

Sensitivity considerations in optimal system design — [Source link](#)

R.A. Rohrer, M. Sobral

Institutions: University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign

Published on: 01 Jan 1965 - IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control (IEEE)

Topics: Sensitivity (control systems), H-infinity loop-shaping, Optimal control, Linear-quadratic-Gaussian control and Control theory

Related papers:

- [On sensitivity in optimal control systems](#)
- [Sensitivity of the performance of optimal control systems to plant parameter variations](#)
- [On the sensitivity of optimal control systems](#)
- [The sensitivity of terminal conditions of optimal control systems to parameter variations](#)
- [A new approach to the sensitivity problem in multivariable feedback system design](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/sensitivity-considerations-in-optimal-system-design-1i0v91k0uj>



Coordinated
Science
Laboratory



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS - URBANA, ILLINOIS

**SENSITIVITY CONSIDERATIONS IN
OPTIMAL SYSTEM DESIGN**

R.A. Rohrer and M. Sobral Jr.

REPORT R-213

JUNE, 1964


COORDINATED SCIENCE LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA, ILLINOIS

Contract DA-28-043-AMC-00073(E)

The research reported in this document was made possible by support extended to the University of Illinois, Coordinated Science Laboratory, jointly by the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy (Office of Naval Research), and the Department of the Air Force (Office of Scientific Research) under Department of Army Contract DA-28-043-AMC-00073(E).

ABSTRACT

The sensitivity of a control system is usually taken to be the normalized variation of some desired characteristic with the variation of plant or controller parameters. Rather than the usual absolute sensitivity described above, a new definition of relative sensitivity is introduced for the optimal control problem, wherein the system performance is always compared with its optimum under the given circumstances. The implications of the relative sensitivity and its relevance to optimal system design are discussed in detail. Moreover, a theoretical approach to the problem of system optimization when plant parameters are subject to change is presented.



II. Relative Sensitivity

The optimal control problem is taken to be that of minimizing a given performance index,¹

$$J(\underline{v}, \underline{u}(t)) = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} F[\underline{v}, \underline{x}(t), \underline{u}(t), t] dt, \quad (2)$$

under the restrictions imposed by plant operation,

$$\dot{\underline{x}}(t) = \underline{f}[\underline{v}, \underline{x}(t), \underline{u}(t), t]. \quad (3)$$

The quantities which appear in the performance index (2) and the state equations (3) are the n -dimensional state vector, $\underline{x}(t)$, the r -dimensional control vector, $\underline{u}(t)$, and the vector \underline{v} which represents the variable plant parameters (the dimension of this vector is virtually unlimited in theory). It is assumed, moreover, that the control and plant parameters are members of given closed sets,

$$\underline{u}(t) \in U \quad (4a)$$

and

$$\underline{v} \in V. \quad (4b)$$

A grossly simplified version of the problem is presented in Figure 1. Although the performance index J is a functional, it is presented here as a function of a single control variable u for various values of the single variable plant parameter v . This picture is adequate for the sake of argument. The controls u_1 , u_2 , and u_3 are optimal for the plant parameters




Figure 1. Simplified representation of optimal control problem.

v_1 , v_2 , and v_3 , respectively. Moreover, the picture has been drawn purposefully so that the value of the performance index is "insensitive" to plant parameter variations for the fourth control u_a . But no right-thinking system designer would choose the control u_a merely on the basis of this insensitivity; a control somewhere in the cluster u_1 , u_2 , u_3 would be better in every sense. It should be noted that although the change in performance index when the plant changes from v_3 to v_1 for control u_3 is large absolutely, there is little that can be done to overcome the situation (the small gain obtained by changing to control u_1 may not even be worth the effort involved). It is considerations such as these which motivate the introduction of relative sensitivity given below.

