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Abstract—This paper presents work on sensor-based motion planning in initially unknown dynamic environments. Motion detection and modeling are combined with a smooth navigation function to perform on-line path planning in cluttered dynamic environments. The SLIP algorithm, an extension of Iterative Closest Point, combines motion detection from a mobile platform with position estimation. This information is used via probabilistic prediction to estimate a traversal risk function that unifies dynamic and static obstacles. The risk is fed to $E^*$ and leads to smooth paths that trade off collision risk versus detours.

I. INTRODUCTION

Path planning in a-priori unknown environments cluttered with dynamic objects is a field of active research. It can be addressed by using explicit time representation to make the problem static and solve it with an existing planner. This increases the dimensionality and requires exact motion models for surrounding objects. The computational effort rises, and motion prediction raises theoretic and practical issues, especially in the presence of humans. As robotic companions are a promising application area, we need on-line path planning in environments with unforeseeable human behavior. It would be inappropriate to add explicit time-representation to the model: if the humans surrounding the robot do not know where they will be going, how can the robot attempt to incorporate such knowledge during planning?

A. Approach and Contribution

Figure 1 illustrates the problem statement of the Probabilistic Navigation Function (PNF). The following objectives led to its ongoing development:

- Avoid invalid assumptions, use sensor-based models. Co-occurrence estimation in PNF uses a few parameters that we quickly and robustly extract from real data.
- Avoid adding dimensions for $ST$ (state×time space) planning [1] by introducing worst-case scenarios.
- Interweave planning and execution, perform many computations in the workspace $W$ to keep complexity low.

To produce smooth navigation functions we rely on $E^*$ [2], [3]. It is a grid-based weighted-region planner, requires relatively little computational overhead, and is capable of dynamic replanning in near real-time\(^1\).

\(^1\)http://estar.sourceforge.net/

On-line motion detection is performed by SLIP [4], a scan alignment method. In order to use sensor-based motion modeling, it is of primary importance to compensate for the ego-motion of the robot. The main sensor used in the presented work is a laser scanner, thus motion detection requires robust scan alignment. The SLIP approach is based on ICP [5], [6] (a comparison of different variants can be found in [7]) and has proven its robustness on sensory data taken during EXPO.02, a six-month national exhibition which took place in Switzerland during the summer of 2002.

The interface between these two building blocks of motion detection and path planning is developed in the following sections. It is an estimation of co-occurrence probabilities between the robot and surrounding dynamic obstacles (e.g. humans, other robots), given environment constraints and assumptions based on worst-case scenarios.

B. Related Work

The PNF is a navigation function, a concept of which the NF1 [8] is a classical implementation. Navigation functions are like potential fields [9], but are guaranteed to have a unique global minimum. The PNF incorporates a continuous
Fig. 2. Steps required for calculating the PNF: aligned laser scanner data is separated into static and dynamic objects. Static elements update the map, while dynamic elements can be optionally tracked (to obtain e.g. velocity vectors). The static and dynamic information is used to calculate co-occurrence probabilities that are fused into a navigation function. Reactive obstacle avoidance is then used to take into account the most recent scans during path execution.

risk measure of traversing regions of $W$, which is similar to edge costs in graph-based planners, but is conceptually closer to weighted regions.

The weighted region path planning problem is described in [10], [11], but instead of pre-determined regions we use a grid-based risk map. Among the published research that incorporates environment dynamics during path planning [1], [12]–[17], most seem inappropriate for an application in highly cluttered dynamic environments: they either rely on information and computational resources that are not available for such unforeseeable settings (extending $C$ to a full-fledged $ST$ representation [1], a velocity space [12], [15], essentially off-line movement simulations [14]), or are limited to constant velocity models [17], [18]. In [16], environment dynamics are treated using worst-case scenarios that take into account the sensor capacities, but it treats all known obstacle information as static during planning.

