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1. Introduction

This paper is part of a research project aiming to use a Hamiltonian approach to study second order conditions in optimal control. Indeed, we prove sufficient second order conditions for the strong local optimality of a bang-singular extremal for the minimum time problem between fixed end-points with dynamics given by

\[ \dot{\xi}(t) = f_0(\xi(t)) + uf_1(\xi(t)) \]  
\[ u \in [-1, 1] \]  

and constrained to

\[ \xi(0) = \hat{x}_0 , \quad \xi(T) = \hat{x}_f . \]  

The state space is a smooth $n$–dimensional manifold $M$ and $f_0, f_1: M \to TM$ are smooth vector fields, by smooth we mean $C^\infty$.

We study the strong local optimality of a reference triplet $(\hat{T}, \hat{\xi}, \hat{u})$, according to the following

---
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Definition 1. The trajectory \( \hat{\xi} \) is a strong local minimizer if there is a neighborhood \( \mathcal{V} \) of its graph in \( \mathbb{R} \times M \) such that \( \hat{\xi} \) is a minimizer with respect to those admissible trajectories whose graph belongs to \( \mathcal{V} \), independently of the values of the associated controls.

Note that this kind of optimality is local with respect to both time and space.

In this paper we consider the strong local optimality of a reference trajectory associated to a bang-singular control, namely we study a reference triplet \((\hat{T}, \hat{\xi}, \hat{u})\) satisfying (1), (2), (3) and such that \( \hat{u} \) has the following structure:

\[
\hat{u}(t) \equiv u_1 \in \{-1, 1\} \quad \forall t \in [0, \hat{\tau}) \\
\hat{u}(t) \in (-1, 1) \quad \forall t \in (\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}),
\]

\( \hat{\tau} \) is called switching time of the reference control \( \hat{u} \).

Thanks to the structure of \( \hat{u} \) we are able to prove that the sufficient conditions for local optimality of \((\hat{T}, \hat{\xi}, \hat{u})\) with end-point constraint (3) are sufficient also for the minimum time problem with the same dynamics and relaxing the final constraint to the integral curve \( \Gamma_f \) of the controlled vector field \( f_1 \) through the final point of the reference trajectory. Namely, we give second order sufficient optimality conditions for the problem

\[
\text{minimize} \quad T
\]

subject to (1), (2) and

\[
\xi(0) = \hat{x}_0, \quad \xi(T) \in \Gamma_f := \{ \exp s f_1(\hat{x}_0) : s \in \mathbb{R} \}.
\]

In this paper we consider the case when there is a feedback singular control, i.e., there is a smooth function \( v_S : M \to \mathbb{R} \) such that any singular state-extremal \( \xi \) associated to the dynamics (1) is an integral line of the vector field \( f_S = f_0 + v_S f_1 \) and any singular control can be written as \( v_S \circ \xi \). Note that this case is generic in dimension 2 and 3, see the subsequent Section 2.5. Under this assumption we have that both the reference trajectory \( \hat{\xi} \) and the reference control \( \hat{u} \) are smooth on the singular arc and that the reference vector field can be written as

\[
\hat{f}_t = \begin{cases} 
    h_1 := f_0 + u_1 f_1 & t \in [0, \hat{\tau}) \\
    f_S & t \in (\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}]
\end{cases}
\]

The Hamiltonian approach to sufficient conditions in Optimal Control corresponds to the classical construction in Calculus of Variations of a field of non-intersecting state extremals covering a neighborhood of the reference trajectory, see for example Gaitskell and Hildebrandt (1996). The idea is to compare the costs of admissible trajectories, independently of the associated controls, by lifting them to the cotangent bundle.
When the maximized Hamiltonian $H_{\text{max}}^*$ is sufficiently smooth, the field of extremals can be obtained by projecting on the state manifold the flow of $\bar{H}_{\text{max}}^*$ emanating from a suitable Lagrangian sub-manifold. Then the coercivity of the second variation permits to invert the projection and lift the admissible trajectories, see Agrachev et al. (1998a, 2002) and the references therein.

An important feature is that the comparison of costs can also be obtained with a Hamiltonian, which is greater than or equal to $H_{\text{max}}^*$. This possibility has been employed in Stefani (2004 and 2007) to prove second order conditions for a totally singular trajectory.

In addition to the first order necessary optimality conditions, in the form of Pontryagin Maximum Principle (Assumption 1), we make regularity assumptions on the bang arc (Assumption 2), and the strengthened generalized Legendre condition (SGLC) (Assumption 3). Moreover, to overcome the difficulties introduced by the junction point $\xi(\hat{\tau})$ between the bang and the singular arc, we introduce a second-order regularity condition at the junction point (Assumption 4). This condition, under SGLC, is proved to be equivalent to the discontinuity of $\dot{u}$ at time $\tau$. These regularity conditions allow us to define a new Hamiltonian, greater than or equal to $H_{\text{max}}^*$, smooth enough to apply the Hamiltonian approach.

As far as the second variation is concerned, we require the coercivity of the extended second variation for the minimum time problem with fixed end-points along the singular arc, as defined in Section 4.

Some partial result was already obtained in Poggiolini and Stefani (2005, 2006), but there the conditions were not completely satisfactory, since stronger second order conditions were required.

For references on singular trajectories see Goh (1966), Galasov and Kirillova (1972), Gardiner Moyer (1973), Dmitruk (1977, 1983), Agrachev and Sachkov (2004), and the references therein. To our knowledge sufficient conditions for strong local optimality do not appear in the literature even for totally singular trajectories.

The plan of the paper is as follows: in Section 2 we give the notation used, the assumptions and the main result of the paper, in Section 3 we describe the Hamiltonian approach to strong optimality, we define a suitable time-dependent Hamiltonian and we prove its properties which allow us to use the method in the present case, in Section 4 we define the coordinate-free extended second variation $J_E''$ and describe its properties. Finally, in Section 5 we prove the main result.

2. Statement of the results

2.1. Notation

In this paper we use some basic element of the theory of symplectic manifolds related to the cotangent bundle $T^*M$. For a general introduction see
Arnold (1980), for specific application to Control Theory we refer to Agrachev and Gamkrelidze (1997) and Agrachev and Sachkov (2004). Let us recall some basic facts and introduce some specific notations.

Denote by \( \pi: T^*M \to M \) the canonical projection, the space \( T^*_n M \) is canonically embedded in \( T_n T^*M \) as the space of tangent vectors to the fibers.

The canonical Liouville one-form \( s \) on \( T^*M \) and the associated canonical symplectic two-form \( \sigma = ds \) make it possible to associate to any, possibly time-dependent, smooth Hamiltonian \( H_1: T^*M \to \mathbb{R} \), a Hamiltonian vector field \( \overline{H}_t \), by

\[
\sigma(v, \overline{H}_t(\ell)) = \langle dH_t(\ell), v \rangle, \quad \forall v \in T_\ell T^*M.
\]

In this paper, time \( \hat{t} \) plays a special role, hence we consider all the flows as starting at time \( \hat{t} \). In particular, we denote the flow of \( \overline{H}_t \) from time \( \hat{t} \) to time \( t \) by

\[
\mathcal{H} : (t, \ell) \mapsto \mathcal{H}(t, \ell) = \mathcal{H}_t(\ell).
\]

Since no misunderstanding can occur, we shall also say that \( \mathcal{H} \) is the flow of the Hamiltonian \( H_1 \). We keep this notation throughout the paper, namely the overhead arrow denotes the vector field associated to a Hamiltonian and the script letter denotes its flow from time \( \hat{t} \).

