W; \{f_i\}_{i \in N})$$

where

- W is a finite set of possible worlds, or states².
- $f_i : W \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ evaluates each propositional variable in V at each possible world in W to either **true**, or **false**.
- For each $i \in N$, $R_i \subseteq W \times W$ is the accessibility relation over possible worlds, and we say world w^0 is considered by agent i as an epistemic alternative if $w^0 R_i w$.

² The term “states” should cause no confusion in this context, since the worlds in the frames we construct in this work happen to be states of some FSA.

Whereas the accessibility relations are commonly required to be equivalence relations over W , the formal construction we will present uses relations that are not reflexive, and are thus partial equivalence relations. Hence we denote accessibility relations as $\sim$, and reserve $\equiv$ for discussions in which the relations are, indeed, equivalence relations. Since Ricker and Rudie (2007) does not distinguish these cases, they used $\sim$ for the latter.

In our formalism, the propositional connectives (the second and third items in Definition 2.8 below) are to be understood as usual. The semantics of the epistemic operator (the last item in Definition 2.8) reflect that, upon observing a sequence of events generated by the plant, a supervisor can only know something (i.e., be certain that it is true), if it is always true after any sequence (generated by the plant) that looks the same to the supervisor as the sequence of events it has observed.

To reflect the discussion above, we thus adopt the following formal definition of the semantics of epistemic formulae as the relation $\models$ of pairs of Kripke structures and worlds, and epistemic modal formulae, given inductively over the structure of the formulae.

Definition 2.8

- $(I; w) \models v$ iff $(w; v) = \text{true}$
- $(I; w) \models \neg S$ iff it is not the case that $(I; w) \models S$
- $(I; w) \models S \wedge T$ iff $(I; w) \models S$ and $(I; w) \models T$
- $(I; w) \models K_i S$ iff for all $w' \in W$ such that $w' \sim_i w$, $(I; w') \models S$. I

In our discussions, it will often be the case that many epistemic expressions are evaluated against the same pair of $I; w$; in such cases, for simplicity, we will write S in place of $(I; w) \models S$.

2.4 Inference-Observability

We can now demonstrate how the epistemic approach by Ricker and Rudie (2007) can be adapted and exploited to describe the architecture by Yoo and Lafortune (2004). Our approach involves 1. accessibility relations that differ from those used by Ricker and Rudie (2007), and 2. a deliberate line-by-line correspondence (which we call “coupling”) between the expression of the solvability condition and the description of the supervisors. The notation and concepts in the first part of this section are adopted from Ean and Rudie (2022).

Consider a plant G , with legal behaviour prescribed by a subautomaton E of G , and n pairs of sets of controllable/observable events. For each supervisor i ($i \in N$), we construct $G_i^{obs} = P_i(G)$, which is effectively an observer of the plant from supervisor i 's point of view. The state set, Q_i^{obs} , of each observer is $f_{i;uo}$ -closure of $q \mid q \in Q, g$. In other words, the supervisor cannot distinguish G and G_i^{obs} by only observing sequences of events generated by these two FSA.

Next we construct a composite structure that will allow us to keep track of plant behaviour and each supervisor's view of the corresponding plant behaviour. We do this through the construction $G^0 = G \times G_1^{obs} \times \dots \times G_n^{obs} = (Q^0; Q^0; \emptyset; q_0^0)$, where $Q^0 = Q \times Q_1^{obs} \times \dots \times Q_n^{obs}$, $Q^0 \xrightarrow{PQ} PQ$, Q^0 is component-wise application of P and Q_i^{obs} for $i \in N$, $q_0^0 = (q_0; q_{0;1}^{obs}; \dots; q_{0;n}^{obs})$ where $q_{0;i}^{obs} \in Q_{0;i}^{obs}$ and thus $q_{0;i}^{obs} \in Q$ for $i \in N$.

Our composite structure G^0 generates the same language as G does, however the Cartesian product of states forming Q^0 allows us to track more information than that

available by simply tracking the sequence of states in Q visited by some sequence of events in the plant language. Namely, $(q; q_1^{obs}; \dots; q_n^{obs}) \in Q$ records not only the current state q of G , but also each supervisor's estimate q_i^{obs} of the set of states the plant could possibly be in based on supervisor i 's observation, for each $i \in N$. For the accessible part of G^0 , we always have that $q \in q_i^{obs}$ for all $i \in N$, which is to be expected since the actual plant state should always be a state that any observer thinks the plant could be in.

Although the automaton G^0 is not necessarily isomorphic to G , its behaviour is identical to that of G , namely, it is always the case that $L(G^0) = L(G)$. In other words, from a behavioural standpoint, G and G^0 cannot be distinguished by observations of generated events. Moreover, while G_i^{obs} and G are not distinguishable by the particular supervisor i , G^0 and G are not distinguishable by any observer (even one observing $\emptyset$). Consequently, if G specifies a plant, one can think of that plant as also being modelled by G^0 . Automaton G^0 can be computed off-line, and therefore its information is available to all supervisors.

Now we are ready to construct the Kripke structure against which the expression of inference-observability is interpreted.

We will start by letting $W = Q^0$. To avoid multiple arguments with both subscripts and superscripts, we will write $(w_e; w_1; \dots; w_n)$ for an element of W instead of $(q; q_1^{obs}; \dots; q_n^{obs})$.

Next we construct accessibility relations $\sim_i$ such that $w \sim_i w^0$ whenever $w_i = w_i^0$, as was done in the work of Ricker and Rudie (2007). Since the accessibility relations $\sim_i$ are clearly equivalence relations, we can denote $f w^0 \in W \sim_i w^0 \sim_i w g$ by $[w]_{\sim_i}$, or simply $[w]_i$.

Again, in a similar way as was done in Ricker and Rudie (2007), we create propositional variables and their evaluation to capture when an event is possible in the plant (G) or when it is legal (E). Hence we create the set of propositions $V = \{ \text{true}, \text{false} \} \cup \{ G_i, E_i \mid i \in N \}$, and define their evaluations as

$$\begin{aligned} (w; G_i) &= \begin{cases} \text{true} & G_i(w) \\ \text{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ (w; E_i) &= \begin{cases} \text{true} & E_i(w) \\ \text{false} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The intended meaning of $(w; G_i) = \text{true}$ is that G_i can physically occur at state w , as specified by G ; whereas $(w; E_i) = \text{true}$ indicates that G_i is legal and should be allowed to happen. It follows that $(w; E_i) = \text{true} \implies (w; G_i) = \text{true}$, which reflects the fact that E is a subautomaton of G .

With the arguments all defined, we can now let the Kripke structure be $\bar{T} = (W; \sim_i; f_i; g_i)_{i \in N}$. We denote a Kripke structure as $\bar{T}$ whenever it is constructed with accessibility relations $\sim_i$ that are equivalence relations, so that we can reserve the notation T (without the overline) for a construction we will discuss in the next section (where the accessibility relations are not equivalence relations).

Although the constructed Kripke structure $\bar{T}$ is parameterized over specific G , f_i , g_i , and E , since in our discussions we will not need to simultaneously consider multiple sets of these entities, but assume an indefinite one, we write simply $\bar{T}$, rather than $\bar{T}(G; P_1; \dots; P_n; E)$.

The notion of inference-observability was previously defined by Ricker and Rudie (2007) as follows.

Definition 2.9

$\bar{I}$ (or E) is said to be inference-observable whenever for all $\bar{I} \in \mathcal{I}$, for all $w \in W$,

$$\exists i; j \in N : (\bar{I}; w) \models K_i(\bar{I} \in E) \rightarrow K_j(\bar{I} \in G \cup E) \quad (1.1)$$

$$\bar{I} \in G \cup E \quad (1.2)$$

Roughly speaking, the expression of inference-observability can be read in the following way. At every state w , either at least one supervisor i can unambiguously make a control decision ((1.1)), or if none of the supervisors can make a control decision, then it must be the case that event $\bar{I}$ can be enabled ((1.2)), hence the fused decision will be the default **enable**. The expression (1.1), however, does not tell us what decision supervisor i would issue, or why it issues such a decision. We will provide in Thm. 3.3 an alternative expression that tells us which supervisor issues which decision.

