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Abstract: Solving the problem of intersection crossing for autonomous vehicles is a challenging task due to combined combinatoric and dynamical control decisions. To reduce the complexity of the computations and distribute the resulting global optimization problem, we propose a combined scheduling-control method. Thereby, in this paper, we focus on the formulation of a resource-constrained-project-scheduling problem (RCPSP) to solve the combinatoric decision, i.e. the order in which vehicles cross an intersection area in a central coordination unit. This problem considers control decisions from the vehicles, which are computed using model predictive control (MPC) laws. In turn, the resulting scheduling solution is incorporated again in local vehicle MPC problems, which negotiate among each other to find a dynamically feasible solution. This seamless combination of scheduling and control results in efficient solutions, which is illustrated using numerical simulation and the results are compared with a first-come-first-served (FCFS) strategy.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The increase in vehicle automation reveals great potential to improve ground traffic coordination. In particular, Vehicle-to-Vehicle and Vehicle-to-Infrastructure (V2X) communication capabilities of cars enables the implementation of scalable and intelligent vehicle coordination procedures. Coordinating vehicles optimally through intersections becomes a bottleneck in cooperative driving scenarios; this is because it requires combined combinatorial and dynamically optimized decisions. This problem has gained high interest in recent years.

A common approach to compute coordinated vehicle trajectories is to use optimal control (OC) methods and, in particular, model predictive control (MPC), see Zhang et al. (2016); Tedesco et al. (2010); Campos et al. (2014); Kneissl et al. (2018); Katriniok et al. (2017). These enable the consideration of complex vehicle dynamics and dynamical constraints as well as environmental constraints, and provide a predictive solution. The combinatorial decision describes the order in which vehicles cross the intersection area. It induces non-convexity into OC problems and makes them prohibitively difficult to solve to optimality when real-time requirements are given. Therefore, simple heuristics, such as first-come-first-served (FCFS), can be applied as by Zhang et al. (2016) and an improved FCFS rule by Kim and Kumar (2014). However, heuristics that are too simple risk leading to an overall suboptimal solution to the intersection coordination problem, e.g. if the dynamic differences between vehicles are not considered. Hult et al. (2018) provide a mixed-integer-quadratic-programming (MIQP) heuristic to overcome the aforementioned issue.

Alternative approaches deploy scheduling theory to solve the sequencing problem at automated intersections. These methods often use high-level traffic dynamics or do not consider vehicle dynamics at all, as proposed by Li and Zhou (2017) and Yan et al. (2011) using machine scheduling. In most cases, the objective of scheduling approaches is to find a solution that minimizes the problem’s makespan, i.e. to minimize the overall time taken for all vehicles to cross the intersection, as proposed e.g. by Wu et al. (2012) and Vial et al. (2016). On the contrary, Colombo and Del Vecchio (2014) and Ahn and Del Vecchio (2016) design a scheduler that incorporates simple linear vehicle dynamics, which acts as a supervisor. It intervenes with the crossing vehicles in a least restrictive manner if
they would leave a safe set. Its implementation as a job-shop scheduling problem can be solved for 25 vehicles at an intersection within 100ms. Scheduling problems can be solved by converting them to a mixed-integer-linear-programming (MILP) optimization problem. Thus, they can also be formulated directly as MILP problems as proposed by Fayazi and Vahidi (2018), in which the vehicles are coordinated through the intersection by receiving target arrival times from the central scheduler.

A main drawback of most scheduling approaches is that they lack the guarantee of dynamic feasibility with respect to local vehicle control systems. In contrast, formulating the intersection crossing task as a scheduling problem enables a seamless integration of precedence constraints. This, for example, excludes solutions that would lead to rear-end collisions, which is often not considered in OC formulations during the approaching phase at intersections. See Zanon et al. (2017); Kneissl et al. (2018).