**Remark 1** If \( M = \mathbb{R}^n \), then

\[
T^*M = (\mathbb{R}^n)^* \times \mathbb{R}^n = \{(p_1, \ldots, p_n, q^1, \ldots, q^n), \; p_i, \; q^i \in \mathbb{R}\},
\]

and \( s = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \, dq^i, \quad \sigma = \sum_{i=1}^n dp_i \wedge dq^i. \)

With this notation, \( \mathcal{H}_t(p_0, q_0) = (\mu(t), \xi(t)) \) is the solution at time \( t \) of the Hamiltonian system

\[
\begin{aligned}
\dot{\mu}_i(t) &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial q^i} H_t(\mu(t), \xi(t)) \\
\dot{\xi}^i(t) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial p_l} H_t(\mu(t), \xi(t)) \\
\mu(\hat{t}) &= p_0, \quad \xi(\hat{t}) = q_0.
\end{aligned}
\]

For a general manifold \( M \), this is the notation in local coordinates.

Finally, recall that any vector field \( f \) on the manifold \( M \) defines, by lifting to the cotangent bundle, a Hamiltonian

\[
F: \ell \in T^*M \mapsto (\ell, f(\pi(\ell))) \in \mathbb{R},
\]

in coordinates \( \ell = (p, q) \) and \( F(p, q) = \langle p, f(q) \rangle). \)
We denote by $F_0$, $F_1$, $F_S$, $H_1$ the Hamiltonians associated to $f_0$, $f_1$, $f_S$, $h_1$, respectively and by

$$F_{i_1i_2...i_k} := \{F_{i_1}, \{...\{F_{i_{k-1}}, F_{i_k}\}...\}, \quad i_1, ..., i_k \in \{0, 1, S\}$$

the Hamiltonian associated to $f_{i_1i_2...i_k} := [f_{i_1}, [...[f_{i_{k-1}}, f_{i_k}]...],$ where $\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ denotes the Poisson parentheses between Hamiltonians and $[\cdot, \cdot]$ denotes the Lie brackets between vector fields.

The flow from time $\hat{\tau}$ of the reference vector field $\hat{f_i}$ is a map locally defined in a neighborhood of $\hat{x} := \hat{x}(\hat{\tau})$. We denote it as

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_i: x \mapsto \begin{cases} \exp(t - \hat{\tau}) h_1(x) & \text{if } t \in [0, \hat{\tau}] \\ \exp(t - \hat{\tau}) f_S(x) & \text{if } t \in [\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}] \\ \end{cases}$$

while

$$\hat{F}_i = \begin{cases} H_1 & \text{if } t \in [0, \hat{\tau}] \\ F_S & \text{if } t \in [\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}] \end{cases}$$

denotes the time-dependent reference Hamiltonian defined by $\hat{f}_i$.

We also use the following notation from differential geometry: $L_f \alpha$ is the Lie derivative of a function $\alpha$ with respect to the vector field $f$. Moreover, if $G$ is a $C^1$ map from a manifold $X$ in a manifold $Y$, we denote its tangent map at a point $x \in X$ by $T_x G$. If the point $x$ is clear from the context, we also write $T_x G = G_x$.

### 2.2. Pontryagin Maximum Principle

In this section we recall the first order optimality condition which the reference couple must satisfy.

We call a curve in the cotangent bundle which satisfies PMP and state-extremal its projection on the state space, namely we give the following

**Definition 2** Let $u \in L^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ be an admissible control, we call extremal of the control system (1)-(2) any non trivial trajectory $\lambda: [0, T] \rightarrow T^* M$ of the Hamiltonian vector field $\hat{F}_0 + u(t) \hat{F}_1$, which satisfies

$$F_0 \circ \lambda(t) + u(t) F_1 \circ \lambda(t) = \max_{u \in [-1, 1]} \{F_0 \circ \lambda(t) + u F_1 \circ \lambda(t)\} \quad \text{a.e. } t \in [0, T]$$

and we call its projection on the state space $\xi := \pi \lambda: [0, T] \rightarrow M$ a state extremal.

We require the reference trajectory to be a state extremal, namely $(\hat{\xi}, \hat{u})$ satisfies the following
Assumption 1 (PMP) There exist $p_0 \in \{0, 1\}$ and a solution $\hat{\lambda}: t \in [0, \hat{T}] \mapsto \hat{\lambda}(t) \in T^* M$ of the Hamiltonian system

$$\hat{\lambda}(t) = \bar{F}^\tau \circ \lambda(t)$$

such that $\pi \hat{\lambda} = \hat{\xi}$, $\hat{\lambda}(0) \neq 0$ and

$$\hat{F}_2(\hat{\lambda}(t)) = \max\{\hat{\lambda}(t), f_0(\hat{\xi}(t)) + u f_1(\hat{\xi}(t))\} : |u| \leq 1 = p_0 \ a.e. \ t \in [0, \hat{T}]$$

We assume that PMP holds in the normal form, i.e. $p_0 = 1$.

$\hat{\lambda}: [0, \hat{T}] \to T^* M$ is called adjoint covector and we denote $\hat{f} := \hat{\lambda}(\hat{\tau})$.

Given the structure of the reference control $\hat{u}$, as defined by equations (4)-(5), PMP implies

$$u_1 F_2 \circ \hat{\lambda}(t) \geq 0 \ \forall t \in [0, \hat{T}], \quad (8)$$

$$F_1 \circ \hat{\lambda}(t) = (\hat{\lambda}(t), f_1(\hat{\xi}(t))) = 0 \ \forall t \in [\hat{T}, \hat{T}]. \quad (9)$$

By differentiation of equation (9) we also have

$$F_{01} \circ \hat{\lambda}(t) = (\hat{\lambda}(t), f_{S1}(\hat{\xi}(t))) = 0 \ t \in [\hat{T}, \hat{T}] \quad (10)$$

$$(F_{001} + \hat{u}(t) F_{01}) \circ \hat{\lambda}(t) = (\hat{\lambda}(t), f_{S01}(\hat{\xi}(t))) = 0 \ t \in (\hat{T}, \hat{T}) \quad (11)$$

while equations (8) and (10) give

$$\lim_{t \to \hat{T}} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} (u_1 F_2 \circ \hat{\lambda}) (t) = u_1 (F_{001} + u_1 F_{01}) \hat{f} \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

It is also known that a necessary condition for the local optimality of a Pontryagin extremal is the generalized Legendre condition (GLC) along the singular arc:

$$F_{01} \circ \hat{\lambda}(t) = (\hat{\lambda}(t), [f_1, [f_S, f_1]](\hat{\xi}(t))) \geq 0 \ t \in [\hat{T}, \hat{T}],$$

see, for example, Agrachev and Sachkov (2004), Corollary 20.18 p. 318; for a classical result see Gabasov and Kirillova (1972).

2.3. Regularity conditions

The regularity conditions we impose consist in requiring strict inequalities where necessary conditions yield mild inequalities.