At a set of plant parameters \underline{y} the relative sensitivity for the control $\underline{u}(t)$ is defined to be the difference between the actual value of the performance index and that which would be obtained if the control were the optimal for the plant parameters \underline{y} (divided by the optimal performance index for normalization):

$$S^R(\underline{y}, \underline{u}(t)) = \frac{J(\underline{y}, \underline{u}(t)) - J(\underline{y}, \underline{u}^o(t))}{|J(\underline{y}, \underline{u}^o(t))|}, \quad (5)$$

where $\underline{u}^o(t)$ is the optimal control for plant parameters \underline{y} ,

$$J(\underline{y}, \underline{u}^o(t)) = \min_{\underline{u}(t) \in U} [J(\underline{y}, \underline{u}(t))] . \quad (6)$$

It should be re-emphasized that the relative sensitivity, $S^R(\underline{y}, \underline{u}(t))$, is that for the given control $\underline{u}(t)$ at the plant "operating point" \underline{y} . For "small" control differences from plant optimal,

$$\delta \underline{u}(t) = \underline{u}(t) - \underline{u}^o(t), \quad (7a)$$

$$\| \delta \underline{u}(t) \| \ll 1, \quad (7b)$$

the relative sensitivity (5) takes on an especially simple form in terms of the calculus of variations (cf., Appendix A):

$$S^R(\underline{y}, \underline{u}(t)) \approx \frac{\delta^2 J(\underline{y}, \underline{u}^o(t), \delta \underline{u}(t))}{|J(\underline{y}, \underline{u}^o(t))|}, \quad (8a)$$

when the optimal control $\underline{u}^o(t)$ is interior to U ;

$$S^R(\underline{y}, \underline{u}(t)) \approx \frac{\delta J(\underline{y}, \underline{u}^o(t), \delta \underline{u}(t))}{|J(\underline{y}, \underline{u}^o(t))|}, \quad (8b)$$

when the optimal control $\underline{u}^o(t)$ is on the boundary of U . It might be argued that the relative sensitivity should be further normalized by the difference in the control from the optimal, but then it would not be an accurate indication of the folly of very poor control choices.

Among the obvious advantages of the relative sensitivity is that it is always a positive number. Moreover, the relative sensitivity reduces to zero at the value of plant parameters \underline{y} for which the control $\underline{u}(t)$ is the optimal. System performance is always compared with an attainable value; consequently, one is not traumatized by matters over which one has no control. In Figure 2 is a simple illustration illuminating the above discussion; the value of the relative sensitivity for the control u_1 is zero at the plant parameter v_1 , $S^R(v_1, u_1) = 0$, which is also true for the control u_2 at the plant parameter v_2 , $S^R(v_2, u_2) = 0$.

III. Optimal System Design

The relative sensitivity is a normalized measure of optimality. The optimal value of relative sensitivity is zero for every plant regardless of the absolute value of its optimal performance index. Hence, before any




Figure 2. Relative sensitivity illustration.

statistic is introduced, the relative sensitivity provides a basis for comparing "the fact of optimality" among many plants. Those plant parameters which provide values near their optimal over a wide range of controls remain near zero in relative sensitivity -- they are relatively insensitive to the choice of control. When a control is to be found which in some sense provides optimality to a variable plant (or a number of plants), it is good procedure to allow those plant parameters with small relative sensitivity to have a lesser affect on the design decision. Consequently, the relative sensitivity is the quantity which is utilized in the design-oriented plant sensitivities evolved below.

The relative sensitivity, $S^R (v, u(t))$, is a functional of both the plant parameters and the choice of control. Small relative sensitivity assures a design close to the optimal. One cannot, however, in general choose a control $u(t)$ for minimum relative sensitivity for any plant. Consequently, the concept of plant sensitivity which relates the design criterion to the relative sensitivity is evolved.

The optimization of a system depends a great deal upon the designer having complete knowledge of the system's behavior. How one deals with a system in partial ignorance of its behavior is in great measure a function of the assumed goals of the design. Two reasonable design criteria can be immediately conjectured:

- 1) Minimize the maximum deviation from optimal behavior; and
- 2) Minimize the average deviation from optimal behavior.

Either of these criteria might be applied when the designer is attempting to find a single controller for a number of similar plants or when he is attempting to find a controller for a single, changeable plant. The first criterion is, of course, the more meaningful when critical tolerances are present; the second, however, would probably find more production line use. The word "deviation" employed in the two criteria above can be the victim of various interpretations; here, the plant sensitivity is chosen as a simple quantitative measure of "deviation". Actually, as has been explained above, the sensitivity is a normalized deviation from some unknown optimal behavior; consequently, it must not be counted upon as an absolute measure.

