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Why Is Robot Control Hard?

Coste-Maniere and Simmons (ICRA 2000):

- High-level, complex goals
  - Assemble this water pump
  - Cook my breakfast
- Dynamic (changing) environment
- Robot has dynamic constraints of its own (don't fall over)
- Sensor noise and uncertainty
- Unexpected events (collisions, dropped objects, etc.)
Approaches To Control

1. Hierarchical: classic sense-plan-act
   - “Top-down” approach
   - Start with high level goals, decompose into subtasks
   - Not very flexible

2. Behavioral
   - “Bottom-up” approach
   - Start with lots of independent modules executing concurrently, monitoring sensor values and triggering actions.
   - Hard to organize into complex behaviors; gets messy quickly.

3. Hybrid
   - Deliberative at high level; reactive at low level
Levels of Control Problem

Robots pose *multiple* control problems, at different levels.

- **Low-level control:**
  - Example: where to place a leg as robot takes its next step
  - Generally, continuous-valued problems
  - Short time scale (under a second); high frequency loop

- **Intermediate level control:**
  - Navigating to a destination, or picking up an object.
  - Continuous or discrete valued problems
  - Time scale of a few seconds

- **High level control:**
  - What is the plan for moving these boxes out of the room?
  - Discrete problems, long time scale (minutes)
Low-Level Control Issues

• Real-time performance requirement
  – Code to issue motor commands or process sensor readings must run every so many milliseconds.

• Safety: avoid states with disastrous consequences
  – Never turn on the rocket engine if the telescope is uncovered.
  – Never fail to turn off the rocket engine after at most \( n \) seconds.
  – Therac-25 accident (see IEEE Computer, July 1993)
  – Safety properties sometimes provable using temporal logic.

• Liveness: every request must eventually be satisfied
• Deadlock-free
“Reactive” Architectures

- Sensors directly determine actions.
- In its most extreme form, stateless control.
- “Let the world be its own model.”
- Example: light-chasing robot:

```scheme
(behavior chase-light
  :period (1 ms)
  :actions
    ((set left-motor (right-sensor-value))
     (set right-motor (left-sensor-value)))))
```
Overriding a Behavior

- If robot loses sight of the light, turn clockwise until the light comes back into view.

(behavior chase-light
  :period (1 ms)
  :actions
    ((set left-motor (right-sensor-value))
     (set right-motor (left-sensor-value))))

(behavior find-light
  :overrides (chase-light)
  :test (0? (+ (left-sensor-value)
               (right-sensor-value)))
  :actions
    ((set left-motor 0.5)))
Light Chasing in a State Machine Formalism

- States treated as equal alternatives.
- State is discrete, but control signal is continuous.
- “Find Light” has to know which state to return control to when the light is found.
- Usually not parallel (but can be).
Rod Brooks' Subsumption Idea

- In 1986 Rod Brooks proposed the “subsumption” architecture, a kind of reactive controller.
- Robot control program is a collection of little autonomous modules (state machines).
- Hierarchy of layers of control.
- Some modules override (subsume) inputs or outputs of lower layer modules.
Genghis: Six-Legged Walker
Hannibal (Breazeal)

Three Distinct Insect Gaits:
(1) slow wave, (2) ripple, (3) tripod
Coping With a Noisy World

• URBI (Baillie, 2005) provides a ~ operator to test if a condition has held true for a certain duration.

• Onleave test is true when condition ceases to hold.

• You can build a state machine from these primitives.

```cpp
// Main behavior
when (ball.visible ~ 100ms) {
    headPan = headPan + ball.a * camera.xfov + ball.x &
    headTilt = headTilt + ball.a * camera.yfov + ball.y;
}

at (!ball.visible ~ 100ms)
    search: {
        { headPan’n = 0.5 smooth:1s &
            headTilt’n = 1 smooth:1s } |
        { headPan’n = 0.5 sin:period ampli:0.5 &
            headTilt’n = 0.5 cos:period ampli:0.5 }
    }
    at (ball.visible) stop search;

// Sound behavior
when (ball.visible ~ 100ms) speaker = found
    onleave speaker = lost;
```
Guarded Commands vs. Finite State Machines

```plaintext
whenever (foo_test) foo_action;
```

```
at (bar_test) bar_action; onleave baz_action;
```

Guarded Commands Diagram:
- A guarded command consists of a guard and an action.
- The `foo` guard transitions to the `foo` action if `foo_test` is true.
- The `bar` guard transitions to the `bar` action if `bar_test` is true.
- There is a `NullTrans` state that does not consume any input.