Ricker and Rudie (2007) show that inference-observability is the necessary and sufficient condition to solve DSCOP when the supervisors are allowed to infer the knowledge of other supervisors to some extent. In Ricker and Rudie (2007) there are four control decisions, where the fusion rule is recalled as in Tbl. 1. Informally our interpretation is as follows. When the control decision **on** (resp., **off**) is present, the fused decision is guaranteed to be **enable** (resp., **disable**), which is why **on** and **off** have been traditionally denoted simply by **enable** and **disable**. Based on this fact, a supervisor issues **on** (resp., **off**) for an event $\bar{I}$ when the supervisor is unambiguously certain (or in the epistemic logic idiom, “the supervisor knows”) that the plant is in a state at which the event $\bar{I}$ can be enabled (resp., disabled). This situation is described by the epistemic formula $K_i(\bar{I} \in G \cup E)$ (resp., $K_i(\bar{I} \in E)$).

In addition, the fusion rule allows supervisors to infer the knowledge of other supervisors. A supervisor i may be uncertain whether an event $\bar{I}$ can be enabled or disabled, but it could be the case that among all possible states the plant could be at (all possible worlds) as seen by supervisor i , either the event $\bar{I}$ can be disabled, or otherwise if $\bar{I}$ must be enabled (expressed as $\bar{I} \in E$), then some other supervisor j knows that $\bar{I}$ can be enabled (expressed as $K_j(\bar{I} \in G \cup E)$), hence supervisor j will thus issue **on**. In such a situation, supervisor i can bet on disabling $\bar{I}$, and let supervisor j correct the decision if that bet is a mistake. This situation is thus described as $K_i(\bar{I} \in E) \rightarrow K_j(\bar{I} \in G \cup E)$. To allow supervisor j 's **on** decision to prevail if the plant is in a state at which $\bar{I}$ must be enabled, supervisor i cannot issue **off**, since otherwise the fused decision would then be undefined, and it would be nonsense to define the fused decision for such a case. Hence a weaker form of the decision, **weak off**, is intended for such a situation. The decision **weak off** was called “**conditional off**” in Yoo and Lafortune (2004) and in Ricker and Rudie (2007).

Finally, the decision **abstain** is used when none of the cases above prevail, so that a supervisor abstains from voting. This decision was called “**don't know**” but for reasons we will see in Section 3.5, it is better to denote this decision as “**abstain**”. Because it is possible that all supervisors abstain, to make the fused decision defined, Ricker and Rudie (2007) chose to, so to speak, default the decision to **enable**.

This result is stated formally as follows.

cd_i	cd_j	$f(fcd_i; cd_j g)$
on	on	enable
on	weak off	enable
on	abstain	enable
off	off	disable
off	on	disable
off	abstain	disable
weak off	off	disable
weak off	weak off	disable
weak off	abstain	disable
abstain	abstain	enable

Table 1: Fusion rule used by Ricker and Rudie (2007) and Prop. 2.10, where $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ and $i \neq j$.

Proposition 2.10 (Ricker and Rudie (2007))

With a set of control decisions $CD = \{f \text{ on}; \text{off}; \text{weak off}; \text{abstain}\}^g$, a fusion rule f defined as in Tbl. 1, two supervisors $(G_i^{obs}; KP_i)$, where $KP_i : Q_i^{obs} \rightarrow \{CD\}$ as defined in Fig. 1, solve the DSCOP iff I is inference-observable. $\square$

$$KP_i(w; s) = \begin{cases} \text{on} & (\bar{I}; w) \models K_i(\neg G \neg E) \\ \text{off} & (\bar{I}; w) \models \neg K_i(\neg G \neg E) \\ & \wedge K_i(\neg E) \\ \text{weak off} & (\bar{I}; w) \models \neg K_i(\neg G \neg E) \\ & \wedge \neg K_i(\neg E) \\ & \wedge K_i(\neg E) \wedge K_j(\neg G \neg E) \\ & \text{for } j \in \{1, 2\} \\ \text{abstain} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Fig. 1: The knowledge-based control policy used by Prop. 2.10

The statement of Prop. 2.10, however, requires some attention. First, while not stated explicitly, the construction of the fusion rule and the proof of this proposition give the impression that the work of Ricker and Rudie (2007) assumes all events are controllable.

Also, on the one hand, as indicated by their proof, by “solving the DSCOP”, Ricker and Rudie (2007) implicitly meant that for all $s \in L(G)$, for all $s \in L(G)$, with letting $w = {}^0(s; q_0^0)$ (such w exists since $s \in L(G)$), if $(I; w) \models \neg G \wedge \neg E$ (i.e., I has to be disabled after s), then it is required that $f_N(s; w) = \text{disable}$. In particular, the above has to hold even for $s \in L(G); s \notin L(E)$. On the other hand, the condition of inference-observability quantifies over all worlds, including those reachable by only illegal strings. This is illustrated by the following example.

Example 2.11

Consider the following example: The plant depicted in Fig. 2a, where double circled states are those in Q^E , and $f = f; g$. Consider the case of one supervisor (since Prop. 2.10 is claimed to hold for two supervisors Ricker and Rudie (2007), one may

- (a) The plant G (b) The supervisor's observation $G^{obs} = P(G)$ (c) The automaton $G^0 = G \times G^{obs}$. A state $(q_G; q^{obs})$ is represented in the figure with q , q^{obs} stacked vertically in that order.

Fig. 2: A language that is not inference-observable but for which control exists.

simply take as the second supervisor an identical copy of the first one) where $\phi_o = ?$ and $\phi_c = f \cdot g$.

Following the construction defined in this section, Fig. 2b depicts the supervisor's perception of the plant. Fig. 2c depicts jointly the plant states and the supervisors' mind states, where the accessibility relations are not explicitly drawn but can be deduced.

Clearly $L(E)$ is not inference-observable in the sense of Defn. 2.9 (or Ricker and Rudie (2007)), since $(\bar{T}; (1; f \cdot 1; 2; 3; 4g)) \models_E$ but $(\bar{T}; (2; f \cdot 1; 2; 3; 4g)) \not\models :_E$ and hence inference-observability does not hold at, in particular, world $(1; f \cdot 1; 2; 3; 4g)$.

However $L(E)$ can still be synthesized by disabling and enabling at state 1. Since ϕ_c is disabled, the plant will not transit to state 2 and hence ϕ_o does not have to be disabled at that state. In other words, requiring that certain propositions hold at worlds that will not survive control is an unnecessarily strong requirement. I

This example also demonstrates how depicting G^0 instead of $\bar{T}$ assists our intuitive understanding of the situation.

While both G^0 and $\bar{T}$ have as their nodes Q^0 , $\bar{T}$, unlike G^0 , illustrates only the accessibility relations but loses the transition relation. On the other hand, although not explicitly depicted, the accessibility relations can be deduced from G^0 (to be specific, Q^0). Hence, we feel that there is no particular need to explicitly depict the accessibility relations as edges.

3 Extending inference-observability

We realized, with the example at the end of the previous section being one of the indications, that adopting the modal approach of Ricker and Rudie (2007) to the research of decentralized supervisory control in general is not as trivial an extension as what we had anticipated. Specifically, what our tasks amount to is as follows. To address the example at the end of the previous section, Section 3.1 proposes, as one of the many equally good alternatives, a revision of the accessibility relations. While the content of Section 3.2 is not essential for the work of Ricker and Rudie (2007) itself, we found that a slight adjustment to the expression of inference-observability to separate out the condition of what has traditionally been known as controllability will otherwise be beneficial when other studies of decentralized problems are to be cast in the modal approach. Then Section 3.3 further restates inference-observability to

create what we call coupling between the solvability condition and the decision policy. Section 3.4 extends from two supervisors to arbitrarily many supervisors. Finally, we demonstrate, with the specific example of the generalized inference-observability (Yoo and Lafortune, 2004), our claim that the modal approach can be used as a universal formalism in the study of decentralized supervisory control.