With the first assumed design criterion in mind, one can define the plant sensitivity

$$S^M(\underline{y}(t)) \equiv \max_{\underline{y} \in V} \left[S^R(\underline{y}, \underline{y}(t)) \right], \quad (9)$$

which is indeed a measure of the maximum deviation from optimal behavior for a given control implementation $\underline{y}(t)$. With the plant sensitivity (9) the optimal design criterion becomes choose

$$\underline{y}(t) = \underline{y}^*(t), \quad (10a)$$

where

$$S^M(\underline{y}^*(t)) = \min_{\underline{y} \in U} \left[S^M(\underline{y}(t)) \right]. \quad (10b)$$

In Figure 3, the above plant sensitivity is illustrated by means of a simplified example; for control u_3 it is

$$S^M(u_3) = S^R(v_2, u_3), \quad (11a)$$

and for control u_4 ,

$$S^M(u_4) = S^R(v_1, u_4). \quad (11b)$$

The analytical details of such a minimum plant sensitivity design are presented in Appendix B, while a simplified example is given in Section IV.




Figure 3. Plant sensitivity illustration.

When the second design criterion listed above is to be employed, an entirely different definition of plant sensitivity can be employed:

$$s^E(\underline{y}(t)) = \underset{\underline{y} \in V}{E} \left[s^R(\underline{y}, \underline{y}(t)) \right], \quad (12)$$

where "E" indicates expected value. Plant sensitivity (12) should be particularly effective in situations where plant parameters are given as random variables. Such a situation might arise when a single (universal) controller is to be designed to control a large number of similar plants. The design criterion, of course, becomes

$$\underline{y}(t) = \underline{y}^*(t), \quad (13a)$$

where

$$s^E(\underline{u}^*(t)) = \min_{\underline{u} \in U} \left[s^E(\underline{u}(t)) \right]. \quad (13b)$$

Since such considerations must enter the maximization (9) or the expected value (12), the plant sensitivity is affected by the means of implementation of the control $\underline{y}(t)$; e.g., closed-loop control renders $\underline{y}(t)$ and $\underline{y}^0(t)$ -- see (5) and (6) -- dependent upon \underline{y} , whereas open-loop control does not.² Since the plant sensitivity varies from one control implementation to another, as well as from one design criterion to another, it can be used as a basis for comparison among them in a manner analogous to that introduced by Cruz and Perkins [4,5].

IV. Example: System Optimization

The simple second order example which follows illustrates some of the principles outlined above. From the amount of manipulation involved in this contrived example, it should be obvious that a computer is in general mandatory for a reasonable design.

Example Given the second-order system characterized by

$$\ddot{x} + v \dot{x} = u, \quad (14)$$

where v is the only variable plant parameter and is assumed to lie in the interval $[0,2]$; consider the problem of choosing the control $u(t)$ in such a way that the performance index

$$J(v, u(t)) = \int_0^{\infty} (x^2 + \dot{x}^2 + u^2) dt \quad (15)$$

is minimized. The optimal trajectories satisfy the second-order equation

$$\ddot{x} + \sqrt{3 + v^2} \dot{x} + x = 0, \quad (16)$$

as can be shown by any one of a number of well-known optimization techniques [7,8,9]. The optimal control can be realized by linear feedback of the state variables:³

$$u^0 = c_1^0 x + c_2^0 \dot{x}, \quad (17)$$

where, from (14) and (16),

$$c_1^0 = -1 \quad (18a)$$

and

$$c_2^0 = v - \sqrt{3 + v^2} \quad (18b)$$

Since c_1^0 is independent of v , the (not necessarily optimal) control is taken as

$$u = -x + c_2 \dot{x} \quad (19)$$

The performance index (15) now becomes a function of v and c_2 ; (it could be a function of c_1 as well, but such a choice would unnecessarily obscure the discussion) a simple calculation yields

$$J(v, c_2) = \frac{(c_2 - v)^2 + v^2 + 3}{2(v - c_2)} x_0^2 + 2x_0 \dot{x}_0 + \frac{c_2^2 + 3}{2(v - c_2)} \dot{x}_0^2, \quad (20)$$