Therefore, in this paper, we propose a combined scheduling-control design. It exploits the strength of scheduling to determine a safe and deadlock free crossing order and uses a distributed MPC framework, which guarantees feasibility of constraint dynamic vehicle systems. The intersection scenario is formulated as a resource-constrained-project-scheduling problem (RCPSP) and solved by converting it to an MILP problem. It receives a heuristic approximation for the vehicles’ crossing duration, which makes the exchange of vehicle model data unnecessary. After extracting the pure order information and, thus, neglecting the timing information from the resulting schedule, the distributed local MPC problems compute timed-trajectories given this crossing order. The trajectories represent a guaranteed dynamically feasible and safe solution by incorporating local dynamic constraints and coupled inter-vehicle safety constraints for collision avoidance. The distributed MPC method is an iterative scheme with any-time feasible inter-sampling iterations and is discussed in detail in Kneissl et al. (2019).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the model of an intersection and state the overall optimization problem as a centralized MPC formulation. Section 3 defines the scheduling problem and explains the link with local vehicle control problems, which are introduced in Section 4. Numerical results that apply the proposed approach are presented in Section 5, while Section 6 contains concluding remarks and comments about future work.

Notation: Throughout this paper, $x(k|t)$ indicates a prediction of state $x$ for time $k$ computed at time $t$, while all prediction values at time $t$ are $x(; |t)$. The set of integers $I_{a,b}$ defines $\{a, a+1, ..., b\}$. The weighted 2-norm is denoted by $\|x - \hat{x}\|_Q = (x - \hat{x})^TQ(x - \hat{x})$ with appropriate dimensions of vectors $x, \hat{x}$ and matrix $Q$. The relation $a \succ b$ indicates that element $a$ appears before element $b$ in a tuple $T$. The cardinality of a set $S$ is given by $|S|$.

Fig. 1. Intersection crossing scenario.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT

2.1 Intersection Framework

We model the intersection scenario consisting of a set of $N_v$ connected automated vehicles (CAV) $v_i$, $i \in \mathbb{I}_{1:N_v}$, with local control units and an intersection management (IM) unit with which the CAVs exchange information via vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) communication. Fig. 1 illustrates the introduced intersection setup. We distinguish between a scheduling area and an intersection area. Vehicles approaching the intersection enter the scheduling area in which, based on their local control computations, the IM determines a crossing order for the inner intersection area and shares this information with the vehicles. We introduce conflict zones, $cz_j$, $j \in \mathbb{I}_{1:6}$, dividing the intersection area into zones for potential rear-end, front and side collisions ($cz_1, ..., cz_5$) and rear-end collisions on approaching lanes ($cz_6$). Note that, in general, the concept of conflict zones and the negotiation process presented in this paper is applicable to arbitrary scenarios in which several vehicles share a common area and where collision conflicts can occur, e.g. obstacle avoidance scenarios.

Finally, we define a multi-graph $G_{\text{route}} = (V_{\text{route}}, E_{\text{route}})$ describing the given vehicles’ routes through the intersection. The set of vertices $V_{\text{route}} = \{cz_1, ..., cz_6\}$ contains all conflict zones and $V_{\text{route}} \subset V_{\text{route}}$ all conflict zones that vehicle $v_i$ passes. Directed edges $e_{jk} \in E_{\text{route}}$ are connections between consecutive conflict zones, which indicates that a vehicle crosses these zones and the driving direction, i.e. $e_{jk} = (cz_j \rightarrow cz_k)$, $j, k \in \mathbb{I}_{1:6}$.

2.2 Control Problem Setting

Next, we state the coordination problem of $N_v$ vehicles through the intersection area as a centralized MPC problem, while we refer to its solution as the optimal solution. The central problem serves as a reference for the distributed implementation presented in this paper. It is defined as
\[ V^* = \min_{Z} V(x(t), u(t)) \]  
subject to  
\[ x(k + 1|t) = Ax(k|t) + Bu(k|t) \quad k \in I_{t:t+M-1} \]  
\[ x(k|t) \in X \quad k \in I_{t+1:t+M} \]  
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|x_i(k|t) - x_{i}^r\|_{Q_i(k)}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|u_i(k|t)\|_{R_i(k)}^2 \]  
where \( M \) is the prediction horizon. The time-discrete local vehicle dynamics models,  
\[ \begin{pmatrix} d_i(t+1) \\ v_i(t) \end{pmatrix} = A_{i} \begin{pmatrix} x_i(t) \\ v_i(t) \end{pmatrix} \]  
are combined to the central linear time invariant (LTI) model. Above sampling time \( T_s \) and \( d_i, v_i, a_i \) describe vehicle \( v_i \)'s distance state, velocity state, and acceleration input, respectively. The distance state \( d_i \) will relate to the vehicle's distance to critical zones in the intersection area. For simplicity we neglect in the above notation the dependency of time \( t = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots \} \).  