II. ALGORITHM OVERVIEW

The components that constitute the PNF approach are shown in figure 2. It is based on the observation that, as static objects define the environment topology, dynamic objects can be considered traversable if it is reasonable to assume that a given object will not remain at its position once the robot has moved there. The result is an approximate plan that relies on lower level obstacle avoidance to turn it into robot movements. The PNF computes a trade-off between the collision risk of traversing a region and the detour needed if it was to be completely circumnavigated. Accepting a certain risk is necessary for avoiding frequent replanning, which would cripple reactive human-robot interaction, but can be done only if lower-level collision avoidance and other safety features perform reliably. The overall steps of the algorithm are:

**Input:** Laser scanner data (and odometry / localisation)

**Output:** Direction of travel (steepest gradient) that can be fed into reactive obstacle avoidance, such as the one in [19].

Motion detection: SLIP precisely determines the transformation between subsequent scans, then reliably detects motion that takes into account occlusion changes from a moving platform.

Determine co-occurrence risk: Translate dynamic objects into a probability of colliding with the given object at a given location, based on assumptions derived from worst-case scenarios.

Path planning: Compute a smooth navigation function using $E^*$, taking into account a fusion of all co-occurrence risks.

Output: Direction of travel (steepest gradient) that can be fed into reactive obstacle avoidance, such as the one in [19].

III. SCAN ALIGNMENT AND MOTION DETECTION

Motion can be detected as differences between successive scans, because moving objects change sensor readings. Additionally, however, differences arise from occlusion changes due to the motion of the robot. Thus, the ego-motion has to be compensated prior to comparing scans. SLIP performs scan matching based on an initial guess from odometry, then iteratively establishes links between points, and transforms
the scans to minimise the remaining distance between the elements. Special care has to be taken to suppress outliers, particularly from moving objects, in order to achieve a high precision. Alignment correction is based on differences between the centers of gravity of the matching point sets in both scans.

To detect motion on aligned scans, elements without correspondence within a defined distance (derived from the maximal localisation error) are considered outliers. Projective filters are used to distinguish between moving objects and occlusion changes. Non-outliers are used to create a map of the static environment. SLIP then determines which outliers were visible from the previous position. An example of motion detection from a mobile robot is shown in figure 4.

IV. PLANNING WITH ESTIMATED RISK

Conceptually, the co-occurrence models the probability that a given location will be occupied by a static or dynamic object by the time the robot has moved there. In principle, when all future trajectories are known, co-occurrence is a deterministic entity. However, the robot trajectory cannot be known at the planning stage, and the object movements are usually not available under real-world conditions. To cope with this, we first reduce the problem to point objects evolving in one dimension, then apply probabilistic worst-case reasoning to compute a co-occurrence estimate, and finally transform the $W$-space information such that it represents non-point objects in $D_W$ dimensions. Figure 5 shows the form of probability densities that we calculate.

A. Co-Occurrence Estimation

Instead of attempting to take into account the infinite number of trajectories that could lead to a certain region of interest $R(x)$ at a given time, we consider the case where the robot moves with $v_r$ along the shortest admissible path to $R(x)$, and then estimate the probability of a dynamic object being there as well. Admissible paths are those along which the robot does not collide with any static objects. The length of the shortest such path is denoted $\lambda_r(x)$.

Similarly we define a dynamic objects’s admissible paths and corresponding $\lambda_i(x)$, and consider a stochastic process for the movement of the object over $\lambda_i$ from its current (estimated) position to $R(x)$. We assume that the object’s speed and direction of travel (along the shortest admissible path) can change several times, but that it is bounded by $v_i$. This motion model allows to compute the probability that the object will

Fig. 4. Example of a motion detection from a mobile robot, using data acquired by the Photobot at EXPO.02. This was a difficult region for localisation, producing particularly large orientation errors when the robot rotated on the spot. Using SLIP, the scans were aligned very precisely to allow robust motion detection (dark spots surrounded by thin lines). Note that the map is shown for illustration only, SLIP does not require such a-priori information.