where

$$x_0 = x(0) \quad (21a)$$

and

$$\dot{x}_0 = \dot{x}(0). \quad (21b)$$

For the specific set of initial conditions $x_0 = 1$ and $\dot{x}_0 = 0$, $J(v, c_2)$ becomes

$$J(v, c_2) = \frac{c_2^2 + 3}{2(v - c_2)} + v, \quad (22a)$$

while, from (18b), the optimum is

$$J(v, c_2^o) = \sqrt{3 + v^2}. \quad (22b)$$

Under the above circumstances, then, the relative sensitivity is

$$S^R(v, c_2) = \frac{(v - c_2 + \sqrt{3 + v^2})^2}{2(v - c_2)\sqrt{3 + v^2}}. \quad (23)$$

Figure 4 graphs $S^R(v, c_2)$ versus v for several values of c_2 . The design procedure being discussed is that of choosing the value of c_2 which minimizes the plant sensitivity (9), $S^M(c_2) = \max_v S^R(v, c_2)$. Inspection of Figure 4 shows that

$$S^M(c_2 = -1.3) \approx 0.04, \quad (24a)$$

whereas other values of plant sensitivity are

$$S^M(c_2 = -1.73) \approx 0.06 \quad (24b)$$

and

$$S^M(c_2 = -1.0) \approx 0.15; \quad (24c)$$

for other values of c_2 it is even higher. Consequently, the design optimal c_2 is approximately

$$c_2^* = -1.3. \quad (25)$$




Figure 4. $S^R(v, c_2)$ versus v for the example.

From Figure 5 it can be seen that $J(v, -1.3)$ varies from 1.77 to 2.72, a gross variation of 35% over the interval $[0, 2]$ in v ; however, these graphs also reveal that $J(v, -1.3)$ is extremely close to the optimal throughout the prescribed range, $[0, 2]$.

V. Conclusions

The relative sensitivity (5) has been shown to be a meaningful measure of the performance of an optimal system. Moreover, two different measures of plant sensitivity, (9) and (12), have been indicated as reasonable design criteria for the optimization of incompletely specified (or variable) plants. With the introduction of relative sensitivity to the system optimization problem, system designs can be compared in new and more meaningful ways. Moreover, computer techniques for optimizing whole classes of systems can be developed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors acknowledge invaluable discussions with Prof. J. B. Cruz, Jr., Prof. W. R. Perkins, and Mr. J. J. Mele.




Figure 5. $J(v, c_2)$ versus v for the example.

REFERENCES

1. Bode, H. W., "Network Analysis and Feedback Amplifier Analysis," D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., New York, N. Y., Chapters 4 & 5; 1945.
2. I. Horowitz, "Fundamental Theory of Automatic Linear Feedback Control Systems," IRE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. AC-4, pp. 5-19; December, 1959.
3. P. Dorato, "On Sensitivity in Optimal Control Systems," IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. AC-8, pp. 256-257; July, 1963.
4. J. B. Cruz, Jr. and W. R. Perkins, "A New Approach to the Sensitivity Problem in Multivariable Feedback System Design," IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, July, 1964.
5. W. R. Perkins and J. B. Cruz, Jr., "The Parameter Variation Problem in State Feedback Control Systems," presented at the 1964 Joint Automatic Control Conference, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
6. Bolza, O., "Lectures on the Calculus of Variations," Dover Publications, Inc., New York, N. Y., Chapter I; 1961.
7. Kipiniak, W., "Dynamic Optimization and Control: A Variational Approach," MIT Press Research Monograph, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1961.
8. G. C. Collina and P. Dorato, "Applications of Pontryagin's Maximum Principle: Linear Control Systems," Research Report No. 10-15-62, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Micro-wave Research Institute; June, 1962.
9. R. E. Kalman, "On the General Theory of Control Systems," Proceedings of the First International Congress of the International Federation of Automatic Control, Moscow, 1960, pp. 481-491.

