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(Basic) Motion Planning

Given a movable object and a description of the environment, find a sequence of valid configurations that moves it from the start to the goal.

The Alpha Puzzle
Hard Motion Planning Problems:
Intelligent CAD Applications

Using Motion Planning to Test Design Requirements:
• Accessibility for servicing/assembly tested on physical “mock ups”.
• Digital testing saves time and money, is more accurate, enables more extensive testing, and is useful for training (VR or e-manuals).

Maintainability Problems:
Mechanical Designs from GE
Hard Motion Planning Problems:
Systems with many joints (articulated)

A Bug’s Life (Pixar/Disney)
Antz (Dreamworks)
Toy Story (Pixar/Disney)
Hard Motion Planning Problems:

Coordinated Behaviors for multiple agents

(dis)Assembly Puzzle

A “shepherd” herding a flock of ducks

A flock exiting building, then in vehicles
Hard Motion Planning Problems: Deformable Objects

- Find a path for a deformable object that can deform to avoid collision with obstacles
- Deformable objects have infinite dof
Hard Motion Planning Problems
Computational Biology & Chemistry

- Drug Design - molecule docking
- Simulating Molecular Motions
  - study folding pathways & kinetics

RNA Folding
Protein Folding
Outline

• C-space, Planning in C-space (basic definitions)

• Probabilistic Roadmap Methods (PRMs)
  • PRM variants (OBPRM, MAPRM, TogglePRM)

• A few challenges
  • Collaboration: Human/Robot and Robot/Robot
  • Scaling to large systems: crowd simulation & autonomous vehicles
Configuration Space (C-Space)

- “robot” maps to a point in higher dimensional space
- parameter for each degree of freedom (dof) of robot
- C-space = set of all robot placements
- C-obstacle = infeasible robot placements

3D C-space $(x,y,z)$
6D C-space $(x,y,z,\text{pitch, roll, yaw})$

3D C-space $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$
2n-D C-space $(\phi_1, \psi_1, \phi_2, \psi_2, \ldots, \phi_n, \psi_n)$
Motion Planning in C-space

Simple workspace obstacle transformed into complicated C-obstacle!!

Workspace

Path is swept volume

C-space

Robot

Path is 1D curve

C-obst

C-obst

C-obst

C-obst
Most motion planning problems of interest are PSPACE-hard [Reif 79, Hopcroft et al. 84 & 86]

The best deterministic algorithm known has running time that is exponential in the dimension of the robot’s C-space [Canny 86]

- C-space has high dimension - 6D for rigid body in 3-space
- simple obstacles have complex C-obstacles impractical to compute explicit representation of freespace for more than 4 or 5 dof

So ... attention has turned to randomized algorithms which
- trade full completeness of the planner
- for probabilistic completeness and a major gain in efficiency
Multiple-Query & Single Query Planners

Multiple-query planning
• when need to solve multiple queries in the ‘same’ environment
• construct ‘roadmap’ representing connectivity of C-space during pre-preprocessing
• use the roadmap to solve queries

Single-query planning
• when only need to solve one query
• construct a path connecting given start and goal configurations
Probabilistic Roadmap Methods (PRMs)
[Kavraki, Svestka, Latombe, Overmars 1996]

C-space

Roadmap Construction (Pre-processing)
1. Randomly generate robot configurations (nodes)
   - discard nodes that are invalid
2. Connect pairs of nodes to form roadmap
   - simple, deterministic local planner (e.g., straightline)
   - discard paths that are invalid

Query processing
1. Connect start and goal to roadmap
2. Find path in roadmap between start and goal
   - regenerate plans for edges in roadmap
PRMs: The Good & The Bad

**PRMs: The Good News**

1. PRMs are probabilistically complete
2. PRMs apply easily to high-dimensional C-space
3. PRMs support fast queries w/ enough preprocessing

Many success stories where PRMs solve previously unsolved problems

**PRMs: The Bad News**

1. PRMs don’t work as well for some problems:
   – unlikely to sample nodes in narrow passages
   – hard to sample/connect nodes on constraint surfaces such as needed for tasks requiring contact

Our work concentrates on improving PRM performance for such problems.
OBPRM: An Obstacle-Based PRM

To Navigate Narrow Passages we must sample in them
• most PRM nodes are where planning is easy (not needed)

Idea: Can we sample nodes near C-obstacle surfaces?
• we cannot explicitly construct the C-obstacles...
• we do have models of the (workspace) obstacles...
OBPRM: Finding Points on C-obstacles

Basic Idea (for workspace obstacle S)
1. Find a point in S’s C-obstacle (robot placement colliding with S)
2. Select a random direction in C-space
3. Find a free point in that direction
4. Find boundary point between them using binary search (collision checks)

Note: we can use more sophisticated heuristics to try to cover C-obstacle
PRM Variants (a sample...)