\[ x(t) = (x_1(t)^T, \ldots, x_N(t)^T)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2N}, \]  
and  
\[ u(t) = (u_1(t)^T, \ldots, u_N(t)^T)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N}, \]  
respectively, a central system and input matrix definition  
\[ A = \text{diag}(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times 2N}, \]  
and  
\[ B = \text{diag}(B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N \times N}. \]  

3. CROSSING ORDER SCHEDULING

The problem of automated intersection crossing, using the framework in Section 2.1, can be seamlessly formulated as a scheduling problem. Therefore, we first introduce the standard notation of a resource-constrained-project-scheduling problem (RCPSp) in the beginning of Section 3.1 as classified in Brucker et al. (1999). Following this, we map this notation to the intersection problem. Finally, we solve it by formulating a mixed integer linear problem (MILP) in Section 3.2.

3.1 Formulation of the scheduling problem

Let us define the RCPSp by the tuple  
\[ (\mathcal{V}, \delta, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R}, \alpha, \mathcal{B}), \]  
where \( \mathcal{V} = \{A_0, \ldots, A_{n+1}\} \) is a set of activities and the subset \( \mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_n\} \subset \mathcal{V} \) with \( n \) non-dummy activities; \( \delta \in \mathbb{N}^{n+2} \) is a vector describing the duration of each activity and we set the dummy activities’ duration to \( \delta_0 = \delta_{n+1} = 0 \); matrix \( \mathcal{E} \in \mathbb{N}^{l \times 2} \) contains \( l \in \mathbb{N} \) precedence relations where each row in \( \mathcal{E} \) with elements \( (A_i, A_j) \in \mathcal{A}, i \neq j \), means that activity \( A_i \) precedes activity \( A_j \); \( \mathcal{R} = \{r_1, \ldots, r_m\} \) is the set of renewable resources with \( m \in \mathbb{N} \); \( \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^m \) is a vector describing the amount of available resources with the respective identifier; finally the matrix of demands is given by \( \mathcal{B} = (\beta_{ir}) \in \mathbb{N}^{l \times 2m} \) with elements describing the amount of consumed resources \( r \in \mathcal{R} \) for each activity \( A_i \in \mathcal{V} \).

The mapping into the intersection framework is proposed as follows. Each non-dummy activity \( A_i \in \mathcal{A}, i \in I_{1:n}, \) indicates a vehicle’s route through the scheduling and intersection zone, i.e.  
\[ A_i = (e_{i,j}, \ldots, e_{i,m}), \]  
where \( e_{i,j}, e_{im} \in E_{\text{route}}. \) We distinguish two types of activities. The first one, drive to, models the vehicle driving in the scheduling zone.
towards the beginning of the intersection. The second one, \textit{cross}, passing through the intersection. For clarification, consider the following demonstrative example.

\textbf{Example 1.} Assume vehicle $v_1$ in Fig. 1 driving from $E$ to $S$, then its route is $cz_6 \rightarrow cz_2 \rightarrow cz_1 \rightarrow cz_4$. Vehicle $v_1$'s \textit{drive to} activity would be “driving in $cz_6$” and its \textit{cross} activity would be “driving through $cz_2$, $cz_1$, and $cz_4$”.

Duration $\delta_i$ of an activity $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ models the expected time a vehicle consumes to perform the respective activity, i.e. to drive to the intersection or to cross it. The activity duration vector $\delta$ represents the interface to the local vehicle control problems, discussed in Section 4. Here several candidates for suitable heuristics exist. We propose an MPC-related duration measure in order to achieve a close link to the local vehicles’ control decisions. Therefore, let us define

$$\delta_i = f_j(\bar{Z}_j),$$

with activity $A_i$’s duration $\delta_i$ given by vehicle $v_j$’s MPC optimization, $\bar{Z}_j$ (see Section 4). We introduce a precedence relation in $\mathcal{E}$ for the routes of a vehicle, i.e. the \textit{drive to} activity precedes the \textit{cross} activity. Furthermore, a precedence relation is added if we a priori know a certain crossing order, e.g. if two vehicles approaching the intersection on the same lane and the first cannot been taken over by its follower (rear-end collision avoidance) such as illustrated in the following example.