APPENDIX A

The purpose of this appendix is to demonstrate the reasonability of expressions (8) for the relative sensitivity. The first term in the numerator of (5) is expanded about the minimum in the standard manner of the calculus of variations [6]: if

$$\delta u(t) = u(t) - u^0(t), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} J(u, u(t)) &= J(u, u^0(t)) \\ &+ \delta J(u, u^0(t), \delta u(t)) \\ &+ \delta^2 J(u, u^0(t), \delta u(t)) \\ &+ \left(\text{terms of order } \|\delta u(t)\|^3 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Thus, the difference expressed by the numerator of (5) is given approximately by

$$\begin{aligned} J(u, u(t)) - J(u, u^0(t)) &\approx \delta J(u, u(t), \delta u(t)) \\ &+ \delta^2 J(u, u(t), \delta u(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for "small" variations in $u(t)$,

$$\|\delta u(t)\| \ll 1. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

When the optimal control $u^0(t)$ is interior to the region U , the first variation of the performance index vanishes,

$$\delta J(x, u^0(t), \delta u(t)) = 0, \quad (\text{A.5a})$$

and the second variation is nonnegative,

$$\delta^2 J(x, u^0(t), \delta u(t)) \geq 0; \quad (\text{A.5b})$$

consequently, expression (5) becomes approximately (8a)

$$S^R(x, u(t)) \approx \frac{\delta^2 J(x, u^0(t), \delta u(t))}{|J(x, u^0(t))|} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

to order $(\|\delta u(t)\|)^3$. On the other hand, when the control $u^0(t)$ is on the boundary of the region of U , the first variation of the performance index does not vanish; the condition for a local minimum becomes rather

$$\delta J(x, u^0(t), \delta u(t)) \geq 0. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

In this situation expression (5) becomes approximately (8b)

$$S^R(x, u(t)) \approx \frac{\delta J(x, u^0(t), \delta u(t))}{|J(x, u^0(t))|} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

to terms of order $(\|\delta u(t)\|)^2$. The intuitive notion that interior (stationary) control is qualitatively less sensitive than boundary control most of

the time is thus reinforced (here the difference is of order $\|\delta u\|$).

In the general control problem, of course, both types of control occur and both expressions (A.6) and (A.8) must be used, each where appropriate.

APPENDIX B

To indicate what steps may be involved in a minimum plant sensitivity design, an analytical procedure is sketched below. It is assumed for simplicity that all extremals [6] occur in the interior of admissible regions; the extension of the procedure to more general cases is readily inferred. If the system equations (3),

$$\dot{x}_i = f_i(y, x, u, t), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

are appended to the performance index (2) by means of lagrange multipliers [6], the integrand becomes

$$\mathcal{L}(y, x, \dot{x}, u, t, \lambda) = F + \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (\dot{x}_i - f_i). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

The resulting Euler equations for the optimal control, $u^0(t)$, are

$$\dot{x}_i = f_i(y, x, u^0, t), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (\text{B.3a})$$

and

$$\dot{\lambda}_i = -\lambda_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[f_i(y, x, u^0, t) \right] + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \left[F(y, x, u^0, t) \right] \\ i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (\text{B.3b})$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u_j^0} \left[F(\underline{y}, \underline{x}, \underline{u}^0, t) - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f_i(\underline{y}, \underline{x}, \underline{u}^0, t) \right] = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m. \quad (\text{B.3c})$$

In the second round one must obtain the plant sensitivity (9) by means of a maximization of the relative sensitivity (5):

$$S^M(\underline{u}(t)) = \max_{\underline{y} \in V} \left[S^R(\underline{y}, \underline{u}(t)) \right] \quad (\text{B.4a})$$

$$= \max_{\underline{y} \in V} \left\{ \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_f} F[\underline{y}, \underline{x}(t), \underline{u}(t), t] dt}{\int_{t_0}^{t_f} F[\underline{y}, \underline{x}(t), \underline{u}^0(t), t] dt} - 1 \right\}. \quad (\text{B.4b})$$

