#### Real-time Adaptive Non-holonomic Motion Planning in Unforeseen Dynamic Environments RAMP-H

S. McLeod, J. Xiao, Department of Computer Science University of North Carolina, ICRA 2016

**Presented by: Alexander Holston** 



# Objectives

- Paper aims for dynamic path planning considering:
  - Global search and real-time adaptation of non-holonomic paths
  - Smooth switching/changing of trajectories
  - Adaptation and prediction of motion error
- To do this it utilizes:
  - Genetic Algorithm inspired approach
  - Bezier Curve For online adaptation of paths
  - Obstacle movement prediction



### **Dynamic Environment Approaches**

- Most previous algorithms do not consider unknown motion
- Gaussian Artificial Potential Fields
  - We know these fail in global motion planning (local minima)
- No algorithm is fully complete
  - Although we may try to move in a currently optimal path, there is always a chance of collision



- Originally created for efficient navigation through unforeseen dynamic obstacles for manipulators with high DoF
- Generates initial population of paths from start to goal
  - Initiated randomly to goal
  - Forced paths can help avoid homotopic paths



Obstacles

Moving obstacle region



- Genetic Algorithm modifications
  - Add Add node
  - Delete Delete node
  - Change Change node location
  - Swap Swap nodes
  - Crossover Mix two









#### Replace non-best fitness (random)





- Path choosing is based on:
  - Feasibility
    - Will the robot collide with an object?
  - Minimal Cost
    - Time
    - Energy
    - Manipulability
    - Includes cost to 'switch' paths
      - Decelerating, changing direction etc.
      - Ensures stable switching
  - Infeasible trajectories are calculated by total feasible cost + penalty



 Planning continually checks for infeasibility and optimal path for next control cycle



- Approximates rough future trajectory based on previous measurements
  - Sorts into 4 types of movements, depending on values of velocity and angular rotation and their directions
- Predicts next time-step movement (sensing cycle) and checks collision
  - Given no fully feasible path, the most feasible can be chosen (It could clear in future)





## **Non-holonomic Extension**

- Non-holonomic robots suffer from additional constraints
  - Original RAMP paths have vertices requiring axial rotation
- RAMP-H adds the capability of adapting these paths to allow for smooth switching



(a) Example hybrid (b) Robot has incortrajectory rect orientation added to enable moving on trajectory



# Non-Holonomic RAMP (RAMP-H)

- Given a 2D example of a non-holonomic car
  - We know a car is limited only by a turning circle, and changing speed accordingly
  - Given three points a quadratic Bezier curve can be created







## **Improved Trajectory Sensing**

- After each cycle:
  - Population for next cycle is taken from previous
  - Starting state (pos/vel) is updated to current
- Due to error in real-world circumstances
  - Algorithm polls the robot sensors to get actual actuator states
  - Subtracts the difference
- Simple way of updating for next cycle while removing actuator inaccuracies



### Results

- One robot setup using RAMP-H
- Others have 'unforeseen' movements
- No external sensors or cameras are incorporated



The RAMP-H robot (circled in green) moving among three dynamic obstacles (circled in red)



The RAMP-H robot (circled in green) moving among two dynamic obstacles and one static obstacle (all obstacles circled in red)



### Results

• We see robot moves in a general direction with priority to avoid nearby moving obstacles



The RAMP-H robot (blue) and three dynamic obstacles (red) in simulation



### Results

• The ability to switch paths without rotating on axis reduced execution time

TABLE I: Execution Time

	Hybrid Traj.	Holonomic Traj.
Mean execution time	22.72s	35.31s
Standard dev.	3.09s	7.64s

TABLE II: Cycle Time and # Cycles

	Planning Cycle	Control Cycle
Mean time	44ms	1.7s
Standard dev.	27ms	0.32s
Mean # per run	221	12
Standard dev.	39	1.5

- Note the planning time is small, especially considering the control time
  - Plenty of time for a number of genetic iterations before each leg



# **Final Intuitive Comparison**

- Why use RAMP-H?
- Compare:
  - Genetic Algorithm Approach
    - Multiple paths, switching, inefficient computation (Best solution from given pop)
  - Real-Time RRT\* Approach
    - Multiple paths, constant rewiring around obstacles (Converges on best solution)



(a)









# **Final Intuitive Comparison**

- Low-DoF
  - RT-RRT\* could allow online convergence in simple problems
  - RAMP(-H) uses essentially as much computation as possible to converge the population
- High-DoF
  - RRT\* known to lack reasonable convergence speed at increased DoF
  - RAMP(-H) could still find a path online, given limitation to underlying path population



## Conclusion

- RAMP originally created for feasible high DoF dynamic obstacles avoidance
  - Given amount of wasted computation, at low DoF perhaps there are better methods
  - Perhaps a better solution lies somewhere between
- Regardless, RAMP-H gives an approach to slowly find better solutions to avoid objects of unforeseen movement while online
  - Gives solution to switch smoothly using Bezier curves



### Questions????

