
Introduction to Mobile Robotics

Robot Control Paradigms

Wolfram Burgard, Michael Ruhnke, Bastian Steder



Classical / Hierarchical Paradigm



- 70s
- Focus on automated reasoning and knowledge representation
- STRIPS (Stanford Research Institute Problem Solver): Perfect world model, closed world assumption
- Find boxes and move them to the designated position

Stanford CART 1973




Stanford AI Laboratory / CMU (Moravec)

Classical Paradigm Stanford Cart




- 1. Take nine images of the environment, identify interesting points in one image, and use other images to obtain depth estimates.
- 2. Integrate information into global world model.
- 3. Correlate images with previous image set to estimate robot motion.
- 4. On basis of desired motion, estimated motion, and current estimate of environment, determine direction in which to move.
- 5. Execute the motion.

Classical Paradigm as Horizontal/Functional Decomposition




Reactive / Behavior-based Paradigm



- No models: "The world is its own, best model"
- Early successes, but also limitations
- Investigate biological systems

Reactive Paradigm as Vertical Decomposition



Characteristics of Reactive Paradigm

- Situated agent, robot is integral part of its environment.
- No memory, controlled by what is happening in the world.
- Tight coupling between perception and action via behaviors.
- Only local, behavior-specific sensing is permitted (ego-centric representation).


Behaviors

- ... are a direct mapping of sensory inputs to a pattern of motor actions that are then used to achieve a task.
- ... serve as the basic building blocks for robot actions, and the overall behavior of the robot is emergent.
- ... support good software design principles due to modularity.


Subsumption Architecture

- Introduced by Rodney Brooks '86.
- Behaviors are networks of sensing and acting modules (augmented finite state machines AFSM).
- Modules are grouped into layers of competence.
- Layers can subsume lower layers.
- No internal state!


Level 0: Avoid



Level 1: Wander




Level 2: Follow Corridor




Potential Field Methods


- Treat robot as particle acting under the influence of a potential field
- Robot travels along the derivative of the potential
- Field depends on obstacles, desired travel directions and targets
- Resulting field (vector) is given by the summation of primitive fields
- Strength of field may change with distance to obstacle/target

Primitive Potential Fields







Perpendicular







Repulsive




Tangential

Corridor Following with Potential Fields

- Level 0 (collision avoidance)
 is done by the repulsive fields of detected
 obstacles.
- Level 1 (wander) adds a uniform field.
- Level 2 (corridor following)
 replaces the wander field by three fields
 (two perpendicular, one uniform).

Characteristics of Potential Fields

Suffer from local minima



- Backtracking
- Random motion to escape local minimum
- Procedural planner s.a. wall following
- Increase potential of visited regions
- Avoid local minima by harmonic functions


Characteristics of Potential Fields

- No preference among layers
- Easy to visualize
- Easy to combine different fields
- High update rates necessary
- Parameter tuning important

Reactive Paradigm

- Representations?
- Good software engineering principles?
- Easy to program?
- Robustness?
- Scalability?

Hybrid Deliberative/Reactive Paradigm



- Combines advantages of previous paradigms
 - World model used for planning
 - Closed loop, reactive control

Discussion

- Imagine you want your robot to perform navigation tasks, which approach would you choose?
- What are the benefits and drawbacks of the behavior based paradigm?
- What are drawbacks of the subsumption architecture?