# Controlling Agile Robots with Formal Safety Guarantees

Anirudha Majumdar

Stanford - Princeton

December 11,2016

#### Introduction

- The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is very concerned
- Safety with autonomy in the loop
  - Regulation, certification

Ideal goal: Formally guarantee that the robot will operate safely

- Dynamics are complicated and uncertain
- Cluttered (e.g., urban) environments





#### Introduction

• Challenges not restricted to unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)





## Roadmap

- I. Focus on high-speed unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) flight
- 2. Sum-of-squares (SOS) programming-based algorithms for designing feedback controllers with formal guarantees on safety
- 3. Real-time planning in previously unseen environments
- 4. Hardware experiments on a small fixed-wing airplane flying through cluttered environments

## General problem

Guarantee that UAV will fly through an environment without collisions given no prior map

- Assumptions:
  - Model of dynamics
  - Model of bounded uncertainty in dynamics
  - Obstacles reported in a finite sensor horizon



#### Important sub-problem

• How to plan a *single maneuver* such that the UAV is guaranteed to be collision-free?



### Related work

- Robust kinematic motion planning
  - [Brooks '82, Lozano-Perez '84, Jacobs '90, Latombe '90, Missiuro '06, Guibas '08, Malone '13, ...]
- Planning under uncertainty
  - [Feldman '77, Littman '95, Kaelbling '98, LaValle '98, Prentice '09, Candido' I I, Patil '15 ...]
- Computing reachable sets using Hamilton Jacobi Bellman (HJB) equation
  - Linear systems + bounded uncertainty [Kurzhanski '01, Girard '05, ...]
  - Nonlinear systems + bounded uncertainty [Tomlin '03, Mitchell '05, Gillula '10, ...]



## Approach

#### Offline computation:

- Compute trajectory library [Stolle '06, Frazzoli '01]
  - Widely used: [Stentz '07, Liu '13, Barry '16...]
- Compute feedback controllers
- Compute "funnels" around each maneuver that the airplane is guaranteed to remain in





## Approach

#### **Online computation:**

• Search through library to find a collision free funnel





## Offline Computation

### Funnels

• Control system:  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = f(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{w}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)), \ \mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$   $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{state}$   $\mathbf{w}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d : \text{disturbance}$  $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m : \text{control input}$ 

• Design feedback controller that minimizes size of funnel



## Funnel

• Funnel is represented as a timevarying sub-level set:

 $\mathcal{F}(t) = \{ \mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n | V(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \le \rho(t) \}$ 

• Guarantees invariance:

 $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{F}(0) \implies \mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{F}(t), \forall t \in [0, T]$ 

• Lyapunov condition [Tedrake '09]:  $V(t, \mathbf{x}) = \rho(t) \implies \dot{V}(t, \mathbf{x}) < \dot{\rho}(t), \ \forall t \in [0, T]$ 



### Robust Funnel

• Dynamics subject to bounded uncertainty:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = f(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{w}(t)), \ \mathbf{w}(t) \in \mathcal{W}$$

- Can guarantee invariance despite bounded uncertainty:  $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{F}(0) \implies \mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{F}(t), \forall \mathbf{w} : [0, T] \to \mathcal{W}$
- Lyapunov condition:

$$V(t, \mathbf{x}) = \rho(t) \implies \dot{V}(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) < \dot{\rho}(t), \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$$

$$V(t, \mathbf{x}) = \rho(t) \implies \dot{V}(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) < \dot{\rho}(t), \forall \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{W}$$

- Approximate dynamics with polynomials
- Impose Lyapunov conditions for funnels using using Sum-of-Squares (SOS) programming
- SOS programs for UAV: 12 variables (typically degree 4 SOS constraints)

### Feedback control synthesis

• Control system:

 $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = f(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{w}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)), \ \mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ 

- Can design controller that explicitly minimizes size of funnel
- Alternate between search for Lyapunov function and controller



#### [Majumdar, Ahmadi & Tedrake, ICRA' I 3]. Best Paper Award.

#### Hardware validation

Goal: Demonstrate that guarantees from funnel are valid on real hardware system

#### Hardware validation on fixed-wing airplane

- SBach:
  - Small acrobatic RC airplane
- System identification: accurate 12 state dynamic model
  - Rigid-body subject to aerodynamic forces
  - Lift/drag coefficients: flat-plate model + correction
  - Model refined using data from flights
  - Parametric uncertainty: decreased as model improved
- Experiments are in motion capture arena
- Computation is off-board





#### Funnel



Computation time: ~30 mins

## Flying through funnel



#### Experimental results

- Funnel is valid for hardware experiments
- 30 flights
  - Different initial conditions in inlet of funnel
- All trajectories remain within the 12 dimensional funnel

### Experimental results

- Funnel is valid for hardware experiments
- 30 flights
  - Different initial conditions in inlet of funnel
- All trajectories remain within the 12 dimensional funnel



### **Online Computation**

### Online computation

• How to deal with obstacles reported by sensors at runtime?