\textbf{Example 2.} Assume vehicle $v_2$ in Fig. 1 driving from $N$ to $S$ and vehicle $v_3$ from $N$ to $E$. Furthermore, let $A_i = (cz_6 \rightarrow cz_3, cz_3 \rightarrow cz_4)$ be the intersection crossing activity of vehicle $v_2$, and $A_j = (cz_6 \rightarrow cz_3, cz_3 \rightarrow cz_1, cz_1 \rightarrow cz_5)$ of vehicle $v_3$. Then a pair $(A_i, A_j)$ in $\mathcal{E}$ ensures that $v_2$ enters the intersection before $v_3$.

The resources represent the set of conflict zones in the scenario, i.e.

$$\mathcal{R} = \{cz_1, ..., cz_n\}$$

in our intersection setup. The availability of the respective resources at a certain time-instant is defined by

$$\alpha = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, N_r)^T$$

and elements of the demand matrix $B$ are

$$\beta_{ir} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } cz_r \in A_i \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$  

Fig. 2 illustrates the construction of a precedence graph according to the definition of $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{R}$, while Table 1 summarizes the scheduling taxonomy related to the intersection model.

### 3.2 Solution of the RCPSP

Problem (10) can be solved by formulating it as MILP. We suggest a modified version of the discrete-time MILP formulation introduced by Pritsker et al. (1969).

Let $b_{i,\tau}$ be a binary decision variable with $b_{i,\tau} = 1$ if activity $i$ starts at time $\tau$ and $b_{i,\tau} = 0$ otherwise, then (10) can be formulated as the following MILP:

$$b^* = \arg\min_b \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{\tau \in H} \tau b_{i,\tau}$$

subject to

$$\sum_{\tau \in H} \tau b_{i,\tau} \geq \sum_{\tau \in H} \tau b_{i,\tau} + \delta_i \quad (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left( \beta_{i,k} \sum_{m=\tau-\delta_i+1}^{\tau} x_{i,m} \right) \leq B_k \quad \tau \in H, k \in \mathcal{R}$$

$$\sum_{\tau \in H} b_{i,\tau} = 1 \quad i \in \mathcal{V}$$

$$b_{i,\tau} \in \{0, 1\} \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \tau \in H,$$

with $H = \{0, 1, ..., T_{sched}\}$ representing the set of scheduling time-steps up to a scheduling horizon $T_{sched}$, with $T_{sched} > MT$, and the optimization variable $b = (b_{1,1}, ..., b_{n,1}, ..., b_{1,n+2T_{sched}})$, $i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}, \tau \in H$. Note that (16a) is formulated such that it minimizes the problem’s makespan as well as each activity’s makespan, i.e. finds the solution with the shortest overall and individual vehicles’ time consumption. This objective is chosen because the infrastructure’s goal is to maximize the vehicle throughput in the intersection area.

The scheduling result can be conveniently illustrated by a Gantt-chart as exemplary shown in Fig. 3.
Given the result of (16) and the respective consumed resources of each activity \( A_j \in A \), we are able to extract a crossing order, \( o_i \), for each critical zone \( c_{z_i} \), \( i \in I_{1:5} \). This is achieved by neglecting the actual scheduling time and solely extract the order in which vehicles \( v_j, j \in I_{1:N_v} \) are scheduled to cross a certain conflict zone \( c_{z_i} \). Consequently, we achieve a set of orders

\[
\mathcal{O} = \{ o_i = (v_{j_1}, v_{k_1}, ...) \mid i \in I_{1:5}; j, k \in I_{1:N_v} \}. \tag{17}
\]

Remark 1. Note that modeling the scheduling such that activities reserve the complete intersection area (cross), does not mean that in the end only a single vehicle can be in the intersection, as we only extract the order decision and pass this information to the local control units, as discussed in the following section.

4. DISTRIBUTED COORDINATION CONTROL

In this section, we first discuss the distributed control law and its connection to the scheduling decision. Thereafter, we argue why the proposed RCPSP results in a deadlock free decision and thus enables a guaranteed feasible control negotiation.