The constraint equations which must be appended for this maximization are the original system equations (B.1) plus the three sets of equations for the optimal control (B.3); thus, the variation is taken for the augmented quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 = & S^R + \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_{1i} (\dot{x}_i - f_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_{2i} (\dot{x}_i - f_i^0) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_{3i} \left(\dot{\lambda}_i + \lambda_i \frac{\partial f_i^0}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial F^0}{\partial x_i} \right) \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^m \rho_{4j} \frac{\partial}{\partial u_j^0} \left(F^0 - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i f_i^0 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where superscript zero indicates that a quantity is to be evaluated on the optimal control. It must be kept in mind that the control quantities $\underline{u}(t)$ only enter this variation through their dependence on other quantities (i.e., because of the means of control implementation). The maximization leads to a set of equations for $\hat{\underline{v}}$, the plant parameters which yield the plant sensitivity, plus $6n + 2m$ auxiliary equations, $2n + m$ from (B.3), n from (B.1), and $3n + m$ for the Lagrange multipliers, ρ_{ij} . All of these constraining relations must be carried in like manner into the final minimization -- that which yields the optimal design $\underline{u}(t)$.

It is clear that although such an optimization procedure can be outlined in detail as above, it is quite untractable in practice. The essential features of the design procedure are incorporated in the example of Section IV; in many practical cases similar simplifying assumptions may be employed.

FOOTNOTES

1. This formulation of the problem is merely for notational convenience; relative sensitivity can be obtained for any optimization problem.
2. Strictly speaking, once a control implementation has been chosen, the control must be represented as

$$\underline{u}(t) = \underline{u} \left[t, \underline{x}(t), \underline{y} \right].$$

Such an interdependence between $\underline{u}(t)$ and $\underline{x}(t)$ and \underline{y} obviously affects the maximization (9).

3. Already, the implementation of the optimal control law has been assumed; the reader can convince himself of the futility of attempting to complete the solution without such an assumption.