Finite State Machine Diagram:
- A finite state machine consists of states and transitions.
- The `foo` state transitions to the `foo` action if `foo_test` is true.
- The `bar` state transitions to the `bar` action if `bar_test` is true.
- There is a `NullTrans` state that does not consume any input.

This diagram illustrates the differences between guarded commands and finite state machines in terms of their structure and behavior.
Why Is Complex State Bad?

- Can be expensive to compute (vision)
- Error-prone: what if you make a map, and it's wrong?
- Goes stale quickly: the world constantly changes

But...
- Non-trivial intelligent behavior can't be achieved without complex world state.
- You really do need a map of the environment.
- Can't use a subsumption architecture to play chess.
- Or even chase a ball well...
Chase Ball 1

• Cooperation between two simple processes:
  – Point the camera at the ball
  – Walk in the direction the camera is pointing

• Each process can execute independently.

• Purely reactive control.
Chase Ball 2

- If we lose sight of the ball, must look for it.

- Now we introduce some internal state:
Chase Ball 3

- More intelligent search: direction of turn should depend on where the ball was last seen.

- Now we need to maintain world state (ball location).
Chase Ball 4

• Must avoid obstacles while chasing the ball.
  – May need to move the head to look for obstacles.
  – Attention divided between ball tracking and obstacle checking.

• May need to detour around obstacles.
  – Subgoal “detouring” temporarily overrides “chasing”.

• Where will the ball be when the detour is completed?
  – Mapping, trajectory extrapolation...

Say “goodbye” to reactive control!
Mid-Level Control: Task Control Languages

- Takes the robot through a sequence of actions to achieve some simple task.
- Must be able to deal with failures, unexpected events.
- There are many architectures for mid-level control. Various design tradeoffs:
  - Specialized language vs. extensions to Lisp or C
  - Client/server vs. publish/subscribe communication model
  - Provide special exception states, or treat all states the same?
  - How to provide for and manage concurrency.

- Lots of languages/tools: RAPs, TCA, PRS, Propice, ESL, MaestRo, TDL, Orccad, ControlShell, 3T, Circa.
Gat's ESL

- ESL: Execution Support Language (Gat, AAAI 1992; AAAI Fall Symposium, 1996) provides special primitives for handling failures and limiting retries.

```lisp
(defun move-object-to-table ()
  (with-recovery-procedures
    (((:dropped-object :retries 2)
      (locate-dropped-object)
      (retry))
      (pick-up-object)
      (move-to-table)
      (put-down-object)))

(defun pick-up-object ()
  (open-gripper)
  (move-gripper-to-object)
  (close-gripper)
  (raise-arm)
  (if (gripper-empty)
      (fail :dropped-object)))
```
ESL (Continued)

• Cleanup procedures are necessary to ensure safe state after failure.

(with-cleanup-procedure
   ((shut-down-motors)
    (close-camera-port))
   (do-some-thing-that-might-fail))

• Deadlock prevention: ESL includes “resource locking” primitives for mutual exclusion and deadlock prevention.

• Synchronization: “checkpoints” allow one process to wait until another has caught up.
High Level Control: Planning

“Deliberative” architectures may run slowly, infrequently.

- Path planning for navigation.
- Planning as problem solving: achieve (on A B) & (on B C) by moving only one block at a time (gripper can't hold two blocks).

![Diagram showing the process of moving blocks to achieve the goal state](image-url)
Shakey the Robot (1968)
And The STRIPS Planner

Go...