Assumption 2 (Regularity along the bang arc)

$$u_1 F_2 \circ \hat{\lambda}(t) > 0 \ \forall t \in [0, \hat{T}).$$
Assumption 3 (Strong generalized Legendre condition (SGLC))

\[ F_{001} \circ \hat{\lambda}(t) > 0, \quad t \in [\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}]. \]  
(SGLC)

Assumption 4 (Regularity at the junction point)

\[ u_1 (F_{001} + u_1 F_{101})(\hat{\ell}) > 0. \]

Remark 2 We point out that, if SGLC holds, then Assumption 4 is equivalent to the discontinuity of \( \hat{u} \) at time \( \hat{\tau} \): in fact, from equation (11) and the continuity of \( \hat{\lambda} \), we have

\[ u_1 (F_{001} + \hat{u}(\hat{\tau}+)) F_{101} (\hat{\ell}) = u_1 \lim_{t \to \hat{\tau}^+} \left( F_{001} \circ \hat{\lambda}(t) + \hat{u}(t) F_{101} \circ \hat{\lambda}(t) \right) = 0. \]

Hence, thanks to Assumption 3, we have \( u_1 F_{001}(\hat{\ell}) + F_{101}(\hat{\ell}) > 0 \) if and only if \( \lim_{t \to \hat{\tau}^+} \hat{u}(t) \neq u_1 \).

2.4. Main result

The remaining sufficient conditions are derived from the sub-problem obtained by keeping the reference final point and the reference bang control fixed and allowing the singular control to vary, namely we study the minimum time problem subject to (1) for \( t \in [\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}] \) and

\[ \xi(\hat{\tau}) = \hat{x}, \quad \xi(T) = \hat{x}_f. \]  
(13)

For this problem we require the second order conditions for singular trajectories stated in Stefani (2004), which will be described in Section 4.

Assumption 5 (2nd order condition on the singular arc) We assume the coercivity of the extended second variation \( J''_E \) associated to the singular trajectory \( \hat{\xi} \) of the minimum time problem with fixed end-points \( \hat{x} \) and \( \hat{x}_f \), as defined in Section 4, see also Stefani (2004 and 2007).

Theorem 1 (Main theorem) Suppose that \( \xi \) is a normal bang–singular state-extremal and that the regularity conditions (Assumptions 2–4) are satisfied. If the extended second variation \( J''_E \) on the singular arc is coercive, then \( \xi \) is a strict strong local minimizer for the minimum time problem between \( \hat{x}_0 \) and the integral curve \( \Gamma_f \) of \( f_1 \) through \( \hat{x}_f \).

2.5. Geometry near the singular arc

In this section we assume SGLC and we describe some properties of the Hamiltonians linked to our system near the singular arc of the adjoint covector.
For \( t \in [\bar{t}, \hat{t}] \), \( \hat{u}(t) = -\frac{F_{001}}{F_{101}}(\hat{\lambda}(t)) \) and \( \hat{\lambda}|_{[\bar{t}, \hat{t}]} \) is called a singular extremal of the first kind, see for example Zelikin and Borisov (1994).

By (9) and (10), any singular extremal of the first kind belongs to the \((2n-2)\)-dimensional symplectic manifold

\[
S = \{ \ell: F_1(\ell) = F_{01}(\ell) = 0, F_{101}(\ell) > 0 \}
\]

which is contained in the hyper-surface

\[
\Sigma := \{ \ell \in T^*M : F_1(\ell) = 0 \},
\]

where the maximized Hamiltonian

\[
H^{\text{max}} : \ell \mapsto \max \{ F_0(\ell) + uF_1(\ell) : u \in [-1, 1] \}
\]

coincides with \( F_0 \).

Note that \( S \) and \( \Sigma \) are independent of the control constraints but, by (2), any singular extremal of our problem belongs to

\[
S \cap \left\{ \ell: \frac{F_{001}}{F_{101}}(\ell) \in (-1, 1) \right\}.
\]

By SGLC it is easy to prove the following result:

**Lemma 2.1** There is a neighborhood \( \mathcal{U} \) of \( S \) in \( T^*M \) where the following claims hold true.

1. \( \Sigma \) is an hyper-surface containing the symplectic manifold \( S \) and it separates in \( \mathcal{U} \) the regions defined by: \( H^{\text{max}} = F_0 + F_1, \quad H^{\text{max}} = F_0 - F_1 \).
2. \( \overline{F}_1 \) is tangent to \( \Sigma \) and transversal to \( S \), while \( \overline{F}_{01} \) is transversal to \( \Sigma \).
3. The maps \( (s, \ell) \mapsto \exp s \overline{F}_1(\ell) \) and \( (\tau, s, \ell) \mapsto \exp \tau \overline{F}_{01} \circ \exp s \overline{F}_1(\ell) \)

are local diffeomorphisms from \( \mathbb{R} \times S \) to \( \Sigma \) and from \( \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times S \) to \( T^*M \) respectively.

Property (3) in Lemma 2.1 yields the possibility of defining the smooth function \( v : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) as

\[
v := -\frac{F_{001}}{F_{101}} \quad \text{on} \quad S
\]

and then extending it constant first on the integral lines of \( \overline{F}_1 \) and then on those of \( \overline{F}_{01} \). In this way we get the Hamiltonian of singular extremal of the first kind by defining

\[
K := F_0 + v F_1.
\]

In this paper we consider the case when the ratio \( F_{001}/F_{101} \) restricted to \( S \) is a function \( v_S \) depending only on \( \pi \ell \in M \). Indeed, in this case the Hamiltonian
$K_S$ is the lift of the vector field $f_S$ and we say that any singular control is feedback. Note that this case is generic in dimensions 2 and 3, as proved in the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.2** Let $\ell \in S$, $x = \pi \ell$ and $f_1(x) \neq 0$.
- If $\dim M = 2$, then $v(\ell)$ depends only on $x$.
- If $\dim M = 3$, then $v(\ell)$ depends only on $x$ either if $f_1(x)$, $f_{01}(x)$ are linearly independent or if $f_1(x)$, $f_{101}(x)$, $f_{001}(x)$ are linearly dependent.

Therefore, in dimension two, $f_1$ non-null on $M$ implies that any singular control of the first kind is feedback, while, in dimension three, the existence of a feedback singular control of the first kind is implied either by $f_1$, $f_{01}$ linearly independent of $M$ or by $f_1$, $f_{101}$, $f_{001}$ linearly dependent on $M$.

**Proof.** $f_1(x) \neq 0$ implies $f_1$, $f_{01}$ linearly independent at $x$. If $\dim M = 2$, we choose $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ as the dual base of $\{f_1(x), f_{01}(x)\}$ and it is easy to see that $v(\ell) = -\langle \omega_2, f_{001}(x) \rangle$.

Analogously, if $\dim M = 3$ and $f_1$, $f_{01}$ are linearly independent at $x$, then we choose $\{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$ as the dual base of $\{f_1(x), f_{101}(x), f_{01}(x)\}$ and we get again $v(\ell) = -\langle \omega_2, f_{001}(x) \rangle$.