4.1 Distributed MPC

Given the orders (17), computed with the scheduling law, the local vehicles can receive a set of neighbors. Based on this information the vehicle trajectories will be computed using distributed MPC laws with respective neighbor predictions. After formulating this distributed MPC setup we introduce how to predict the vehicles’ activity duration (12).

The MPC laws, solved locally in each vehicle \( v_i, i \in I_{1:N_v} \), are given by:

\[
Z_i^* = \arg\min_{Z_i} V_i(k, x(t), u(t)) \tag{18a}
\]

subject to

\[
x_i(k+1)|t = A_i x_i(k)|t + B_i u_i(k)|t \quad k \in I_{t+1:M-1} \tag{18b}
\]

\[
x_i(k)|t \in \mathcal{Y}_i \quad k \in I_{t+1:M} \tag{18c}
\]

\[
w_i(k)|t \in U_i \quad k \in I_{t+1:M-1} \tag{18d}
\]

\[
d_{P_i}(k)|t \geq d_s \quad k \in I_{t+1:M} \tag{18e}
\]

\[
d_{S_i}(k)|t \geq d_s \quad k \in I_{t+1:M} \tag{18f}
\]

\[
x_i(t)|t = x_i(t) \tag{18g}
\]

\[
x_i(t+1)|t \in \{ x_i(t)|v_i(t) = 0 \} \tag{18h}
\]

\[
u_i(t+1)|t = 0. \tag{18i}
\]

Thereby, \( Z_i \) is the complement of (8) containing only local information from vehicle \( v_i \). Similar, (18b) - (18d) and (18g) are as defined in (1) with local information only. The application of terminal constraints (18h) and (18i) contribute to the recursive feasibility guarantee of the distributed computations (Kneissl et al. 2019)). For a given scheduling decision (17) we are able to formulate the distance constraints (18e) and (18f). Note that all feasible combinations \( N \) in (1e) are replaced by these local constraints for a single combination. This reduces the computational effort. The set of predecessors,

\[
\mathcal{P}_i = \{ v_j \mid j \in I_{1:N_v} \land v_j \prec v_i, c_{z_k} \in V_{route} \setminus c_{z_0} \}, \tag{19}
\]

contains all vehicles crossing before vehicle \( v_i \) on its route through the intersection. Then we derive \( d_p(k)|t = d_{P_i}|t (k)|t - d_i^{cz_0}(k)|t - 1 \), with

\[
j_k^* = \arg\max_{j \in \mathcal{P}_i} \tilde{d}_j^{cz_0}(k)|t - 1 \tag{20}
\]

and notation \( \tilde{d}_j^{cz_0} \) indicating a transformation of \( v_i's \) distance state \( d_i \) to the beginning of the critical zone \( c_{z_m} \), which \( v_i \) and \( v_j \) have in common.

Similar for the set of successors,

\[
\mathcal{S}_i = \{ v_j \mid j \in I_{1:N_v} \land v_j \succ v_i, c_{z_k} \in V_{route} \setminus c_{z_0} \}, \tag{21}
\]

we construct \( d_{S_i}(k)|t = d_{S_i}|t (k)|t - 1 - d_i^{cz_0}(k)|t \), while substituting \( \mathcal{P}_i \) with \( \mathcal{S}_i \) and argmax with argmin in (20).

We find that local problems (18) are convex as (18a) is quadratic and (18b) - (18i) are linear constraints. These problems are thus QPs and can be solved efficiently.

Above we described how the global scheduling decisions are incorporated in the local control problems. Now, it remains to discuss the reverse link between local control decisions and the scheduling problem. This link is represented by (12). Solving (18) is conducted in a distributed and iterative manner where neighbor intentions ((18e) - (18f)) are shared in each iteration step. Details on the distributed algorithm, which guarantees any-time feasible solutions, are presented in Kneissl et al. (2019). During iterations in the procedure each vehicle computes a nominal trajectory \( \hat{Z}_i \), neglecting (18h) and (18i) when solving (18), and \( Z_i^* \) used to provide the feasibility guarantee. In what follows we will refer to the states from the nominal optimization vector \( \hat{Z}_i \).