3.1 Accessibility Relation

As we have seen at the end of the previous section, the current expression of the inference-observability condition (Ricker and Rudie, 2007) requires that the correct control decisions must be made even after illegal sequences. This is unnecessary: if control decisions can always be made so the system never generates an illegal sequence, we'd have no obligation at all to make any decision after an illegal sequence. Equivalently, since legal behaviours are prefix-closed, once an illegal sequence is generated, there is no way we can steer the plant back to legal behaviour.

A naive approach to mend inference-observability is as follows: one may exploit prefix-closedness of the language $L(E)$ and introduce an additional atomic proposition w_E to express that the world w is reachable by legal sequences, then amend all modal sub-expressions $K_i(\)$ to $K_i(w_E \)$ and finally replace the entire expression with $w_E \)$. This approach, while leading to a better condition, greatly complicates the matter. If we take this approach, with $w_E \)$ floating ubiquitously, the expression would be too complex for an informal reading, and hence would convey little conceptual intuition, and thus defy the purpose of expressing ideas in epistemic logic.

The approach we propose here, in contrast, strives to preserve the form of the earlier work of DSCOP by Ricker and Rudie (2007). As much as possible, so any previous understanding would easily extend to the work here. As we shall see, there is a solution such that the epistemic expression stays intact, with only a small modification to the Kripke structure (to be precise, the accessibility relations) needed.

We construct the interpreted system (the Kripke structure) exactly in the same way, except that we construct accessibility relations $\sim_i$ such that $w \sim_i w^0$ whenever $w_e \in Q^E \wedge w_e^0 \in Q^E \wedge w_i = w_i^0$. Particularly note that $\sim_i$ is an equivalence relation on $\{w \in W \mid w_e \in Q^E\}$, and for all w such that $w_e \notin Q^E$, w has no referent nor relatum (participating $\sim_i$). Hence, the relations $\sim_i$ are partial equivalence relations. It is reasonable to consider the equivalence class $[w]_{\sim_i}$, or simply, $[w]_i$, for $w_e \in Q^E$. Only with an abuse of notation, let $[w]_i = \emptyset$ for $w_e \notin Q^E$. Informally, one may interpret $[w]_i$ as containing exactly the worlds that are epistemic alternatives to w as perceived by supervisor i . One can observe that $\sim_i = \sim_i'$.

To signify the difference, we denote any frame constructed with the original equivalence accessibility relations as $\bar{T}$, and any frame constructed with our new accessibility relations as simply T .

One may object to the use of non-equivalence relations as accessibility relations in an epistemic frame, especially when they are not even reflexive, which contradicts what one might understand knowledge to be (Fagin et al., 2004). To relieve this worry, we give a number of arguments.

Informally, when a supervisor looks for epistemic alternatives, it no longer consider illegal states as possible, as the supervisor can be certain, that as long as control decisions have been made correctly along the way, the system is certainly not in an

illegal state. On the other hand, none of the states could be an epistemic alternative to one that is illegal, including the illegal state itself. Hence being in an illegal state would be considered an absurdity by a supervisor, and one can show, as an epistemic analogy to the EFQ (ex falso quodlibet), that $(I; w) \models K_i(\perp)$ for arbitrary i at any illegal state w (one such that $w \in Q^E$). In this way, we encapsulate (or pack) the ubiquitous $w \in Q^E$ appearing in the naive approach inside the modal operators.

As the change only occurs within the Kripke structure, the rest of the inference-observability condition can be expressed exactly as it has been in Defn. 2.9 when only two supervisors are to be constructed. Hence we have the following updated definition of inference-observability.

Definition 3.1

I (or E) is said to be inference-observable whenever for all $i \in \mathcal{C}$, for all $w \in W$ such that $w \in Q^E$,

$$\exists i; j \in \mathcal{N} : (I; w) \models K_i(\perp) \wedge K_j(\neg G \wedge E) \quad (2)$$

3.2 Separating Controllability

By intention, we have made Defn. 3.1 differ from that of Defn. 2.9 in yet one more way: i is quantified over $\mathcal{C}$, instead of $\mathcal{S}$. This difference deserves some explanation.

Readers more familiar with traditional works in supervisory control problems with partial observations, with centralized (Lin et al., 1988) and decentralized (Rudie and Wonham, 1992) approaches, will notice, such works usually propose two orthogonal conditions for the problem to be solvable. In the decentralized case (Rudie and Wonham, 1992), one of the conditions, co-observability, captures the same idea as inference-observability, namely, does the plant, at any point, appear unambiguous to at least one supervisor, where being unambiguous is in the sense that the same control decision is appropriate in any state a supervisor thinks the plant could reasonably be in. The other condition, controllability, considers whether the desired behaviour is at least implementable by a centralized, monolithic supervisor, which observes every event observable to any of the decentralized supervisor, and controls all controllable events. It is thus reasonable for such readers to ponder over the absence of controllability in the work of Ricker and Rudie (2007).

In fact, controllability can be incorporated in the corrected inference-observability as Ricker and Rudie (2007) did without stating so. However, later as we make extensions to inference-observability, doing so will be quite awkward and the result would obscure, rather than assist, our understanding. Moreover, as we have demonstrated in our earlier work (Ean and Rudie, 2022), the fact that controllability and an architecture's observability condition can be combined into a single expression is only a happy coincidence for only some architectures. Hence we choose not to do so. We still provide the following lemma to bridge the work of Ricker and Rudie (2007) to this work.

Theorem 3.2

Inference-observability, as defined in Defn. 3.1 (which we write in condensed form using ellipses),

$$\exists w \in Q^0 : \exists w_e \in Q^E :$$

$$(I; w) \models \dots$$

$$\vdash G \vdash E$$

together with

$$L(E) \vdash_{uc} \vdash L(G) \vdash L(E)$$

i.e., the prefixed-language $L(E)$ is controllable, is equivalent to

$$\exists w \in Q^0 : \exists w_e \in Q^E :$$

$$(I; w) \models \dots$$

$$\vdash G \vdash E$$

I

The theorem can be proven in a manner analogous to what is demonstrated in our previous work (Ean and Rudie, 2022).

Proof. To begin, we first rewrite controllability of $L(E)$ as

$$\exists w \in Q^0 : \exists w_e \in Q^E : (I; w) \models \vdash G \vdash E$$

which is equivalent to

$$\exists w \in Q^0 : \exists w_e \in Q^E :$$

$$(I; w) \models \vdash G \vdash E$$

Now, inference-observability and controllability together is equivalent to

$$\exists w \in Q^0 : \exists w_e \in Q^E :$$

$$(I; w) \models \vdash G \vdash E$$

$$\vdash G \vdash E$$

$$\wedge \exists w \in Q^0 : \exists w_e \in Q^E :$$

$$(I; w) \models \vdash G \vdash E$$

The part omitted by $\vdash G \vdash E$ begins by quantifying over N existentially, which is empty for $\vdash_{uc}$, and hence is trivially false. Thus we can attach it to the second conjunct and have equivalently

$$\exists w \in Q^0 : \exists w_e \in Q^E :$$

$$(I; w) \models \vdash G \vdash E$$

$$\vdash G \vdash E$$

$$\wedge \exists w \in Q^0 : \exists w_e \in Q^E :$$

$$(I; w) \models \vdash G \vdash E$$

$$\vdash G \vdash E$$

and thus have equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} \exists w \in Q^0 \text{ such that } w \in Q^E : \\ (I; w) \models \dots \\ \dots : G \cup E \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

3.3 Splitting Cases

We take a further step and provide an equivalent expression of inference-observability. The development is analogous to that of Ean and Rudie (2022, Section 3.6).

Theorem 3.3

The expression

$$\exists i, j \in N : (I; w) \models \dots : G \cup E \\ \dots K_i(\dots) K_j(\dots : G \cup E))$$

is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \exists i, j \in N : i \neq j : (I; w) \models & K_i(\dots : G \cup E) \\ & \dots K_i(\dots : E) \\ & \dots K_i(\dots) K_j(\dots : G \cup E)) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Before proving this theorem, we motivate the need for it.