If $f_1$, $f_{01}$ are linearly dependent at $x$, then we choose $\{\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3\}$ as the dual base of a base of type $\{f_1(x), f_{101}(x), y\}$ and we get $\ell \in S$ if $\ell = a_2\omega_2 + a_3\omega_3$ with $a_2 > 0$. Therefore $v(\ell) = -\langle \omega_2, f_{001}(x) \rangle - \frac{a_3}{a_2} \langle \omega_3, f_{001}(x) \rangle$ and the claim follows. $lacksquare$

3. **Hamiltonian approach to strong local optimality**

The classical Hamiltonian approach to prove sufficient conditions for strong optimality is based on the construction of a field of non-intersecting state extremals covering a neighborhood of the given trajectory: i.e. by projecting on the state space the flow of $H_{\max}$ starting from a suitable horizontal Lagrangian submanifold. Indeed, if $H = H_{\max}$ is $C^2$ and we can find a Horizontal Lagrangian submanifold $\Lambda$ such that

$$\text{id} \times \pi \mathcal{H} : [0, T] \times \Lambda \to [0, T] \times M \ , \ (t, \ell) \mapsto (t, \pi \mathcal{H}_t(\ell))$$

is a diffeomorphism, then we can use symplectic arguments to compare the costs by lifting admissible trajectories to the cotangent bundle, independently of the associated controls, and finally to prove sufficient conditions. In this case $\text{id} \times \pi \mathcal{H}$ is a $C^1$ map and the coercivity of the second variation allows us to define a suitable manifold $\Lambda$ for which $\text{id} \times \pi \mathcal{H}$ is locally one-to-one, see Agrachev et al. (1998b).

The same ideas have been used in Agrachev et al. (2002) for bang-bang trajectories. In this case $\mathcal{H}$ is not $C^1$ but suitable regularity conditions at the switching points of the reference extremal imply that $\mathcal{H}$ is piecewise $C^\infty$. Again
the coercivity of a suitable second variation permits us to find $\Lambda$, for which $\text{id} \times \pi \mathcal{H}$ is a piecewise diffeomorphism.

The presence of a singular arc prevents the existence of a sufficiently smooth flow of $\overrightarrow{H}_{t}^{\text{max}}$, on the other hand one can observe that a comparison of the costs can be obtained also with a Hamiltonian $H$ which is greater than or equal to $H_{t}^{\text{max}}$. For this reason we are led to introduce a time-dependent Hamiltonian $H_{t}$ and the notion of almost-extremal. We call almost-extremal a solution of the Hamiltonian system associated to a Hamiltonian $H_{t}$ with the following properties

$$H_{t} \geq H_{t}^{\text{max}}, \quad H_{t} \circ \tilde{\lambda} = \tilde{H}_{t} \circ \tilde{\lambda}, \quad \tilde{\lambda} = \tilde{H}_{t} \circ \tilde{\lambda}. \quad (16)$$

See Stefani (2004) for the application to a totally singular arc and Subsection 3.2 for further details on the bang-singular case.

The paradigm is as follows: the regularity assumptions allow us to choose an over-maximized Hamiltonian satisfying (16) and whose flow is $C^1$. The coercivity of the second variation gives the possibility of defining a manifold $\Lambda$ such that map (15) is invertible.

This general paradigm can be followed to prove sufficient conditions also in other situations.

### 3.1. The Hamiltonian $\chi$

We use the strategy adopted in Stefani (2007) to overcome the problems arising from the existence of a singular arc, that is we add, near the singular arc of the adjoint coector, a positive Hamiltonian $\chi$ to the reference one, see Section 3.2. This possibility is given by Regularity Assumption 3 and is described in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.1.** By possibly restricting $\mathcal{U}$, it is possible to define a smooth function $\rho : \mathcal{U} \subset T^* M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with the following properties

i. The Hamiltonian $\chi = \frac{\rho}{2} F^2_{01}$ is such that the Hamiltonian vector field $\overrightarrow{F}_{0} + \overrightarrow{\chi}$ is tangent to $\Sigma$.

ii. For any $\ell \in \mathcal{S}$, $\rho(\ell) = \frac{1}{F^2_{01}(\ell)}$, hence, without loss of generality, we can suppose $\rho > 0$.

iii. $\rho$ can be chosen so that

$$\chi(\ell) = F_{0} \circ \exp \vartheta(\ell) \overrightarrow{F}_{1}(\ell) - F_{0}(\ell)$$

where $\vartheta(\ell)$ is defined by

$$F_{01}(\exp \vartheta(\ell) \overrightarrow{F}_{1}(\ell)) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \vartheta(\ell) = 0, \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{S},$$

hence

$$\overrightarrow{F}_{0} + \overrightarrow{\chi}(\ell) = (\exp(-\vartheta(\ell)) \overrightarrow{F}_{1}), \overrightarrow{F}_{0} \circ (\exp \vartheta(\ell) \overrightarrow{F}_{1})(\ell), \quad \forall \ell \in \Sigma.$$
Proof. The proof is given in Stefani (2007) with a reversed inequality; indeed in that paper the first order conditions are considered in the form of Lagrange multipliers rule, which leads to an adjoint covector which is opposite to the one we consider.

In the following lemma we collect the main properties of the Hamiltonian \( \chi \) in connection with the Hamiltonians \( H_1 \) and

\[
H_S := K + \chi = F_0 + \nu F_1 + \chi,
\]

which allow us to pursue our paradigm.

**Lemma 3.2** The following statements hold true:
1. \( H_S \geq H_{\text{max}} \) on \( \Sigma \) and \( \overline{H}_S \) is tangent to \( \Sigma \)
2. \( H_1 + \chi \geq H_{\text{max}} \) on \( \Sigma \) and \( \overline{H}_1 + \overline{\chi} \) is tangent to \( \Sigma \)
3. \( \overline{\chi} \) is null and \( \overline{K} = \overline{F}_S \) on \( S \), hence, \( \lambda_{\overline{F}_S} \) is a trajectory of \( \overline{H}_S \).
4. \( \overline{F}_1 \) is invariant both with respect to the flow of \( \overline{H}_S \) and with respect to the flow of \( \overline{H}_1 + \overline{\chi} \), namely let \( H \) be either equal to \( H_S \) or equal to \( H_1 + \chi \), then

\[
\overline{F}_1 \circ \mathcal{H}_t(\ell) = \mathcal{H}_t \overline{F}_1(\ell), \quad \ell \in \Sigma
\]

5. \( \langle \ell, \pi_s \overline{\chi}(\ell) \rangle = \chi(\ell) \) for all \( \ell \in \Sigma \).

**Proof.** Claims 1, 2, 3 follow easily from the definitions and Lemma 3.1.

To prove claim 4, take \( \ell \in \Sigma \), notice that \( L_{\overline{F}_1} \nu \equiv 0 \) by definition, and compute

\[
\partial_t \left( \mathcal{H}_t^{-1} \overline{F}_1 \circ \mathcal{H}_t \right)(\ell) = \mathcal{H}_t^{-1} \left[ \overline{F}_0 + \overline{\chi}, \overline{F}_1 \right] \circ \mathcal{H}_t(\ell).
\]

From claim iii. of Lemma 3.1 we obtain on \( \Sigma \)

\[
[\overline{F}_0 + \overline{\chi}, \overline{F}_1] = \left[ \exp(-\theta \overline{F}_1), \exp(\theta \overline{F}_1), \overline{F}_1 \right] = \exp(-\theta \overline{F}_1) \{ \overline{F}_0 - L_{\overline{F}_1} \theta \overline{F}_1 \} \circ \exp(\theta \overline{F}_1) = 0
\]

since \( L_{\overline{F}_1} \theta \equiv -1 \) on \( \Sigma \).