For a given vehicle \( v_i's \) activity \( A_j \) we extract \( c_{z_k} \in V_{route} \) and \( c_{z_0} \in V_{route} \) which are the first zone in the intersection of \( v_i's \) route and the zone after leaving the intersection area, respectively. We estimate the duration of activity \( A_j \) by
\[ \delta_j = |t_{end} - t_{start}|, \]  
which is computed distinguishing following cases:

\[
t_{end} = \begin{cases} 
\min \left( (t + M)T_s + \frac{\delta_{t}^{z}_i(t + M)}{v_i(t + M)} \right), T_s + T_{sched}, & \text{if } \delta_{t}^{z}_i(t + M) \geq 0 \\
k_{end}T_s, & \text{if } \delta_{t}^{z}_i(t + M) < 0, 
\end{cases} 
\]  
with 
\[ k_{end} = \arg\min_k |\tilde{d}_j^{z} (k|t)| \]  

This is computed distinguishing following cases:

\[
t_{end} = \begin{cases} 
\min \left( (t + M)T_s + \frac{\delta_{t}^{z}_i(t + M)}{v_i(t + M)} \right), T_s + T_{sched}, & \text{if } \delta_{t}^{z}_i(t + M) \geq 0 \\
k_{end}T_s, & \text{if } \delta_{t}^{z}_i(t + M) < 0, 
\end{cases} 
\]  
with 
\[ k_{end} = \arg\min_k |\tilde{d}_j^{z} (k|t)| \]  

Finally, Algorithm 1 gives a summary of the combined scheduling-control coordination procedure.

Algorithm 1 Combined Scheduling-Control Procedure

1. Vehicles: Compute distributed MPC problems (18) without (18e),(18f),(18h),(18l).
2. IM: Compute activity duration estimation (22).
3. solve (16) and determine (17).
4. Vehicles: Compute distributed MPC problems (18) without (18e),(18f),(18h),(18l).
5. Vehicles: Compute distributed MPC problems (18) without (18e),(18f),(18h),(18l).

4.2 Feasibility Discussion

This section discusses on example the deadlock free scheduling solution and how it relates to dynamic feasibility of local control decisions. Proving generality of this result is subject of future work.

Assume two vehicles, v1 and v2, conduct a left turn from opposite directions. Then, in the d1(t)-d2(t)-space there are unfeasible areas due to commonly passed czs, as illustrated by the red boxes in Fig. 4. As the cross-activity of the RCPSP (10) groups all passed czs of a vehicle, a consistent order solution is computed. Compare the blue shaded area in the left plot of Fig. 4, which indicates the possible d1(t)-d2(t)-trajectory space if v1 has to cross before v2. This space is a connected set and thus there exists a homotopy class of d1(t)-d2(t)-trajectories (Gregoire et al. (2014)). On the contrary, the right plot in Fig. 4 shows a non-consistent order decision where the trajectory ends in deadlock configuration D and thus the goal configuration G cannot be reached.

Now, it remains to discuss the relation to dynamic feasibility of the local MPC problems. In Kneissl et al. (2019) we discuss feasibility for the area d1 < d2, which is considered via constraints (18e) and (18f). Moving the trajectory there, i.e. from S to A in Fig. 4 is out of scope of this paper, but we have a simple guarantee to reach it, if a vehicle is able to stop before the entrance of an intersection. After v1 has left the intersection area the constraint can be unbound (B in Fig. 4). Thus, we conclude that a deadlock free schedule enables a dynamically feasible vehicle coordination.

5. NUMERICAL EVALUATION

In this section we illustrate the functionality of the introduced RCPSP method in combination with the distributed MPC laws. Furthermore, we discuss its benefit in comparison to a first-come-first-served (FCFS) strategy on example scenarios. Using the FCFS law, the vehicle’s crossing order in the intersection area is determined according to their distance to the entrance of the intersection. That means, the closest vehicle reserves the critical zones it passes first and similar for following vehicles organized by ascending distance.