Remark 3.4

Thm. 3.3 applies both to inference-observability and the fusion rule in Fig. 1 (where $\bar{I}$ becomes I as discussed). When applied to the fusion rule in Fig. 1, Thm. 3.3 says that we can add the requirement that $j \neq i$, which—although superfluous—is intuitively helpful. When applied to inference-observability, the alternative expression has a line-by-line correspondence with that of the fusion rule. We have thus created a direct coupling between the problem-solvability requirement of inference-inference-observability and the control policy to be used when the problem is solvable. Not only does it give a better understanding of the inference-observability condition than Defn. 2.9, it also yields an easier proof of that condition (both the original version of Ricker and Rudie (2007) and our extended version to be given) being the necessary and sufficient condition to solve DSCOP (using the specific set of control decisions, knowledge-based control policy, and fusion function). The proof can be trivially (i.e., mechanically) done by case analysis.

To prove Thm. 3.3, we need the following lemmata.

Lemma 3.5

$$(I; w) \models K_i(\dots) K_i(\dots : G \cup E) \quad (4)$$

iff

$$\begin{aligned} (I; w) \models & K_i(\dots : G \cup E) \\ & \dots K_i(\dots : E) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Proof. (): We have

$$\begin{aligned} (I; w) &\models K_i(\neg E) \\ \Rightarrow (I; w) &\models K_i(\neg E \rightarrow K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E)) \\ \Rightarrow (I; w) &\models K_i(\neg E \rightarrow K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (I; w) &\models K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E) \\ \Rightarrow 8w^0 \in [w]_i: (I; w^0) &\models K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E) \\ \Rightarrow 8w^0 \in [w]_i: (I; w^0) &\models \neg E \rightarrow K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E) \\ \Rightarrow (I; w) &\models K_i(\neg E \rightarrow K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E)) \end{aligned}$$

():

Assume $(I; w) \models K_i(\neg E \rightarrow K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E))$.

Hence equivalently

$$8w^0 \in [w]_i: (I; w^0) \models \neg E \rightarrow K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E).$$

Hence equivalently

$$8w^0 \in [w]_i: (I; w^0) \models \neg E \rightarrow K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E). \quad ()$$

So we have either

A: $w_e \in Q^E$; or

B: $w_e \notin Q^E$.

Case A: $w_e \in Q^E$

Hence $[w]_i$ is not empty.

We have either

A.1: $9w^0 \in [w]_i: (I; w^0) \models K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E)$; or

A.2: $\neg 9w^0 \in [w]_i: (I; w^0) \models K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E)$

// The trick here is to not split the disjunction in ().

Case A.1: $9w^0 \in [w]_i: (I; w^0) \models K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E)$

Obtain w^0 such that

$w^0 \in [w]_i$ and

$$(I; w^0) \models K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E).$$

Hence $8w^{00} \in [w]_i: (I; w^{00}) \models K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E)$.

With $[w^0]_i = [w]_i$,

we have $8w^{00} \in [w]_i: (I; w^{00}) \models K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E)$.

Hence $(I; w) \models K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E)$.

Case A.2: $\neg 9w^0 \in [w]_i: (I; w^0) \models K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E)$

Hence $8w^0 \in [w]_i: (I; w^0) \models \neg K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E)$.

With (),

we have $8w^0 \in [w]_i: (I; w^0) \models \neg (\neg E)$.

Thus $(I; w) \models K_i(\neg E)$.

Together from A.1 and A.2, we have either

$(I; w) \models K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E)$; or

$(I; w) \models K_i(\neg E)$.

Thus $(I; w) \models K_i(\neg G \rightarrow E) \rightarrow K_i(\neg E)$.

Case B: $w_e \notin Q^E$

Hence $[w]_i$ is empty.

Hence $\exists w^0 \in [w]_i: (I; w^0) \models \neg$ holds vacuously true.

Hence $(I; w) \models K_i(\neg)$ holds vacuously true.

Hence $(I; w) \models K_i(\neg \neg G \neg E)$

and $(I; w) \models K_i(\neg \neg E)$ hold vacuously true.

Thus $(I; w) \models K_i(\neg \neg G \neg E) \neg K_i(\neg \neg E)$.

Together from A and B, have

$(I; w) \models K_i(\neg \neg G \neg E) \neg K_i(\neg \neg E)$,

which is what we wanted.

Lemma 3.6

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists i, j \in N : \\ & (I; w) \models K_i(\neg E) \neg K_j(\neg \neg G \neg E) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

iff

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists i, j \in N ; i \neq j : \\ & (I; w) \models K_i(\neg \neg G \neg E) \\ & \quad \neg K_i(\neg \neg E) \\ & \quad \neg K_i(\neg E) \neg K_j(\neg \neg G \neg E) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Proof. We show (6) is equivalent to (7) through a sequence of equivalences. By splitting cases, we have that (6), i.e.,

$$\exists i, j: (I; w) \models K_i(\neg E) \neg K_j(\neg \neg G \neg E)$$

is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & [\exists i, j; i = j: (I; w) \models K_i(\neg E) \neg K_j(\neg \neg G \neg E)] \\ & \neg [\exists i, j; i \neq j: (I; w) \models K_i(\neg E) \neg K_j(\neg \neg G \neg E)] \end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the first disjunct, by substituting j with i , we have equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} & [\exists i: (I; w) \models K_i(\neg E) \neg K_i(\neg \neg G \neg E)] \\ & \neg [\exists i, j; i \neq j: \dots] \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the first disjunct with the equivalence given by Lem. 3.5, we have equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} & \neg \exists i: (I; w) \models K_i(\neg \neg G \neg E) \\ & \quad \neg K_i(\neg \neg E) \\ & \neg [\exists i, j; i \neq j: \dots] \end{aligned}$$

By quantifying over j in the first disjunct which does not occur free there, we have equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} & \neg \exists i, j; i \neq j: (I; w) \models K_i(\neg \neg G \neg E) \\ & \quad \neg K_i(\neg \neg E) \\ & \neg [\exists i, j; i \neq j: \dots] \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} 9i; j; i \notin j: (I; w) \models & K_i(\neg G \neg E) \\ & \neg K_i(\neg E) \\ & \neg K_i((G \wedge \neg E) \rightarrow K_j(\neg E)) \end{aligned}$$

which is what we wanted.

Now we are ready to prove Thm. 3.3.

Proof (Thm. 3.3). By Lem. 3.6.

Finally, we are ready to restate the significance of inference-observability to DSCOP.

Theorem 3.7

With a set of control decisions $CD = \{ \text{on; off; weak off; abstain} \}$, a fusion rule f defined as in Tbl. 1, there exists a set N of two supervisors that solves the DSCOP iff I is controllable and inference-observable (in the sense of Defn. 3.1).

Moreover, whenever controllability and inference-observability hold, the supervisors can be constructed as $(G_i^{obs}; KP_i)$, where KP_i are defined as in Fig. 1 with $\bar{I}$ replaced by I . I

Notice that, aside from using the alternatively expressed inference-observability and replacing $\bar{I}$ by I , this theorem is stated differently than Prop. 2.10. The latter does not assert that if inference-observability fails, the problem is not solvable by supervisors of some other flavour, i.e., ones that are not based on the FSA G_i^{obs} and the knowledge-based control policy KP .

To support our claim that epistemic logic can be used as a universal tool in studies of DSCOP, we have to make the point that if the problem is solvable by supervisors of any flavour, it must always be solvable by supervisors based on the FSA G_i^{obs} and the knowledge-based control policy KP .

Assuming supervisors of a particular flavour can be problematic. One should however, only assume the fusion rule, as it suffices to give semantics to the control decisions. See also Rmk. 2.3.

This is not seen in traditional approaches to DSCOP such as Rudie and Wonham (1992) where FD is taken to be equal to CD and the control policy is not explicitly constructed: disabling of an event at a state is expressed by the absence of a transition labelled by that event at the corresponding state of a supervisor, hence the term “implicit supervisors”.