The proof of claim 5 follows easily from iii. of Lemma 3.1.

**3.2. Almost extremals**

In this section we prove that regularity Assumptions 2, 3 and 4 imply the existence of a Hamiltonian \( H_1 \) with the desired properties (16) on its flow starting from \( \Sigma \).

The flow of \( H_1 \) backward in time emanating from \( \ell \in \Sigma \) at time \( \tau \) behaves differently according to the sign of \( u_1 F_{01}(\ell) \). Namely, if \( u_1 F_{01}(\ell) \leq 0 \) then
u_1 F_1 (\exp(t - \hat{\tau}) \vec{H}_1)(\ell) > 0 \text{ for } t < \hat{\tau}, \text{ hence } H_1 \text{ is the maximized Hamiltonian along its own flow. If } u_1 F_0 (\vec{H}_1) > 0 \text{ then } u_1 F_1 (\exp(t - \hat{\tau}) \vec{H}_1)(\ell) < 0 \text{ for } t < \hat{\tau}, \text{ hence } H_1 \text{ is no longer the maximized Hamiltonian. We overcome this problem by substituting } H_1 \text{ with } H_1 + \chi \text{ for these bad points so that the flow is kept on } \Sigma \text{ until it reaches a good point, as precisely in the following lemma.}

**Lemma 3.3** Let Assumptions 3 and 4 be satisfied. Then

1. There exists a neighborhood \( \mathcal{O} \) of \( \ell \) in \( \Sigma \) such that the implicit equation

\[
\begin{cases}
\tau(\ell) = \hat{\tau}, \\
F_{01} \circ \exp(\tau(\ell) - \hat{\tau})(\vec{H}_1 + \vec{\chi})(\ell) = 0
\end{cases}
\]

defines a smooth function

\[ \tau : \ell \in \mathcal{O} \mapsto \tau(\ell) \in \mathbb{R}. \]

2. \( \langle d\tau(\ell), \delta \ell \rangle = \frac{-\sigma \left( \delta \ell, F_{01}(\ell) \right)}{(F_{001} + u_1 F_{101})(\ell)} \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{S}. \]

3. \( F_{01}(\ell) = 0 \iff \tau(\ell) = \hat{\tau} \text{ and } \text{sgn}(u_1 F_{01}(\ell)) = \text{sgn}(\hat{\tau} - \tau(\ell)). \]

4. There exists \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that

\[ |\tau(\ell) - \hat{\tau}| < \varepsilon \quad \forall \ell \in \mathcal{O} \]

and such that, for any \( \ell \in \mathcal{O} \) and for any \( t, s \) with \( \hat{\tau} - \varepsilon \leq t \leq s \leq \hat{\tau} \), the following inequality holds:

\[ u_1 \left( F_{001} + u_1 F_{101} \right) \circ \exp(t - s) \vec{H}_1 \circ \exp(s - \hat{\tau}) \left( \vec{H}_1 + \vec{\chi} \right)(\ell) > 0. \quad (19) \]

**Proof.** 1. and 2. Since the partial derivative

\[ \partial_t F_{01} \circ \exp(t - \hat{\tau})(\vec{H}_1 + \vec{\chi})(\ell) \bigg|_{(t, \ell) = (\hat{\tau}, \ell)} = (F_{001} + u_1 F_{101})(\hat{\ell}) \]

is not zero by Assumption 4, then the implicit function theorem applies.

3. From equation (20) and Assumption 4 the function

\[ t \mapsto u_1 \partial_t F_{01} \circ \exp(t - \hat{\tau})(\vec{H}_1 + \vec{\chi})(\ell) \]

is locally strictly increasing, hence claim 3. follows.

4. Inequalities (18)–(19) are satisfied in a neighborhood of \( t = s = \hat{\tau}, \ell = \hat{\ell} \), by

continuity. \( \blacksquare \)

Now we are able to define a Hamiltonian \( H_t \), visualized in Fig. 1, which allows us to pursue the paradigm:

\[
H_t(\ell) = \begin{cases}
H_1(\ell) & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \hat{\tau} - \varepsilon \text{ or } \hat{\tau} - \varepsilon < t < \hat{\tau}, u_1 F_{01}(\ell) \leq 0 \\
(H_1 + \chi)(\ell) & \text{if } \hat{\tau} - \varepsilon < t < \hat{\tau}, u_1 F_{01}(\ell) > 0 \\
H_S(\ell) & \text{if } \hat{\tau} \leq t \leq \hat{T}
\end{cases}
\]

(21)
Note that the above defined Hamiltonian $H_t$ has the required properties only on its flow starting from $\Sigma$, as shown in the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4** The Hamiltonian

$H: (t, \ell) \in [0, \hat{T}] \times T^*M \mapsto H_t(\ell) \in \mathbb{R}$

satisfies the following properties:

1. $H$ is $C^1$ with respect to $\ell$, for any $t$.
2. $\overline{H}_t(\ell)$ is Lipschitz continuous with respect to $\ell$, for any $t \in [0, \hat{T}]$. The only discontinuities, with respect to time, of $\overline{H}_t(\ell)$ occur at $t = \hat{\tau}$, i.e. they occur at the discontinuities of the reference control function $\hat{u}$.
3. The flow $\mathcal{H}$ of $\overline{H}_t$ is $C^1([0, \hat{T}] \times \mathcal{O})$.
4. The restriction of the Hamiltonian $H$ to $(\text{id} \times \mathcal{H})([0, \hat{T}] \times \mathcal{O})$ is continuous.
5. $\mathcal{H}_t(\hat{\lambda}(t)) = \hat{\lambda}(t)$, for any $t \in [0, \hat{T}]$.
6. $F_1 \circ \mathcal{H}_t(\ell) = 0$ for any $(t, \ell) \in \min\{\tau(\ell), \hat{\tau}\} \times \mathcal{O}$.
7. Possibly restricting $\mathcal{O}$,

$$u_1 F_1 \circ \mathcal{H}_t(\ell) > 0 \quad \forall (t, \ell) \in [0, \min\{\tau(\ell), \hat{\tau}\}) \times \mathcal{O}. \quad (22)$$

8. $H_t \circ \hat{\lambda}(t) = \overline{H}_t \circ \hat{\lambda}(t)$ for any $t \in [0, \hat{T}]$ and

$$H_t \circ \mathcal{H}_t(\ell) \geq H_{\max} \circ \mathcal{H}_t(\ell) \quad \text{for any} \quad (t, \ell) \in [0, \hat{T}] \times \mathcal{O}.$$

**Proof.** 1. and 2. are easy corollaries of Lemma 3.3, taking into account that $\chi$ is $C^\infty$, by Lemma 3.1.
3. For \( t \in (\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}] \), the property is obvious, since \( H_t = H_S \) is \( C^\infty \).