- Many PRM Variants proposed to address challenges
  - **Sampling near obstacle surfaces** [Amato et al, 98; Boor/Overmars/van der Steppen 99; Xiao 99; Hsu et al 01; Yeh’12]
  - **Sampling near Medial Axis** [Kavraki et al 99; Amato et al. 99, 03; Lin et al 00; Yeh’14]
  - **PRMs for Closed Chain Systems** [Lavalle/Yakey/Kavraki 99; Han/Amato 00; Xie/Bayazit/Amato 04; Cortes/Simeon 04; Tang/Thomas/Amato 07]
  - **PRMs for Flexible/Deformable Objects** [Kavraki et al 98, Bayazit/Lien/Amato 01]
  - **Lazy Evaluation Methods** [Nielsen/Kavraki 00; Bohlin/Kavraki 00; Song/Miller/Amato 01, 03]
  - **Simultaneous Mapping of free & non-free space** [Denny/Amato 11]
Toggle PRM: Map C-free & C-obst

Jory Denny (U Richmond), Kensen Shi (as High School student, now Stanford ugrad)

Traditional Philosophy

• Only map $C_{\text{free}}$
• Narrow Passages are hard to distinguish from blocked space
Toggle PRM: Map C-free & C-obst
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Traditional Philosophy

- Only map $C_{\text{free}}$
- Narrow Passages are hard to distinguish from blocked space

Idea: Map both $C_{\text{free}}$ & $C_{\text{obst}}$?
Toggle PRM: Map C-free & C-obst

Jory Denny (U Richmond), Kensen Shi (as High School student, now Stanford undergrad)

Traditional Philosophy

- Only map $C_{\text{free}}$
- Narrow Passages are hard to distinguish from blocked space

Idea: Map both $C_{\text{free}}$ & $C_{\text{obst}}$?
Witnesses to failed connections in one space provide configurations in other space
When varying passage width, Toggle PRM increased sampling density in narrow passages compared with other methods

- All experiments used 1000 attempts to sample
A Few Challenges

• Collaboration – Human/Robot or Robot/Robot

• Scaling to Large Systems
  • Multi-robot Systems, architectural design, autonomous vehicles
1. User collects approximate path using haptic device
   • User insight identifies critical cfgs
   • User feels when robot touches obstacles and adjusts trajectory
2. Approximate path passed to planner and it fixes it
   • Planner is more efficient because search is targeted to promising areas

Current Applications
• Intelligent CAD Applications
• Molecule Docking in drug design
• Animation w/ Deformable Models
Hybrid Human/Planner System

Haptic Hints Results

Issues: Workspace doesn’t correlate with C-space. Common for high DOF system.
Coordinated Motion in Multi-Agent Systems

Sam Rodriguez (Texas Wesleyan), Marco Morales (ITAM), Jyh-Ming Lien (GMU), Burchan Bayazit (WUSTL)

- Flocking systems are good at simulating behaviors of groups of objects (schools of fish, crowds...)
  - flock formation is selfish, local, decentralized, and efficient
- Flocking systems are not good at complex navigation or customizing behavior in different regions
  - but roadmap-based planners are! .... but generally just for one robot....

Solution: Roadmap-based flocking!
Roadmap-based Flocking

- **Roadmap**
  - Map encoding global information (e.g., topology)
  - data structure for storing and accessing information
  - supports implicit communication among group
  - Customize agent behavior in different regions

- **Agents**
  - have traditional flocking behavior, local sensing ability
  - have memory & reasoning
  - dynamically (locally) select routes in roadmap
    - edges selected based on edge weights
    - Edge weights updated as agents traverse them (e.g., ant pheromone)
Coordinated Behaviors for multiple agents

Recent work: use workspace skeletons to guide planners for multiple agents [WAFR 2016]

- Challenge integrating non-holonomic systems and uncertainty
Evaluating & Improving Architectural Design

Recent Collaboration with Architecture using crowd simulation to evaluate & improve designed world in terms of safety, health, and well being

- **Hospital Design:** maximize patient & staff comfort and reduce stress, incorporate service robots
- **Eldercare:** robotic assistants enable independent living
- **Campus/Office:** design to encourage walking
Conclusion

Diverse problems can be addressed using appropriate adaptations of Sampling Based Motion Planners

- key is defining appropriate models and their C-spaces
- validation check is very general - ranging from traditional collision detection to potential energy thresholds to ...

- other strategies (user guidance, parallelism) still needed for many important problems

More info and Movies: http://parasol.tamu.edu/~amato
REFERENCE LETTERS: WHY THEY ARE IMPORTANT AND HOW TO CULTIVATE THEM

Speaker: Nancy M. Amato
Host: Lori Pollock
References

References are a common part of many application processes – graduate studies, jobs, awards, etc.

• A reference is intended to provide additional information to allow the selection committee to determine how well you meet the requirements of the position or the award
• A good reference could help you nail the position or award
• A poor or luke-warm reference could lose you an opportunity for which you are otherwise well qualified

Note: While we will be talking about references in the context of graduate school and fellowship applications, the advice holds for all references
Outline

In this session we’ll cover
• What makes for a (not) good reference letter
• Who (not) to ask for a reference
• How (not) to ask for a reference