Distribution list as of February 1, 1964

1	Director Air University Library Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama Attn: CR-4803a	1	The RAND Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California Attn: Library	1	Chief of Naval Operations (Code OP-ONT) Department of the Navy Washington, D. C. 20350
1	Redstone Scientific Information Center U.S. Army Missile Command Redstone Arsenal, Alabama	1	Stanford Electronics Laboratories (Unclassified) Stanford University Stanford, California Attn: SEL Documents Librarian	1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Personnel Research Office Washington 25, D. C.
1	Electronics Research Laboratory (Unclassified) University of California Berkeley 4, California	1	Dr. L. F. Carter Chief Scientist Air Force Room 4E-324, Pentagon Washington 25, D. C.	1	Commanding Officer & Director Code 142 Library David W. Taylor Model Basin Washington, D. C. 20007
2	Hughes Aircraft Company Florence and Teale Culver City, California Attn: N. E. Devereux Technical Document Center	1	Mr. Robert L. Feik Associate Director for Research Research and Technology Division AFSC Bolling Air Force Base 25, D. C.	1	Chief, Bureau of Ships (Code 686) Department of the Navy Washington, D. C. 20360
3	Autonetics (Unclassified) 9150 East Imperial Highway Downey, California Attn: Tech. Library, 3041-11	1	Captain Paul Johnson (USN-Ret) National Aeronautics and Space Administration 1520 H Street, N. W. Washington 25, D. C.	1	Chief, Bureau of Ships (Code 732) Department of the Navy Washington, D. C. 20360
1	Dr. Arnold T. Nordsieck General Motors Corporation Defense Research Laboratories 6767 Hollister Avenue Goleta, California	1	Major Edwin M. Myers Headquarters USAF (AFRDR) Washington 25, D. C.	1	Chief, Bureau of Naval Weapons Technical Library, DLI-3 Department of the Navy Washington, D. C. 20360
1	University of California (Unclassified) Lawrence Radiation Laboratory P. O. Box 808 Livermore, California	1	Dr. James Ward Office of Deputy Director (Research and Info) Department of Defense Washington 25, D. C.	1	Director, (Code 5140) U. S. Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D. C. 20390
1	Mr. Thomas L. Hartwick Aerospace Corporation P. O. Box 95085 Los Angeles 45, California	1	Dr. Alan T. Waterman Director, National Science Foundation Washington 25, D. C.	1	Chief of Naval Research (Code 437) Department of the Navy Washington, D. C. 20360
1	Lt. Colonel Willard Levin Aerospace Corporation P. O. Box 95085 Los Angeles 45, California	1	Mr. G. D. Watson Defense Research Member Canadian Joint Staff 2450 Massachusetts Ave., N. W. Washington 8, D. C.	1	Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko (Unclassified) Institute for Defense Analyses Research & Engineering Support Division 1666 Connecticut Ave., N. W. Washington 9, D. C.
1	Professor Zorab Kaprelian University of Southern California University Park Los Angeles 7, California	1	Mr. Arthur G. Wimer Chief Scientist Air Force Systems Command Andrews Air Force Base Washington 25, D. C.	1	Data Processing Systems Division National Bureau of Standards Conn. at Van Ness Room 239, Bldg. 10 Washington 25, D. C. Attn: A. K. Smilow
1	Sylvania Electronic Systems - West Electronic Defense Laboratories P. O. Box 205 Mountain View, California Attn: Documents Center	1	Director, Advanced Research Projects Agency Washington 25, D. C.	1	National Bureau of Standards (Unclassified) Research Information Center & Advisory Service on Information Processing Data Processing Systems Division Washington 25, D. C.
1	Varian Associates 611 Hansen Way Palo Alto, California Attn: Dr. Ira Weissman	1	Air Force Office of Scientific Branch Directorate of Engineering Sciences Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Electronics Division	1	Exchange and Gift Division (Unclassified) The Library of Congress Washington 25, D. C.
1	Huston Denslow (Unclassified) Library Supervisor Jet Propulsion Laboratory California Institute of Technology Pasadena, California	1	Director of Science and Technology Headquarters, USAF Washington 25, D. C. Attn: AFRST-EL/GU	1	NASA Headquarters Office of Applications 400 Maryland Avenue, S. W. Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Mr. A. M. Greg Andrus Code FC
1	Professor Nicholas George California Institute of Technology Electrical Engineering Department Pasadena, California	1	AFRST - SC Headquarters, USAF Washington 25, D. C.	1	APGC (PGAPI) Eglin Air Force Base Florida
1	Space Technology Labs., Inc. One Space Park Redondo Beach, California Attn: Acquisitions Group STL Technical Library	1	Headquarters, R & T Division (Unclassified) Bolling Air Force Base Washington 25, D. C. Attn: RTHR	1	Martin Company P. O. Box 5837 Orlando, Florida Attn: Engineering Library MP-30
2	Commanding Officer and Director U.S. Naval Electronics Laboratory San Diego 52, California Attn: Code 2800, C. S. Manning	1	Headquarters, U. S. Army Material Command Research Division, R & D Directorate Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Physics & Electronics Branch Electronics Section	1	Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research, Chicago Branch 6th Floor, 230 North Michigan Chicago 1, Illinois
1	Commanding Officer and Director U.S. Navy Electronics Laboratory San Diego 52, California Attn: Library	1	Commanding Officer Diamond Ordnance Fuze Laboratories Washington 25, D. C. Attn: Librarian, Room 211, Bldg. 92	1	Laboratories for Applied Sciences University of Chicago 6220 South Drexel Chicago 37, Illinois
1	Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1000 Geary Street San Francisco, California	1	Operation Evaluation Group Chief of Naval Operations (OP-03EG) Department of Navy Washington, D. C. 20350	1	Librarian (Unclassified) School of Electrical Engineering Purdue University Lafayette, Indiana