Figure 5 introduces the vehicle setups of the simulated scenarios. Scenario 1 is presented in the top plot and Scenarios 2 and 3 at the bottom. The plots show the vehicle IDs, vi, i ∈ I, and their respective maneuvers in the intersection, with right turn r, left turn l, and straight crossing s. Table 2 lists the simulation parameters. It distinguishes the reference values \( x_{i,v}^r \) of the velocity state for vehicles \( v_i \), i ∈ I, with respect to Scenarios 1-3. Furthermore, the inter-vehicle safety distance \( d_s = d_{cz} + l_v \) is computed by considering the length of a route through a critical zone, \( d_{cz} \), two vehicles have in common and the length of a vehicle, \( l_v \), where we assume for simplicity that all vehicles have same dimensions.

Now, we demonstrate the simulation results by applying Algorithm 1 for Scenarios 1 to 3 in Figures 6, 7, and 8, respectively. In these figures the top plot represents the...
As an example we state for Scenario 1 the estimated duration of activities:

\[ \delta = (2.6s, 1.4s, 3.8s, 1.4s, 6.0s, 0.6s, 5.0s, 1.0s, 5.2s, 1.0s, 5.8s, 1.0s), \]

where the bold values are the estimated crossing duration for vehicles \( v_1 \ldots v_6 \), respectively, and the other values are the estimated drive to duration. The resulting RCPSP order decision set \( \mathcal{O} \) is given by

\[ \mathcal{O} = \{o_1 = (v_2, v_6, v_5), o_2 = (v_1, v_2, v_4, v_5), o_3 = (v_4, v_6), o_4 = (v_2, v_3, v_5), o_5 = (v_1, v_6)\}. \]

Table 3 summarizes the simulation results by comparing the proposed RCPSP method and the FCFS strategy. Time represents the total simulated time until all vehicles have crossed the intersection area, \( \Delta \) time lists the percentage of saved time by applying the RCPSP instead of FCFS. Cost indicates the sum of all vehicle individual MPC costs over the time of simulation, \( k_{\text{sim}} \), i.e. \( \sum_{k=1}^{\text{sim}} V(x(t), u(t)) \), and \( \Delta \) cost the saving, similar as above. We find that the RCPSP method outperforms the FCFS strategy. This becomes significantly visible in Scenario 3, where vehicle \( v_3 \) has a higher velocity reference value \( (x_{3,v} = 9) \) compared to the other vehicles. The RCPSP method is able to consider the individual vehicle interests (references or weights), while the FCFS strategy is not aware of that.
Table 3. Overall crossing time and cost evaluation for different intersection scenarios.

| Method       | Time (s) | ∆ time (%) | Cost | ∆ cost (%) |
|--------------|----------|------------|------|------------|
| FCFS         | 10.9     | 6.4        | 3.75e4 | 16.8       |
| RCPSP method | 10.2     | 6.4        | 3.12e4 |            |

| Method       | Time (s) | ∆ time (%) | Cost | ∆ cost (%) |
|--------------|----------|------------|------|------------|
| FCFS         | 16.8     | 15.5       | 3.87e4 | 22.2       |
| RCPSP method | 14.2     | 15.5       | 3.01e4 |            |

| Method       | Time (s) | ∆ time (%) | Cost | ∆ cost (%) |
|--------------|----------|------------|------|------------|
| FCFS         | 16.8     | 32.7       | 7.06e4 | 62.6       |
| RCPSP method | 11.3     | 32.7       | 2.64e4 |            |

This leads to a more efficient crossing order decision with the RCPSP.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper we present a combined scheduling-control methodology for intersection crossing of automated vehicles. The scheduling problem, formulated as a resource-constrained-project-scheduling problem, receives crossing duration estimations via V2I communication from the local vehicle MPC controllers. Based on its solution, a crossing order in the intersection area can be found. This information is then applied in the distributed MPC negotiation procedure. Thus, this method makes use of the strength of scheduling problems by determining feasible crossing orders and guarantee dynamic feasibility through the locally distributed MPC problems. Furthermore, the distribution between the central intersection management unit (scheduling problem) and the local vehicles (distributed MPC) keeps the problem scalable and avoid the computation of a non-convex optimization problem. Finally, the individual vehicle models can be kept privately in each vehicle unit without the need to share it with other vehicles or coordination units. We show the benefit of the proposed method on numerical examples by a comparison with a first-come-first-served strategy.

Future work shall investigate the effect of re-scheduling during the crossing procedure. Moreover, computation time and the optimality gap with respect to the central solution will be subject of further research.
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