We do not provide a proof for Thm. 3.7. A proof could be obtained by altering the proof provided by Ricker and Rudie (2007) to Prop. 2.10 (their Thm. 1) correspondingly. More significantly, though, an alternative proof can be easily obtained from the proof of our main result Thm. 3.10 due to the line-to-line correspondence between the control policy and inference-observability expression. See also Rmk. 3.4.

3.4 Extending to Arbitrarily Many Supervisors

While the framework set up by Ricker and Rudie (2007) is stated for an arbitrary number of supervisors, their fusion function is designed for only two supervisors, and hence also their proof.

One may realize that the expression of inference-observability appears to be compatible with arbitrarily many supervisors because of the existential quantification, and attempt only a simple extension of the fusion function.

While this approach does yield a broader class of DSCOP to be solvable, with a weaker-than-it-could-be inference-observability condition, it is not as general as possible.

Omitting the fusion function for now, consider just the (alternatively expressed) inference-observability condition given by (3). It is not hard to see that it is equivalent to the expression (8):

$$\begin{aligned}
 (I; w) \models & \bigwedge_{i \in N} \neg K_i(\neg G \cup E) \\
 & \bigwedge_{i \in N} \neg K_i(\neg E) \\
 & \bigwedge_{i \in N} \bigwedge_{\substack{j \in N \\ j \neq i}} \neg (K_i(\neg E) \wedge K_j(\neg G \cup E)) \quad (8.3) \\
 & \neg : G \cup E
 \end{aligned}$$

Since the number of supervisors is finite, we rewrote existential quantifiers to n -ary disjunctions, and distributed then down the expression tree as far as possible.

Compare the condition (8) above with the following one ((9)):

$$\begin{aligned}
 (I; w) \models & :::: \\
 & \bigwedge_{i \in N} \neg K_i(\neg E) \wedge \bigwedge_{\substack{j \in N \\ j \neq i}} \neg K_j(\neg G \cup E) \quad (9.3) \\
 & ::::
 \end{aligned}$$

These two conditions would be equivalent if $N = \{1, 2, \dots, g\}$. With $j \neq i$, when there are only two supervisors, once i is fixed, j must also be. But in general, (9) is weaker.

Where j is quantified matters: if we quantify j at where i is quantified as we did in condition (8.3), for this line to hold true, supervisor i has to be able to certify the knowledge of some indefinite but fixed supervisor j ; whereas when we do as in (9.3), we only require supervisor i to combine the knowledge of a collection of supervisors. Technically, this distinction is due to the disjunction ($\vee$) not commuting across the implicit conjunction hidden in the modal operator $K_i(\neg G \cup E)$.

Since we intend to make further extension of inference-observability, we do not give the corresponding control protocols and fusion rules here. One will see how to derive them (and proofs of their correctness) from the discussion below.

3.5 Completing the Decision Set

Although the work of Ricker and Rudie (2007) was based on Yoo and Lafortune's work on the use of non-binary control decisions (Yoo and Lafortune, 2004), Ricker and Rudie did not include the decision **weak on**. Further, given an a priori partition $c = c;e \cup c;d$, Yoo and Lafortune (2004) allows one to "default" the final decision of an event to either **enable** or **disable** when all supervisors are uncertain

and issue **abstain**. The construction of Ricker and Rudie (2007) implicitly assumed that $c = c;e$, so that all events are defaulted to be enabled. This section adds the capability of assigning the default decision of some event to **disable** when all supervisors **abstain**.

Hence in this section, we extend the DSCOP problem to one where $CD = f \text{ on; off; weak on; weak off; abstain } g$, i.e., one that includes the complete set of control decisions from Yoo and Lafortune (2004). This yields a relaxed condition of inference-observability. We state and prove the result for an arbitrary number of supervisors. From there, we will indicate how proofs to claims we made in previous sections can easily be obtained. Henceforth, unless explicitly stated for comparison, we use inference-observability to refer to the extended condition.

For ease of understanding and compactness, we define the following shorthand notation for epistemic formulae, all implicitly parameterized by an event known from the context. The notation originated in our previous work (Ean and Rudie, 2022, Section 3.11).

First, phrases regarding the desired decision of e :

$e = : G _ E$	can be enabled
$d = : E$	can be disabled
$\underline{e} = E$	must be enabled
$\underline{d} = G \wedge : E$	must be disabled

We give informal readings respectively:

- $\underline{e} = E$: being equivalent to $G \wedge : E$, can be read as “must be enabled to satisfy the control requirement”.
- $e = : G _ E$: can be enabled without violating the control requirement. Moreover, being equivalent to $G _) E$, the expression can be read as “if something ought to be decided about e , it is enabling, otherwise whatever”.
- $\underline{d} = G \wedge : E$: can be read as “must be disabled to satisfy the control requirement”.
- $d = : E$: equivalent to $: G _ : E$, and hence equivalent to $G _) : E$, can be read as “if something ought to be decided about e , it is disabling, otherwise whatever”. Or more compactly, “can be disabled without violating the control requirement”.

Then, define the modal operator “someone knows...”:

$$S = _ i \in N K_i$$

With a supervisor i known from the context, define a variant of the modal operator “someone knows” as “some other supervisor (other than i) knows...”:

$$O = _ j \in N, j \neq i K_i$$

Definition 3.8

I (or E) is said to be inference-observable whenever for all $2 _ c$, there is a certain $2 f e; dg$ for this c , so that for all $w \in W$ such that $w_e \in Q^E$, we have

$$(I; w) \models S e \quad (10.1)$$

$$\neg Sd \quad (10.2)$$

$$\neg S(\underline{e}) \rightarrow Oe \quad (10.3)$$

$$\neg S(\underline{d}) \rightarrow Od \quad (10.4)$$

$$\neg \quad (10.5)$$

The interpretation of the expression is as follows: if one of (10.1) to (10.4) holds, at least one supervisor unambiguously knows what decision to issue. In all the worlds such that none of these expressions hold, i.e., the worlds in which all supervisors abstain, then either in all such worlds could be disabled, or in all such worlds could be enabled. This would allow us to “default” the decision of an event to either **enable** or **disable**.

Defn. 3.8 is clearly strictly weaker than Defn. 3.1.

The last ingredient we need before showing that inference-observability is necessary and sufficient to solve DSCOP is a characterization of “solving” DSCOP. This characterization is expressed in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.9

A joint supervision f_N solves DSCOP iff

$$\begin{aligned} & s \in L(E) \wedge s \in L(G) \wedge \neg \exists u \in U_c \\ & \quad \rightarrow s \in L(E) \end{aligned} \quad (11.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & s \in L(E) \wedge s \in L(G) \wedge \neg \exists c \in C \wedge s \in L(E) \\ & \quad \rightarrow f_N(s; \cdot) = \text{enable} \end{aligned} \quad (11.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & s \in L(E) \wedge s \in L(G) \wedge \neg \exists c \in C \wedge s \in L(E) \\ & \quad \rightarrow f_N(s; \cdot) = \text{disable} \end{aligned} \quad (11.3)$$

The lemma expresses that a solution to DSCOP must ensure that uncontrollable events do not lead to illegality (11.1), and that if a controllable event is legal, it is allowed to happen (11.2), and if it is illegal, it is prevented from happening (11.3).

Proof. Directly from the definition of $L(f_N = G)$.

We can now state and prove our main result.

Theorem 3.10

With a set of control decisions $CD = \{ \text{on}, \text{off}, \text{weak on}, \text{weak off}, \text{abstain} \}$, and for each $c \in C$, a default action $dft \in \{ \text{enable}, \text{disable} \}$, so that the fusion rule f^{dft} for $\cdot$ is defined as

$$f^{dft}(cd) = \begin{cases} \text{enable} & \text{if } \text{on} \in cd; & \text{off} \notin cd \\ \text{disable} & \text{if } \text{on} \notin cd; & \text{off} \in cd \\ \text{enable} & \text{if } \text{on} \notin cd; & \text{off} \notin cd; \\ & \text{weak on} \in cd; \text{weak off} \notin cd \\ \text{disable} & \text{if } \text{on} \notin cd; & \text{off} \notin cd; \\ & \text{weak on} \notin cd; \text{weak off} \in cd \\ dft & \text{if } \text{on} \notin cd; & \text{off} \notin cd; \\ & \text{weak on} \notin cd; \text{weak off} \notin cd \end{cases}$$

where $cd = \{ f_i(P_i(s); \cdot) \mid g_i \in N \}$ for short, there exists a set N of n supervisors that solves the DSCOP iff I is controllable and inference-observable (in the sense of Defn. 3.8).