For \( t \in [0, \hat{\tau}] \), the only discontinuities of the map \( \ell \mapsto T_t H_t \) may occur at the
(\( t, \ell \)) such that \( F_0(\ell) = 0 \) or such that \( u_1 F_0(\ell) \geq 0 \) and \( t = \tau(\ell) \). By definition
we obtain

\[
T_t H_t = \begin{cases} 
T_t \exp(t - \hat{\tau}) \hat{H}_1 & \text{if } u_1 F_0(\ell) < 0 \\
T_t \exp(t - \hat{\tau})(\hat{H}_1 + \overline{\chi}) & \text{if } u_1 F_0(\ell) > 0, \ t \in (\tau(\ell), \hat{\tau}).
\end{cases}
\]

Moreover, if \( u_1 F_0(\ell) > 0 \) and \( t \in [0, \tau(\ell)) \) then, taking into account that
\( \overline{\chi} \circ \mathcal{H}_{\tau(\ell)}(\ell) = 0 \), we get

\[
T_t H_t = T_{\mathcal{H}_{\tau(\ell)}} \exp(t - \tau(\ell)) \hat{H}_1 \circ T_t \exp(\tau(\ell) - \hat{\tau})(\hat{H}_1 + \overline{\chi}).
\]

An easy computation completes the proof.

4. and 5. follow easily from 1. and 2.

6. is obvious, by Lemma 3.1.

7. Consider the cases

1. \( \hat{\tau} \leq \tau(\ell) \) and \( t < \hat{\tau} \). \( \mathcal{H}_t(\ell) = \exp(t - \hat{\tau}) \hat{H}_1(\ell) \) and \( u_1 F_0(\ell) \leq 0 \) so that

\[
u_1 F_1 \circ \mathcal{H}_t(\ell) = (t - \hat{\tau}) u_1 F_0(\ell) + \frac{(t - \hat{\tau})^2}{2} u_1 (F_{001} + u_1 F_{101})(\ell) + o((t - \hat{\tau})^2).
\]

2. \( \tau(\ell) < \hat{\tau} \) and \( t < \tau(\ell) \). \( \mathcal{H}_t(\ell) = \exp(t - \tau(\ell)) \hat{H}_1(\mathcal{H}_{\tau(\ell)}(\ell)) \), \( u_1 F_0(\ell) > 0 \) so that

\[
u_1 F_1 \circ \mathcal{H}_t(\ell) = \frac{(t - \tau(\ell))^2}{2} u_1 (F_{001} + u_1 F_{101}) \circ \mathcal{H}_{\tau(\ell)}(\ell) + o((t - \tau(\ell))^2).
\]

Using (19), 7. follows.

8. The proof is straightforward from 7., since \( \chi \) is a non-negative function.

4. The extended second variation

In Stefani (2004) the extended second variation \( J'' \), associated to a totally singular extremal of a minimum time problem is defined starting from the coordinate-free second variation given in Agrachev et al. (1998a). Locally around \( \hat{z} \) define the time-dependent vector field

\[
g_t := \hat{S}_t^{-1} f_1 \circ \hat{S}_t : W \rightarrow TM, \quad t \in [\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}]
\]

and choose a function \( \beta \) on \( W \) such that

\[
d\beta(\hat{x}) = -\hat{\lambda}(\hat{\tau}).
\]

Then the second variation as defined in Agrachev et al. (1998a) is a quadratic form on \( L^2([\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}], \mathbb{R}) \) realized as the following intrinsic LQ problem on the vector
space $T_{\tilde{x}}M$:  
\[
J''[\delta u]^2 = \int_{\tilde{T}} \delta u(t) L_{\delta\eta(t)} L_{g_t} \beta(\tilde{x}) \, dt \\
\delta\eta(t) = \delta u(t) g_t(\tilde{x}), \quad \delta\eta(\tilde{T}) = \delta\eta(\tilde{T}) = 0.
\]

This result is independent of the choice of the function $\beta$ with property 23, see Agrachev et al. (1998), hence we can choose $\beta$ so that $L_{f_1}^2 \beta \equiv 0$. Applying the techniques in Stefani (2004), developed in Stefani (2007), we obtain a quadratic form on $\mathbb{R} \times L^2([\tau, \tilde{T}], \mathbb{R})$ realized as an intrinsic LQ problem on the vector space $T_{\tilde{x}}M$. Setting for $t \in [\tau, \tilde{T}]$

\[
R(t) := L_{[g_t, g_t]} \beta(\tilde{x}) = \langle d\beta(\tilde{x}), [\dot{g}_t, g_t] \rangle = \langle \dot{\lambda}(t), f_{101}(\xi(t)) \rangle \\
Q(t) := L_{\xi(t)} L_{g_t} \beta(\tilde{x}) \\
\delta e := (w_0, w) \in \mathbb{R} \times L^2([\tau, \tilde{T}], \mathbb{R})
\]

we can write the extended second variation as  
\[
J''_{E}[\delta e]^2 = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tilde{T}} w(t)^2 R(t) + 2w(t)Q(t)\zeta(t) \, dt, \\
\zeta(t) = \dot{w}(t)\dot{g}_t(\tilde{x}), \quad \xi(\tau) = w_0 f_1(\tilde{x}), \quad \xi(\tilde{T}) = 0.
\]

See Stefani (2007) for further details and note that the same second variation, written in symplectic form, is considered in Agrachev and Sachkov (2004). In Stefani (2007) the necessary and sufficient conditions are proved for the coercivity of $J''_{E}$ from different points of view, in particular a reduction to a non-singular problem is proved: denote  
\[
\Gamma := \{ \exp sf_1(\tilde{x}), s \in \mathbb{R} \}
\]

the integral curve of $f_1$ through $\tilde{x}$, and let $\alpha$ be any function such that $d\alpha(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{\ell}$ and $L_{f_1}^2 \alpha(\tilde{x}) = 0$. Then, $J''_{E}$ is proved to be the standard second variation, relative to the extremal $\tilde{\lambda}_{|[\tau, \tilde{T}]}$ and to the reference control $\tilde{w} \equiv 0$, of the Mayer problem  

\begin{align*}
\text{minimize} \quad & \alpha(\xi(\tilde{T})) \quad \text{subject to} \\
& \dot{\xi}(t) = f_{S}(\xi(t)) + w(t)f_{S_1}(\xi(t)) + \frac{1}{2}w(t)^2f_{S_1}(\xi(t)) \\
& \xi(\tau) \in \Gamma, \quad \xi(\tilde{T}) = \tilde{x}_f.
\end{align*}

Note that the coercivity of $J''_{E}$ implies that SGLC must be satisfied and that $f_1(\tilde{x}) \neq 0$. Moreover, easy calculations show that SGLC is the strong Legendre condition for the above non-singular problem.
Since in our case the Hamiltonian of singular extremals $F_S$ is the lift of a
vector field $f_S$, we can use Lemma 6.4 in Stefani (2007) to give necessary and
sufficient conditions for the coercivity of $J'_E$ in terms of the vector fields $f_S$ and
$f_1$.

**Lemma 4.1** Necessary and sufficient condition for the coercivity of $J'_E$.
If $f_1$, $f_0$ are linearly dependent at $\hat{x}$, then $J'_E$ is coercive if and only if
$$f_1(\hat{\xi}(t)) \neq 0 \text{ for all } t \in [\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}].$$
If $f_1$, $f_0$ are linearly independent at $\hat{x}$, then $J'_E$ is coercive if and only if
$$f_1(\hat{\xi}(t))$$ and $\hat{S}_e f_1(\hat{x})$ are linearly independent for all $t \in [\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}].$

### 4.1. Reduction to a free initial point problem

In this section we show how the coercivity of $J'_E$ allows us to add a penalty on
the initial point of problem (24)–(25)–(26) so that the second variation remains
coercive also removing the constraint on the initial point. This allows us to
define the Lagrangian sub-manifold with the property required in Section 3.