1	Donald L. Epley (Unclassified) Department of Electrical Engineering State University of Iowa Iowa City, Iowa	1	AFMDC (MDSGP/Capt. Wright) Holloman Air Force Base New Mexico	1	H. E. Cochran Oak Ridge National Laboratory P. O. Box X Oak Ridge, Tennessee
1	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Medical Research Laboratory Fort Knox, Kentucky	1	Commanding General White Sands Missile Range New Mexico	1	U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Office of Technical Information Extension P. O. Box 62 Oak Ridge, Tennessee
2	Keats A. Pullen, Jr. Ballistic Research Laboratories Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland	1	Microwave Research Institute Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn 35 John Street (Unclassified) Brooklyn 1, New York	1	President U. S. Army Air Defense Board Fort Bliss, Texas
1	Director U. S. Army Human Engineering Laboratories Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland	1	Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc. 4455 Genesee Street Buffalo 21, New York Attn: J. P. Desmond, Librarian	1	U. S. Air Force Security Service San Antonio, Texas Attn: ODC-R
1	Mr. James Tippet National Security Agency Port Meade, Maryland	1	Sperry Gyroscope Company (Unclassified) Marine Division Library 155 Glen Cove Road Carle Place, L. I., New York Attn: Mrs. Barbara Judd	1	Director Human Resources Research Office The George Washington University 300 North Washington Street Alexandria, Virginia
1	Commander Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories Laurence G. Hanscom Field Bedford, Massachusetts	1	Major William Harris RADC (RAWI) Griffiss Air Force Base New York	20	Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314
1	Dr. Lloyd Hollingsworth Director, ERD AFCR L. G. Hanscom Field Bedford, Massachusetts	1	Rome Air Development Center Griffiss Air Force Base New York Attn: Documents Library RAALD	1	Commander U. S. Army Research Office Highland Building 3045 Columbia Pike Arlington 4, Virginia
1	Data Sciences Laboratory Air Force Cambridge Research Lab Office of Aerospace Research, USAF L. G. Hanscom Field Bedford, Massachusetts Attn: Lt. Stephen J. Kahne - CRB	1	Library (Unclassified) Light Military Electronics Department General Electric Company Armament & Control Products Section Johnson City, New York	1	U. S. Naval Weapons Laboratory Computation and Analysis Laboratory Dahlgren, Virginia Attn: Mr. Ralph A. Niemann
1	Instrumentation Laboratory (Unclassified) Massachusetts Institute of Technology 68 Albany Street Cambridge 39, Massachusetts	1	Columbia Radiation Laboratory Columbia University (Unclassified) 538 West 120th Street New York 57, New York	2	Army Material Command Research Division R & D Directorate Bldg. T-7 Gravelley Point, Virginia
1	Research Laboratory of Electronics (Unclassified) Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge 39, Massachusetts Attn: Document Room 26-327	1	Mr. Alan Barnum Rome Air Development Center Griffiss Air Force Base Rome, New York		
1	Dr. Robert Kingston Lincoln Laboratories Lexington, Massachusetts	1	Dr. E. Howard Holt (Unclassified) Director Plasma Research Laboratory Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York		
1	Lincoln Laboratory (Unclassified) Massachusetts Institute of Technology P. O. Box 73 Lexington 73, Massachusetts Attn: Library, A-082	3	Commanding Officer U. S. Army Research Office (Durham) Box CM, Duke Station Durham, North Carolina Attn: CRD-AA-1P, Mr. Ulsh		
1	Sylvania Electric Products, Inc. Electronic Systems Waltham Labs. Library 100 First Avenue Waltham 54, Massachusetts	1	Battelle-DEFENDER Battelle Memorial Institute 505 King Avenue Columbus 1, Ohio		
1	Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co. Aeronautical Division (Unclassified) 2600 Ridgeway Road Minneapolis 13, Minnesota Attn: Dr. D. F. Elwell Main Station: 625	1	Aeronautical Systems Division Navigation and Guidance Laboratory Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Ohio		
1	Inspector of Naval Material Bureau of Ships Technical Representative 1902 West Minnehaha Avenue St. Paul 4, Minnesota	1	Aeronautical Systems Division Directorate of Systems Dynamic Analysis Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Ohio		
20	Activity Supply Officer, USAEIRDL Building 2504, Charles Wood Area Fort Monmouth, New Jersey For: Accountable Property Officer Marked: For Inst. for Exploratory Research Inspect at Destination Order No. 576-PM-63-91	1	Commander Research & Technology Div. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Ohio 45433 Attn: MAYT (Mr. Evans)		
1	Commanding General U. S. Army Electronic Command Fort Monmouth, New Jersey Attn: AMSEL-RE	1	Commanding Officer (AD-5) U. S. Naval Air Development Center Johnsville, Pennsylvania Attn: NADC Library		
1	Mr. A. A. Lundstrom Bell Telephone Laboratories Room 2E-127 Whippany Road Whippany, New Jersey	2	Commanding Officer Frankford Arsenal Philadelphia 37, Pennsylvania Attn: SMUFA-1300		