Whenever controllability and inference-observability hold, the construction produced in our proof yields a set of knowledge-based supervisors that solves the DSCOP.

Informally, for the necessary part of the proof, we will perform a case analysis on the control decisions a supervisor may issue, and show that the control requirement cannot be achieved if the language is not inference-observable.

For the sufficient part, we will also perform a case analysis. This part is more complicated, as one cannot simply say “if line n is true”. In some situations an event cannot happen, and therefore no decision is required, which justifies that the fusion rule is not defined on some cases. In other situations, the condition tells not only what fused decision must be achieved, but also what control decisions each supervisor will make by referring to the control policy, and it will be immediately apparent that the control decisions issued will be fused to exactly the desired decision.

We now provide our formal proof.

Proof. Condition (11.1) is equivalent to controllability. Hence it suffices to show that (11.2) and (11.3) are equivalent to inference-observability.

($\Rightarrow$): Suppose there exists such a set $N = (f_1; \dots; f_n)$ of n supervisors, such that (11.2) and (11.3) hold.

Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that $L(E)$ is not inference observable. I.e., for some $e \in \Sigma$, for each $f \in \Sigma$, there is some w such that $w_e \in Q^E$,

$$(I; w) \models \bigwedge_{i \in N} : K_i e \quad (12.1)$$

$$\bigwedge_{i \in N} : K_i d \quad (12.2)$$

$$\bigwedge_{i \in N} : K_i (e \mid Oe) \quad (12.3)$$

$$\bigwedge_{i \in N} : K_i (d \mid Od) \quad (12.4)$$

$$\bigwedge : \quad (12.5)$$

We could proceed by considering either $e = e$ or $e = d$, since it suffices to derive a contradiction from either of them. We choose $e = e : G \mid E$. Then by (12.5), we have $G \mid E$ so must be disabled after any sequence leading to state w .

Consider the string s such that $q_0(s; q_0^0) = w$. Such a string must exist and $s \in L(E)$ since $w_e \in Q^E$. Now we have $s \in L(G) \mid L(E)$, hence by (11.3) it must be that $f_N(s;) = \mathbf{disable}$. By the fusion rule, this can be achieved in two ways: either $\exists i \in N : f_i(P_i(s);) = \mathbf{off}$, or alternatively $\exists i \in N : f_i(P_i(s);) = \mathbf{off}$, $\exists i \in N : f_i(P_i(s);) = \mathbf{on}$ and $\exists i \in N : f_i(P_i(s);) = \mathbf{weak off}$.

If it is the case that $f_i(P_i(s);) = \mathbf{off}$ for some i , we can derive a contradiction in the following way: from (12.2), there is a world $w^0 \in [w]_i$ and $(I; w) \models E$. Then $w_e^0 \in Q^E$ and there is a string s^0 such that $P_i(s^0) = P_i(s)$, $s^0 \in L(E)$. Then we have $f_i(P_i(s^0);) = f_i(P_i(s);) = \mathbf{off}$, and by the fusion rule we have $f_N(s^0;) = \mathbf{disable}$, contradicting the requirement that $f_N(s^0;) = \mathbf{enable}$.

If it is the case that $\exists i \in N : f_i(P_i(s);) \neq \mathbf{off}$, $\exists i \in N : f_i(P_i(s);) \neq \mathbf{on}$ and $f_i(P_i(s);) = \mathbf{weak off}$ for some $i \in N$, we can derive contradiction in the following way: from (12.3), there is a world $w^0 \in [w]_i$ and $(I; w^0) \models E \wedge \bigwedge_{j \in N, j \neq i} : K_j (: G \mid$

E). In particular, $(I; w^0) \models \neg \phi$, and for all $j \in N$, $j \neq i$, there is a world $w^0 \in [w^0]_j$ such that $(I; w^0) \models \phi \wedge \neg \psi$. Since $w_e^0, w_d^0 \in Q^E$, there are strings $s^0, s^0 \in L(E)$ such that $\phi(s^0; q_0^0) = w^0$ and $\psi(s^0; q_0^0) = w^0$. Then we have $f_i(P_i(s^0); \cdot) = f_i(P_i(s); \cdot) = \text{weak off}$, so to enable after s^0 , i.e., at world w^0 , the fusion rule requires $f_j(P_j(s^0); \cdot) = \text{on}$ for some $j \in N$, $j \neq i$. However there cannot be such a supervisor j , as otherwise we have $f_j(P_j(s^0); \cdot) = f_j(P_j(s); \cdot) = \text{on}$, and by the fusion rule we have $f_N(s^0; \cdot) = \text{enable}$, which violates the control requirement.

Hence the language must be inference-observable.

($\square$): Suppose that $L(E)$ is inference-observable.

We provide a knowledge-based control policy that forms the basis of our solution:

$$\begin{aligned}
 KP_i(w; \cdot) = & \\
 & \text{on} \quad \text{if } (I; w) \models K_i e \wedge \neg K_i d \\
 & \text{off} \quad \text{if } (I; w) \models \neg K_i e \wedge K_i d \\
 & \text{weak on} \quad \text{if } (I; w) \models \neg K_i e \wedge \neg K_i d \\
 & \quad \wedge \neg K_i(e \rightarrow Oe) \wedge K_i(d \rightarrow Od) \\
 & \text{weak off} \quad \text{if } (I; w) \models K_i e \wedge K_i d \\
 & \quad \wedge K_i(e \rightarrow Oe) \wedge K_i(d \rightarrow Od) \\
 & \text{abstain} \quad \text{if } (I; w) \models \neg K_i e \wedge \neg K_i d \\
 & \quad \wedge K_i(e \rightarrow Oe) \wedge K_i(d \rightarrow Od) \\
 & \text{abstain} \quad \text{otherwise}
 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where by deriving the definition of $KP_i(w; \cdot)$ directly from the definition of $f^{\text{dft}}(cd)$, there is a correspondence between the definitions, which is what we call “coupling”.

Formally, we claim that the FSA-based supervisors constructed as (G_i^{obs}, KP_i) , satisfy (11.2) and (11.3). Since for any string $s \in L(E)$, the two propositions $s \in L(E)$ and $s \notin L(E)$ are mutually exclusive, we only need to show one of (11.2) and (11.3), the other vacuously holds true.

We perform a case analysis over inference-observability (10) and show that in each case one of (11.2) and (11.3) holds. For each case, consider only w where $w_e \in Q^E$ and $\neg \psi$ such that $\neg \phi$. We will also assume that $\neg \phi$ can happen at state w , that is, assume $\neg \phi$: if it is not physically possible for $\neg \phi$ to happen at state w , we are not obligated to make any decision.

Suppose (10.1) holds for some i , but (10.2) does not hold for any i . Then we have e and supervisor i issues **on**. Also none of the supervisors can issue **off**, since otherwise contradicting e . Regardless which default action we choose for (similarly hereinafter unless explicitly stated otherwise), the joint decision is **enable**, i.e., $f_N(s; \cdot) = \text{enable}$, thus (11.2) holds.

Suppose (10.2) holds for some i , but (10.1) does not hold for any i . The result follows in an analogous way to the previous case.

Suppose both (10.1) and (10.2) hold true for not necessarily the same i . In this case we have $e \wedge d$, which implies $\neg \phi$. Thus (11.2) and (11.3) both hold vacuously. Informally, since $\neg \phi$ cannot happen at state w , we have no obligation to make a decision regarding $\neg \phi$. This is the reason that the control protocol is not defined to be total: it lacks the case $(I; w) \models K_i e \wedge K_i d$, and the fusion rule does not consider the case where both **on** and **off** are issued, unlike that of Ricker and Rudie (2007). This also suggests that our expression of the fusion rule automatically ensures control-nonconflicting (Yoo and LaFortune, 2004) supervisors.