## Real-time planning with funnels

- Search through pre-computed library of funnels
- Find one whose projection is collision free
  - This is a purely geometric problem
  - Leverage mature collision libraries (e.g., Bullet)



- What if we cannot find a collision-free funnel?
- Idea: Exploit invariances in dynamics
  - e.g., shift invariance
- Shifting a funnel results in a valid funnel
- Shift funnel while maintaining current state in "inlet"



#### [Majumdar & Tedrake '16, arXiv:1601.04037]

- What if we cannot find a collision-free funnel?
- Idea: Exploit invariances in dynamics
  - e.g., shift invariance
- Shifting a funnel results in a valid funnel
- Shift funnel while maintaining current state in "inlet"



- What if we cannot find a collision-free funnel?
- Idea: Exploit invariances in dynamics
  - e.g., shift invariance
- Shifting a funnel results in a valid funnel
- Shift funnel while maintaining current state in "inlet"



Can handle using a convex Quadratically Constrained Quadratic Program

[Majumdar & Tedrake '16, arXiv:1601.04037]

- For each segment of funnel, find collision normal and distance to each obstacle
- This defines a separating hyperplane to each obstacle
- These are linear constraints
- Containment of current state in inlet of funnel (convex quadratic constraint)
- Convex QCQP!
- Extremely fast software based on code generation (e.g., ForcesPro [Domahidi '14])



### Hardware experiments

- 40 pre-computed funnels
- Planner is informed obstacle locations when airplane clears launcher







#### [Majumdar & Tedrake '16, arXiv:1601.04037]

#### Results



#### Examples of planned funnels



#### Importance of exploiting invariances



Best funnel with no shifting

#### Importance of exploiting invariances



#### Best funnel with no shifting

#### Best funnel with shifting

## Flying continuously

## Receding horizon planning



- Quadrotor: 12 states, 4 control inputs
- Uncertain "cross-wind"

## Receding horizon planning



Constraints on environment guarantee that collision-free funnels will always be found

# Robust real-time planning using contraction theory

Joint work with Sumeet Singh (Stanford), Marco Pavone (Stanford), Jean-Jacques Slotine (MIT)

#### Do we need a fixed library of funnels?

- Ideal goal: Generate a funnel around any nominal trajectory
- Need a notion of invariance that is independent of a specific trajectory
- Incremental exponential stability (IES):

$$\|x^{\star}(t) - x(t)\| \le Ce^{-\lambda t} \|x^{\star}(0) - x(0)\|$$

• Goal: design a tracking feedback controller that can be applied to *any* feasible trajectory and make it IES

#### **Contraction Theory**

- Contraction theory [Lohmiller and Slotine '98]:
  - Convergence between trajectories
  - Dynamics of (infinitesimal) distances  $\delta$  between trajectories is linear



- Control contraction metrics (CCMs) [Manchester and Slotine '15, '16]:
  - Design a differential controller using a differential Control Lyapunov Function
  - Conditions based on SOS programming

#### Robust real-time motion planning

- Offline:
- CCM tracking controller can be used to make any nominal trajectory IES
- This gives us a (fixed-size) funnel around any nominal trajectory
  - Analysis extends to bounded disturbances
- Online:
  - Compute nominal trajectory such that funnel around it is collision-free
  - Receding horizon planning

#### Example: Planar Quadrotor



#### [Singh, Majumdar, Slotine, Pavone '17 (Under Review)]

#### Challenges and Future Directions

- Sensing and estimation
  - Exciting new sensors (e.g., Intel's RealSense, FPGA stereo, sparse stereo, ...)
  - How can we make guarantees with sensing?
- Real-time planning with probabilistic guarantees
  - e.g., won't collide with 0.95 probability (with stochastic wind gusts)
  - Using such certificates for real-time planning
- Formal/model-based tools and data-driven learning
  - How can we combine model-based tools with data-driven approaches?

## Acknowledgements

- Collaborators:
  - Russ Tedrake, Amir Ali Ahmadi
  - Sumeet Singh, Marco Pavone, Jean-Jacques Slotine
- Funding sources:
  - ONR MURI grant N00014-09-1-1051



• ONR Science of Autonomy, N00014-15-1-2673



#### **Contributions and Future Work**



#### **Funnels and controllers**

- Guarantees that system will remain within funnel
- Computed using powerful tools from SOS programming



#### Real-time planning using funnels

- Collision-free funnel guarantees safety
- Can handle complicated geometric constraints at runtime

#### Future work

- Guarantees with sensing/estimation
- Real-time planning with probabilistic guarantees
- Formal guarantees and learning

Tremendous potential to make robots operate safely in real environments