**Lemma 4.2** If $J'_E$ is coercive, then there is a function $\alpha$ defined in a neigh-
borhood $W$ of $\hat{x}$, with the following properties

1) $L_{f_1} \alpha \equiv 0$
2) $\text{d} \alpha(\hat{x}) = \hat{\ell}$
3) Let $\Lambda = \{ \text{d} \alpha(x) : x \in W \}$ be the Lagrangian sub-manifold defined by $\alpha$ and
let $\mathcal{H}$ be the Hamiltonian flow associated to the Hamiltonian $H_1$ defined in
(21), then $\pi, \mathcal{H} : T\Lambda \rightarrow T_{\hat{\xi}(t)} M$ is an isomorphism for $t \in [\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}].$

**Proof.** Since $f_1(\hat{x}) \neq 0$, we can choose coordinates $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ at $\hat{x}$ such that
$f_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}$, therefore $\hat{\ell} = \sum_{i=2}^n \lambda_i \, dx_i$, and we can choose $\beta$ in (23) as
$$\beta = -\sum_{i=2}^n \lambda_i x_i.$$ 

In these coordinates choose the non-negative quadratic form on $T\Lambda M$
$$\Omega = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=2}^n dx_i \otimes dx_i$$
and extend it to $T\Lambda M \times L^2([\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}], \mathbb{R})$ by $\Omega[\delta x]^2 = \Omega[dx]^2$. The quadratic form
defined on $T\Lambda M \times L^2([\hat{\tau}, \hat{T}], \mathbb{R})$ by
$$(\delta x, w) \mapsto \Omega[\delta x]^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\hat{\tau}}^{\hat{T}} w(t)^2 R(t) + 2w(t)Q(t)\hat{\zeta}(t) \, dt$$
$$\hat{\zeta}(t) = w(t)\hat{g}_t(\hat{x}), \quad \zeta(\hat{\tau}) = \delta x, \quad \zeta(\hat{T}) = 0,$$
coincides with $J''_E$ on the kernel of $\Omega$, hence we can apply Theorem 13.2 of Hestenes (1951) and conclude that there is a positive constant $s$ such that

$$J''_E + s\Omega \text{ is coercive on } W = \{ \delta e \in T_\overline{\gamma} M \times L^2([\overline{\gamma}, \overline{T}], \mathbb{R}) : \zeta(\overline{T}) = 0 \}.$$ 

By defining

$$\alpha(x) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} \lambda_i x_i + \frac{1}{2} s \sum_{i=2}^{n} x_i^2,$$

we get that $\alpha$ satisfies i), ii) and that $\gamma'' := D^2(\alpha + \beta)(\overline{x}) = s\Omega$.

$J''_E + s\Omega$ turns out to be the standard second variation of the Mayer problem

minimize $\alpha(\zeta(\overline{T}))$ subject to (25) and $\zeta(\overline{T}) = \overline{x}_f$.

Therefore the proof of iii) follows from Corollary 6.1 in Stefani (2007).

5. Proof of the Main Theorem

In this section we complete the proof of the main result. We start by proving the existence of a Lagrangian sub-manifold having the required properties with respect to the Hamiltonian defined in (21).

Lemma 5.1. Let $\alpha : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\Lambda$ be the function and the associated Lagrangian sub-manifold defined in Lemma 4.2. Possibly restricting $\mathcal{W}$, the map

$$\text{id} \times \pi H : (t, \ell) \in [0, \overline{T}] \times \Lambda \mapsto (t, \pi H_t(\ell)) \in [0, \overline{T}] \times M$$

is one-to-one onto a neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ of the graph of $\overline{\xi}$ in $[0, \overline{T}] \times M$.

Proof. Since $[0, \overline{T}]$ is compact, it suffices to show that $\pi H_t : \ell \mapsto \pi H_t(\ell)$ is locally one-to-one around $(t, \overline{\ell})$ for any $t \in [0, \overline{T}]$. Since $H_t$ is $C^1$, it suffices to show that $\pi_t H_{t*} : T_t \Lambda \rightarrow T_{\xi(t)} M$ is an isomorphism for any $t \in [0, \overline{T}]$. In fact, if $t \geq \overline{\tau}$, the claim is proved in Lemma 4.2, while if $t \in [0, \overline{\tau}]$ an easy calculation shows that $\pi_t H_{t*} = \exp(t - \overline{\tau})h_{1*}$.

We can now use symplectic arguments to complete the proof of the main theorem. First, observe that the one-form $\omega$ defined by

$$\omega = H^* (s - H_t dt)$$

is exact on $[0, \overline{T}] \times \Lambda$, see Arnold (1980).

Let $(T, \xi, u)$ be an admissible triplet such that $\overline{\tau} < T \leq \overline{T}$ and such that the graph of $\xi : [0, T] \rightarrow M$ is in the neighborhood $\mathcal{V}$ defined in Lemma 5.1.

By assumption $\xi(T)$ belongs to the integral line of $f_1$ emanating from $\overline{x}_f$ i.e. $\exists \overline{x} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\xi(T) = \exp \overline{x} f_1(\overline{x}_f)$. Define

$$\phi : r \in [0, 1] \mapsto \exp \overline{x} (1 - r) f_1(\overline{x}_f) \in M.$$ 

Consider the paths in $\mathcal{V}$:
1. $\Xi := (\text{id}, \xi): t \in [0, T] \mapsto (t, \xi(t)) \in \mathbb{R} \times M$.
2. $\Phi: r \in [0, 1] \mapsto \left( (T - T)r + T, \phi(r) \right) \in \mathbb{R} \times M$.
3. $\tilde{\Xi} := (\text{id}, \tilde{\xi}): t \in [0, \tilde{T}] \mapsto (t, \tilde{\xi}(t)) \in \mathbb{R} \times M$
and denote $\psi := (\text{id} \times \pi_\mathcal{H})^{-1}$. Since the concatenation of $\psi \circ \Xi$, $\psi \circ \Phi$, and of $\psi \circ \tilde{\Xi}$ run backward in time, is a closed path in $[0, \tilde{T}] \times \Lambda$, then

$$0 = \int_0^\omega = \int_{\psi \circ \Xi} \omega + \int_{\psi \circ \Phi} \omega - \int_{\psi \circ \tilde{\Xi}} \omega. \quad (27)$$

From the properties of $H_t$ (point 8. of Lemma 3.4) we get

$$\int_{\psi \circ \Xi} \omega = 0, \quad \int_{\psi \circ \Phi} \omega \leq 0 \quad (28)$$

so that

$$\int_{\psi \circ \Phi} \omega \geq 0. \quad (29)$$

Since $\mathcal{H} \circ \psi \circ \Phi$ takes values in $\Sigma$, then

$$\langle \mathcal{H} \circ \psi \circ \Phi(r), f_1(\pi_\mathcal{H} \circ \psi \circ \Phi(r)) \rangle = F_1 \circ \mathcal{H} \circ \psi \circ \Phi(r) \equiv 0,$$

so that

$$0 \leq \int_{\psi \circ \Phi} \omega = -(\tilde{T} - T) \int_0^1 H_S(\mathcal{H} \circ \psi \circ \Phi(r)) \, dr. \quad (30)$$

Assume that $T \leq \tilde{T}$, then (30) is equivalent to

$$0 \leq -\int_T^\tilde{T} H_S \circ \mathcal{H} \circ \psi(t, \exp \frac{\pi(\tilde{T} - t)}{\tilde{T} - T} f_1(\tilde{x}_f)) \, dt$$

$$= \int_T^\tilde{T} \left( H_S \circ \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{T}} \circ \psi(\tilde{T}, \tilde{x}_f) + O(t - \tilde{T}) \right) \, dt = \int_T^\tilde{T} \left( H_S \circ \mathcal{H}_{\tilde{T}}(t) + O(t - \tilde{T}) \right) \, dt$$

$$= \int_T^\tilde{T} \left( 1 + O(t - \tilde{T}) \right) \, dt = T - \tilde{T} + O\left( (T - \tilde{T})^2 \right)$$

which implies $T = \tilde{T}$, so that $(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{u})$ is a (time, state)-local minimizer.