Then consider the following cases, where (10.1) and (10.2) both do not hold.

Suppose (10.3) holds for some i , but (10.4) does not hold for the same i . Then we have $\underline{e} \in \mathcal{O}_e$ and supervisor i issues decision **weak off**. Again, consider only cases where $\mathcal{G}$ holds. If $\mathcal{E} = \underline{e}$, then for some $j \in N$ other than i , we have $K_j e$ and thus supervisor j issues **on**. Also no other supervisor issues **off**, since otherwise this would contradict e . Hence by the fusion rule, the joint decision is **enable**, thus (11.2) holds. If, however, $\mathcal{E} = \underline{d}$, then no supervisor issues **on**, otherwise this would contradict d . Hence either some other supervisor issues **off**, in which case the fused decision would be **disable**; or there is no such supervisor issuing **off**, but some supervisor j other than i issuing **weak on**, in which case, it must be $\underline{d} \in \bigcup_{\substack{j \in N \\ j \neq i}} \mathcal{O}_d$.

Since we have $\underline{d}$, there must be a third supervisor issuing **off**, which overrides both conditional decisions (since there is no **on** issued), and hence the fused decision would be **disable**; lastly, if no **off** nor **weak on** is issued, the fused decision would also be **disable**. Thus **disable** is issued in all cases, and (11.3) holds.

Suppose (10.4) holds for some i , but (10.3) does not hold for the same i . The result follows in an analogous way to the previous case.

Suppose both (10.3) and (10.4) hold true for the same i . In this case supervisor i would issue decision **abstain**. Also we have $[\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_e] \wedge [\mathcal{E} \in \mathcal{O}_d]$ (since $\mathcal{G}$ has been assumed). In the case of $\mathcal{E}$, for some $j_1 \in N$ other than i , we have $K_{j_1} e$, i.e., (10.1) holds for j_1 , and hence j_1 issues **on**. By the fusion rule, the joint decision is **enable**, thus (11.2) holds. In the case of $\mathcal{E}$, for some $j_2 \in N$ other than i , we have $K_{j_2} d$, i.e., (10.2) holds for j_2 , and hence j_2 issues **off**. By the fusion rule, the joint decision is **disable**, thus (11.3) holds. Notice the choice of instantiations of j_1 and j_2 are arbitrary; in particular there is no requirement that $j_1 \neq j_2$. Previously in the work of Yoo and Lafortune (2004), supervisor i would issue the **don't know** decision in this case, which is semantically identical to **abstain** as specified by the fusion rule. However our argument indicates that in this case supervisor i knows that whatever has to be done about $\mathcal{E}$ has already been taken care of by supervisors j_1, j_2 hence it actively decides not to engage in shaping the fused decision. Given this interpretation, it is, therefore, more suitable to change the **don't know** decision in this case to **abstain**.

Suppose (10.3) but not (10.4) holds true for some i_1 , while not (10.3) but (10.4) holds true for some other i_2 . I.e., supervisor i_1 issues **weak off** while supervisor i_2 issues **weak on**. With similar reasoning as the previous case, it is always the case that some third supervisor would issue **on** or **off** (since $\mathcal{G}$ has been assumed), either way, we derive one of (11.2) and (11.3). This highlights why the fusion rule need not consider the situation when both **weak off** and **weak on** are issued, and yet neither **on** nor **off** is issued.

Finally, if for some i (10.1) to (10.4) do not hold but only (10.5) holds, then we have $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{E}$ or $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}$.

If $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{E}$, since we do not consider the case where $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{G}$, it must be $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}$. Hence it is impossible for some supervisors to issue **off**. If some supervisor j_1 other than i issues **weak off**, then since $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}$, there must be a third supervisor j_2 issues **on**. If some supervisors other than i issue **weak on**, then **off** and **weak off** cannot be issued. In the two cases above, to get a fused decision **on**, by the fusion rule, we need i to issue **abstain**, and (13) is deliberately constructed to ensure this. However, if all supervisors issue **abstain**, then in order to have **enable**, we choose $\text{dft} = \text{enable}$. In any case, we have shown that (11.2) holds.

In the case of $\alpha = \epsilon$, by a similar argument to the aforementioned argument, we can let i issue **abstain**, and choose $dft = \mathbf{disable}$, and thus (11.3) holds.

We have now exhausted all cases of (10), and derived (11.2) and (11.3) as desired.

Notice that inference-observability ensures consistent choice of f .

A final comment on the case where for some i (10.1) to (10.4) do not hold but only (10.5) holds: this is the case where it might have been more accurate to denote the control decision as **don't know** instead of **abstain**. However, as discussed, since the fusion rule does not have to treat differently the decisions **don't know** and **abstain**, we have elected to not include both **don't know** and **abstain**, but use only **abstain**.

We have opted for a less rigorous description of the control policies KP_i for conciseness, hence we elaborate further. We defined the control policies KP_i over the Kripke Structure W , which is essentially the automaton $G^0 = G \times P_1(G) \times \dots \times P_n(G)$. However, the automaton G^0 contains unobservable events and hence is not suitable to be used as supervisors. The solution is simple: use the automata $P_i(G)$ for the supervisors and construct the control policies $KP_i^0 : W_i \rightarrow \{c, d\}$ so that $KP_i^0(w_i; \alpha) = KP_i(w; \alpha)$ whenever the i 'th component of w is w_i . This construction is well-defined since for all w whose i 'th component is w_i , $KP_i(w; \alpha)$ takes the same value.

The choice of default decision in the proof above indicates how one can obtain a partition $c = c;e \sqcup c;d$. Readers familiar with the work of Yoo and Lafortune (2004) might have noticed that there could be multiple such partitions so that the language is inference-observable (or conditionally co-observable (Yoo and Lafortune, 2004)), since one can directly prove that these two conditions are equivalent). With the epistemic expression, we are able to give the following interpretation of this phenomenon: these partitions differ exactly on the events for which there is no world where all supervisors abstain from voting.

The proof of Thm. 3.10 shows how a proof of Thm. 3.7 can be constructed: with the expression of inference-observability being directly coupled with the control policy, one simply performs a case analysis over how some supervisor $i \in N$ makes its decision and reuse most of the paragraphs in the proof of Thm. 3.10.

One can see how to modify the expression of inference-observability ((10)) when some of the control decisions we discussed are no longer permitted. It is particularly interesting to see that with only **foff; abstaining** we arrive at C&P co-observability, and with only **fon; abstaining**, at D&A co-observability Yoo and Lafortune (2004). In these two cases, if the Kripke structures are constructed as $\bar{I}$ instead of I , we have instead strong C&P or strong D&A co-observabilities (Takai et al., 2005). See Ean and Rudie (2022) for details.

4 Using the Epistemic Logic Formalism to Revise Problem Requirements

We provide an example of a non-inference-observable language. We then point out how epistemic expression of inference-observability reveals what prevents the language from being inference-observable. Finally we discuss how inference-observable languages can be obtained based on the non-inference-observable one, including a sublanguage.

Consider the following example: given a plant G with event set $\Sigma = f \cup \{1; 2; 1; 2; \dots\}$, do there exist two supervisors, with observed event sets $\Sigma_{1;o} = f \cup g$, $\Sigma_{2;o} = f \cup \{1; 2; \dots\}$, and controlled event sets $\Sigma_{1;c} = \Sigma_{2;c} = f \cup g$, such that the given language $L(E)$ is inference-observable?

Fig. 3 depicts the automaton $G^0 = G \parallel P_1(G) \parallel P_2(G)$. Since G^0 and G happens to be isomorphic in this example, we do not draw G separately. The language $L(E)$ is marked by states with double borders.