Go to object bx
GOTOB(bx)
Preconditions: TYPE(bx,OBJECT), (\exists x)[INROOM(bx,rx) ∧ INROOM(ROBOT,rx)]
Deletions: AT(ROBOT,$1,$2), NEXTTO(ROBOT,$1)
Additions: *NEXTTO(ROBOT,bx)

Go to door dx.
GOTOD(dx)
Preconditions: TYPE(dx,DOOR), (\exists x)[INROOM(ROBOT,rx) ∧ CONNECTS(dx,rx,ry)]
Deletions: AT(ROBOT,$1,$2), NEXTTO(ROBOT,$1)
Additions: *NEXTTO(ROBOT,dx)

Go to coordinate location (x,y).
GOTOL(x,y)
Preconditions: \( (\exists x)[\text{INROOM(ROBOT,rx) ∧ LOCINROOM(x,y,rx)]} \)
Deletions: AT(ROBOT,$1,$2), NEXTTO(ROBOT,$1)
Additions: *AT(ROBOT,x,y)

Go through door dx into room rx.
GOTHURD(dx,rx)
Preconditions: TYPE(dx,DOOR), STATUS(dx,OPEN), TYPE(rx,ROOM),
NEXTTO(ROBOT,dx) \( (\exists x)[\text{INROOM(ROBOT,ry) ∧ CONNECTS(dx,ry,rx)]} \)
Deletions: AT(ROBOT,$1,$2), NEXTTO(ROBOT,$1), INROOM(ROBOT,$1)
Additions: *INROOM(ROBOT,rx)
Really High Level Control

- Can use cognitive modeling architectures such as SOAR (Newell) or ACT-R (Anderson) to control robots.

- RoboSoar (Laird and Rosenbloom, 1990): plan-then-compile architecture.
  - Generate high level plan.
  - Then compile into reactive rules for execution.

- ACT-R has been used in simulated worlds (Unreal Tournament).

Gat's Three-Level Architecture

- Gat (Artificial Intelligence and Mobile Robots, ch. 8, 1998) proposed a different three-level architecture:

  - The Controller:
    - collection of reactive “behaviors”
    - each behavior is fast and has minimal internal state

  - The Sequencer
    - decides which primitive behavior to run next
    - doesn't do anything that takes a long time to compute, because the next behavior must be specified soon

  - The Deliberator
    - slow but smart
    - can either produce plans for the sequencer, or respond to queries from it
What Does Tekkotsu Provide?

- Low-level control implemented by motion commands, e.g., for walking.
- Mid-level control via state machine formalism can be reactive or use a more hybrid approach.
- Behaviors can execute in parallel; event-based communication follows a publish/subscribe model.
- Main/Motion dichotomy – but Motion is only for ultra-low-level control.
- Specialized path planners for navigation and manipulation, but no general high level control layer.
- Future plans: add a high level task planner to Tekkotsu.
The Tekkotsu “Crew”

- The Lookout controls the head:
  - visual search
  - target tracking
  - obstacle detection
- The MapBuilder does vision
- The Pilot controls the body:
  - walking, rotating in place
  - path planning
  - trajectory following
- The Grasper controls the arm
  - grasping, pushing, toppling, flipping, etc.
Potential for Lookout/Pilot Interactions

• The Lookout may need to turn the body in order to conduct a visual search, when head motion alone isn't enough.
  - Lookout makes a request to the Pilot for a turn.

• The Pilot may need to ask the Lookout to locate some landmarks so it can self-localize.
  - Pilot makes a request to the Lookout for a search.

• Interactions must be managed to prevent deadlock, infinite loops.

• But the user shouldn't have to worry about this.
Robot Cooperation

- An even higher level of control is cooperation among multiple robots working as a team.

- Tekkotsu allows robots to communicate by subscribing to each other's events.

  ```
  doStart:
  int ip = EventRouter::stringToIntIP("172.16.0.4");
  erouter->addRemoteListener(this, ip, EventBase::motmanEGID);

  doEvent:
  if ( event.getHostID() == ip )
    cout << "Got remote event " << event.getDescription() << endl;
  ```

- Can also subscribe to state updates using

  ```
  requestRemoteStateUpdates(ip, state_type, interval)
  ```

- This is only a low-level form of coordination, but cooperation could be built on top of this.