To prove that such minimum is strict, let us assume, by contradiction, that $T = \tilde{T}$. Then $\Phi(r) = \left( \tilde{T}, \exp \pi(1 - r) f_1(\tilde{x}_f) \right)$, and $\int_{\psi \circ \Phi} \omega = 0$. From equation (27) we also get

$$0 = \int_{\psi \circ \Xi} \omega = \int_0^{\tilde{T}} \langle \mathcal{H} \circ \psi(t, \xi(t)) \circ \xi(t) - H_t \circ \mathcal{H} \circ \psi(t, \xi(t)) \rangle \, dt,$$
and, by property 8. of Lemma 3.4,
\[
(H \circ \psi(t, \xi(t)), (f_0 + u(t)f_1)(\xi(t))) = H_t \circ H \circ \psi(t, \xi(t))
= H^{\text{max}} \circ H \circ \psi(t, \xi(t)) \quad (31)
\]
for any \( t \in [0, \hat{T}] \). Define \( \lambda(t) := H \circ \psi(t, \xi(t)) \). If \( \lambda(t) \in \Sigma \), then (31) implies \( \lambda(t) \in S \), while if \( \lambda(t) \notin \Sigma \), then claim 7. of Lemma 3.4 and equation (31) yield \( u(t) = u_1 \) for any \( t \in [0, \tau - \varepsilon] \), therefore \( \lambda(t) = \hat{\lambda}(t) \) for any \( t \in [0, \tau - \varepsilon] \), since \( \lambda(0) = \hat{\lambda}(0) \).

For \( t \in (\tau - \varepsilon, \hat{T}) \) we can compute
\[
\dot{\lambda}(t) = \bar{H}_t \circ \lambda(t) - H_{t\ast}(\pi H_t)^{-1}_{\ast} \left\{ \pi_t \bar{H}_t \circ \lambda(t) - (f_0 + u(t)f_1) \circ \xi(t) \right\} =
= \begin{cases}
\bar{H}_t \circ \lambda(t) + (u(t) - u_1)H_{t\ast}(\pi H_t)^{-1}_{\ast}f_1 \circ \xi(t) & t \in (\tau - \varepsilon, \tau) \\
\bar{H}_g \circ \lambda(t) + (u(t) - v_g \circ \xi(t))H_{t\ast}(\pi H_t)^{-1}_{\ast}f_1 \circ \xi(t) & t \in (\hat{T}, \hat{T}).
\end{cases}
\]
Since, whenever \( \lambda(t) \in \Sigma \), \( H_{t\ast}(\pi H_t)^{-1}_{\ast}f_1 \circ \pi \lambda(t) = \bar{F}_1 \circ \lambda(t) \) (by point 4 of Lemma 3.2), in any case we get
\[
\dot{\lambda}(t) = (\bar{F}_0 + u(t)\bar{F}_1) \circ \lambda(t) \quad \forall t \in (\tau - \varepsilon, \hat{T}),
\]
which, together with (31), means that \( \lambda \) satisfies PMP on \( [\tau - \varepsilon, \hat{T}] \). Since \( \lambda(\tau - \varepsilon) = \hat{\lambda}(\tau - \varepsilon) \), we easily get \( \lambda = \hat{\lambda} \) on \( [0, \hat{T}] \). Moreover, on \( [\hat{T}, \hat{T}] \), \( \lambda \) is a Pontryagin extremal and its range is in \( S \), so that \( \lambda \) is a solution to the Cauchy problem
\[
\dot{\lambda}(t) = \left( \bar{F}_0 - \frac{\bar{F}_{01}}{\bar{F}_{11}} \bar{F}_1 \right) \circ \lambda(t) \quad \lambda(\hat{T}) = \hat{\ell}
\]
on the interval \( [\hat{T}, \hat{T}] \). Hence \( \lambda(t) = \hat{\lambda}(t) \) for any \( t \in [\hat{T}, \hat{T}] \). Projecting on the state manifold \( M \), we finally get \( \xi(t) = \hat{\xi}(t) \).

6. An example

Consider the Dodgem car problem:

\[
\text{minimize} \quad T
\]
such that
\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_1(t) &= \cos(x_3) \quad x_1(0) = 0 \quad x_1(T) = b_1 \\
\dot{x}_2(t) &= \sin(x_3) \quad x_2(0) = 0 \quad x_2(T) = b_2 \\
\dot{x}_3(t) &= u \quad x_3(0) = 0 \quad x_3(T) \in \mathbb{R} \\
u &\in [-1, 1]
\end{align*}
\]
where $x \equiv (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

We have

$$f_0(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(x_3) \\ \sin(x_3) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad f_1(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

hence, with a simple computation, we also get

$$f_{01}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \sin(x_3) \\ -\cos(x_3) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad f_{101}(x) = f_0(x), \quad f_{001}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and the associated Hamiltonians are

$$F_0(p, x) = F_{101}(p, x) = p_1 \cos(x_3) + p_2 \sin(x_3) \quad F_1(p, x) = p_3,$$
$$F_{01}(p, x) = p_1 \sin(x_3) - p_2 \cos(x_3) \quad F_{001}(p, x) = 0.$$

Since, along any singular arc of a normal Pontryagin extremal, the condition $F_0(\lambda(t)) = 1$ must hold, then SGLC is satisfied and the only admissible singular control is $u(t) \equiv 0$, so that any singular arc is driven by $f_S = f_0$, and our theory applies.

Let us check that along any singular arc the hypotheses of Lemma 4.1 are satisfied. In fact, since $f_0(x)$ and $f_{01}(x)$ are linearly independent at any point of $\mathbb{R}^3$, we just need to show that $f_1(x)$ and $\exp(t f_0), f_1 \circ \exp(-t f_0)(x)$ are linearly independent for any $t \neq 0$.

A simple computation shows that

$$\exp(t f_0)(x) = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 + t \cos(x_3) \\ x_2 + t \sin(x_3) \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\exp(t f_0), f_1 \circ \exp(-t f_0)(x) = \begin{pmatrix} -t \sin(x_3) \\ t \cos(x_3) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

which proves our claim.

Any bang-singular arc satisfying PMP in normal form is a strong local optimizer for the problem. It is known, see Craven (1995), Teo et al. (1991), Fleming and Rishel (1975), Dmitruk (2007), that if $b_1^2 + (b_2 - 1)^2 > 1$, then any minimum time extremal is bang-singular with junction point on the cylinder $x_1^2 + (x_2 - 1)^2 = 1$.
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