Fig. 3: The automaton $G^0 = G \parallel P_1(G) \parallel P_2(G)$. A state $(q_G; q_1^{obs}; q_2^{obs})$ is represented in the figure with q, q_1^{obs}, q_2^{obs} stacked vertically in that order. The equivalence classes are marked according to the following rule: a state is marked at the upper left (resp. upper right) corner according to its containing equivalence class formed by the accessibility relation $\sim_1$ (resp. $\sim_2$); the symbols for the equivalence classes are deliberately chosen, so, for instance, the states supervisor 2 thinks the plant could be in after it sees 1 are in the equivalence class **B**₁.

Let us focus on 1 since it is the only controllable event. Hence we focus on states 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, since these are the states where 1 can happen.

In state 4 (resp. 5), supervisor 2 can enable (resp. disable) 1 . In state 0, supervisor 1 can enable 1 . But in states 2, 3, which are indistinguishable to both supervisors, since they are both in the same equivalence classes (**M**₁ for supervisor 1 and **B**₀ for supervisor 2), neither supervisor 1 nor 2 can control 1 unambiguously. Hence the language $L(E)$ is not inference-observable.

The representation of G^0 and the epistemic interpretation of conditional control decisions provides guidance for how to modify the control requirement to obtain an inference-observable language.

If we are looking for a sublanguage, we can only make legal states illegal but not vice versa. By our previous analysis, at least one supervisor is able to make a correct control decision unambiguously in states $S = f0; 1; 4; 5; 7; 8; 10g$, hence all we need to worry about are the states in the set $M_1 \quad S = B_0 \quad S = f2; 3g$. To resolve the conflict that is legal at state 3 but illegal at state 2, we can make state 7 illegal.

To see how making state 7 illegal gives an inference-observable sublanguage, let's look at states in M_1 and B_0 . At states in M_1 , is illegal at states 2; 3; 5 but is legal at state 4. With only binary control decisions, supervisor 1 cannot possibly make an unambiguous decision. We can see that supervisor 2 is in a similar situation by examining states in B_0 .

However, with the ability to infer the knowledge of other supervisors and the conditional decisions at their disposal, the desired control requirement can be achieved. Suppose that supervisor 1 is an intelligent being, and let's imagine how the intelligent being may attempt to solve the dilemma. If supervisor 1 were to try "guessing" the legality of after it sees , it would realize, that even the guess " is illegal" is not always correct, i.e., it is false at exactly state 4, by knowing that the other supervisor can unambiguously enable if the plant is indeed at state 4, supervisor 1 is then able to focus on only the rest of the states in M_1 , and fortunately, its guess is correct in all of them, hence supervisor 1 can confidently disable at states in M_1 unambiguously, knowing its mistake would be corrected by the other supervisor. Similar reasoning is also carried out by supervisor 2.

The design of the fusion rule is exactly to allow the correction of mistakes. A **weak off** is issued by a supervisor knowing that if disabling the event is incorrect then another supervisor can correct the first supervisor by a definite **on** decision.

Formally, with state 7 made illegal, states $f2; 3g$ are unambiguous. However, since the set $f2; 3g$ is a proper subset of both M_1 and B_0 , and states in both sets M_1 and B_0 remain ambiguous, the conditional decision, i.e., **weak off** has to be issued at states in the set M_1 (resp. B_0) by supervisor 1 (resp. supervisor 2).

If we are open to not necessarily a sublanguage, we can also make state 6 legal too. By similar reasoning as we just did, supervisor 1 should issue decision **weak on** at states 2, 3; and supervisor 2 can issue decision **on** at states in the set B_1 , since this set is no longer ambiguous.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we discuss how decentralized control with non-binary control decisions (Yoo and Lafortune, 2004) can benefit from the use of epistemic logic.

We point out that epistemic logic can be used to discuss not only some specific classes of DSCOP (Ricker and Rudie, 2007, 2000), but also more universally. We demonstrated this by showing how epistemic logic formally encapsulates the expression $8s; s_i: P_i(s) = P_i(s_i) \quad) \quad :::$ (or similarly $P_i^{-1}P_i()$) used ubiquitously in discussions of DSCOP, and by informally personifying supervisors so that we can understand and discuss the control problem with an anthropomorphic perspective and language.

We deliberately coupled the epistemic expression characterizing the class of DSCOP discussed by Yoo and Lafortune (2004) and the expression describing the control policies. This line-by-line coupling allows us to use the same expression throughout the discussions of proving necessary and sufficient conditions, of describing the algorithm to construct the supervisors, and of verifying the correctness of the algorithm.

From the forgoing discussions, we would expect other decentralized control or diagnosis conditions could be treated in a comparable fashion. For instance, consider the work of Kumar and Takai (2007), which is more general than that of Yoo and Lafortune (2005). We develop our epistemic expressions based on Yoo and Lafortune (2005) because it is simpler and thus we are able to demonstrate our key ideas without more complex (yet not conceptually different) technical development. The same principles demonstrated here could apply to Kumar and Takai (2007) as well. The only technical difference is that one would need to use a finer, (possibly infinite) string-based Kripke structure as described by Ricker and Rudie (2000), along with a corresponding definition of relations ρ_i .

Casting the decentralized problem the way we did makes it easier to understand the reasoning behind various control decisions. We believe that one advantage of our framework is that in trying to come up with solutions to future DES problems, this framework can aid in going directly from a working supervisor solution to the necessary and sufficient conditions that would match such a solution. Moreover, if the constraints of some given problem are not met (and hence that problem is not solvable as is using decentralized control), our model makes it more apparent how to alter the constraints in a way that is meaningful for the application at hand.

Acknowledgements

The research described in this paper was undertaken at Queen's University, which is situated on traditional Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee territory. The research was inspired by and supported through an NSERC CRD-DND project with General Dynamics Land Systems–Canada and Defence Research and Development Canada.

Conflicts of Interest Statement

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- R. Cieslak, C. Desclaux, A. S. Fawaz, and P. Varaiya, "Supervisory control of discrete-event processes with partial observations," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 249–260, 1988.
- K. Rudie and W. M. Wonham, "Think globally, act locally: decentralized supervisory control," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 37, no. 11, pp. 1692–1708, 1992.
- T.-S. Yoo and S. Lafortune, "A general architecture for decentralized supervisory control of discrete-event systems," *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 335–377, 2002.

- , “Decentralized supervisory control with conditional decisions: Supervisor existence,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, no. 11, pp. 1886–1904, 2004.
- , “Decentralized supervisory control with conditional decisions: supervisor realization,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 50, no. 8, pp. 1205–1211, 2005.
- S. L. Ricker and K. Rudie, “Knowledge is a terrible thing to waste: Using inference in discrete-event control problems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 428–441, 2007.
- R. Ean and K. Rudie, “Epistemic interpretations of decentralized discrete-event system problems,” 2022, to appear in *Discrete Event Dynamic Systems*.
- W. M. Wonham and K. Cai, *Supervisory Control of Discrete-Event Systems*. Springer-Verlag GmbH, 2018.
- C. G. Cassandras and S. Lafortune, *Introduction to Discrete Event Systems*, 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag GmbH, 2007.
- J. H. Prosser, M. Kam, and H. G. Kwatny, “Decision fusion and supervisor synthesis in decentralized discrete-event systems,” in *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, 1997.
- S. L. Ricker and K. Rudie, “Know means no: Incorporating knowledge into discrete-event control systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 45, no. 9, pp. 1656–1668, 2000.
- J. Y. Halpern and Y. Moses, “Knowledge and common knowledge in a distributed environment,” *Journal of the ACM*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 549–587, 1990.
- R. Fagin, J. Y. Halpern, Y. Moses, and M. Vardi, *Reasoning About Knowledge*. The MIT Press, 2004.
- F. Lin, A. F. Vaz, and W. M. Wonham, “Supervisor specification and synthesis for discrete event systems,” *International Journal of Control*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 321–332, 1988.
- S. Takai, R. Kumar, and T. Ushio, “Characterization of co-observable languages and formulas for their super/sublanguages,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 434–447, 2005.
- R. Kumar and S. Takai, “Inference-based ambiguity management in decentralized decision-making: Decentralized control of discrete event systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 1783–1794, 2007.