Fig. 5. $P_{c,i}$ in the 1D case. The robot is at the origin, collisions may occur on either side of its initial position; objects can catch up if they have higher speeds. (a) objects are located at $x = \{-20, -5\}$ and move with equal or twice the speed of the robot. (b) $P_{c,i}$ is adapted to the robot and object shapes in the $W$ transform, which computes the distance from a point of interest to the borders of the robot and the dynamic object (at $x = -20$ and moving twice as fast as the robot, object and robot radii $r_r = r_i = 4$).
be at $R(x)$ when the robot arrives. We consider them to co-
occur if they are then within the same interval of size $\delta$, which
discretizes space into grid cells.

We develop the co-occurrence estimation $P_c$ in the one-
dimensional case. For workspaces with $D_W$ dimensions we
compute $\lambda_c$ and $\lambda_i$ for each region of interest and thus obtain
$P_c : \mathbb{R}^{D_W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for each dynamic object $i$. $P_c,i$ has five terms that
are switched on or off depending on the robot and object
speeds and reflect co-occurrences in different areas, namely
far-left, left, center, right and far-right:

$$P_{c,i} = p_{c,1} + p_{c,2} + p_{c,m} + p_{c,rt} + p_{c,x}$$  (1)

where $v_i$ is the robot speed, $v_l$ the object speed, $\lambda_i$ the
distance to the object, $\lambda_c$ the distance to the robot, and $\delta$ the grid
resolution.

Each individual $p_c$ represents an estimate for the partial co-
ocurrence in one of the five different areas mentioned above.
Equations (3)-(7) are the expressions for these terms and the
conditions under which they are non-zero. The values of $v_{1,2}$,
$N$, and $\eta$ are defined as:

$$v_{1,2} = \frac{v_i (\lambda_i + \delta)}{2\lambda_c}, \quad N = \left\lceil \frac{\lambda_c}{\delta} \right\rceil, \quad \eta = \frac{N - 1}{2Nv_i^2}$$  (2)

The bounds $v_{1,2}$ govern the applicability of the individual
terms below. For each of the following equations, if the interval
condition does not hold, the corresponding $p_c = 0$.

$$p_{c,1} = \frac{v_i + v_l}{v_i} + \eta (v_i^2 - 2v_l^2)$$  (3)

$$p_{c,2} = \frac{v_i - v_l}{v_i} + \eta (v_i^2 - 2v_l^2)$$  (4)

$$p_{c,m} = \frac{v_i - v_l}{v_i} - \eta (v_i^2 + 2v_l^2)$$  (5)

$$p_{c,rt} = \frac{v_i - v_l}{v_i} - \eta (v_i^2 - 2v_l^2)$$  (6)

$$p_{c,x} = \frac{v_i - v_l}{v_i} - \eta (v_i^2 - 2v_l^2)$$  (7)

Note that $\lambda$ denotes distances after the $W$-transform, such that
these equations take into account non-point objects and robots
by using the distance to their boundaries, as opposed to their
center points. The effect of the $W$-transform is illustrated in
figure 5(b).

Fig. 6. Processing flow inside the PNF. Cylinders show a-priori information
and inputs, rectangles represent grid layers, big arrows denote $E^*$ operation,
rounded boxes are other computations. $C$ obstacles are essentially binary maps
for each object and the robot.

B. Risk Fusion and Planning

How can the co-occurrence information be used for path
planning? The PNF is based on a combination of collision
risks estimated in workspace $W$, which is then fused and
transformed to configuration space $C$. The main contribution
lies in the formulation of multiple layers of co-occurrence
probabilities, and how these are fused into a risk map rep-
resenting all dynamic objects as well as the environment
topology. A flow diagram of the PNF algorithm is given in
figure 6:

1) The distance from each grid cell to the closest static
object is computed using $E^*$. The resulting distance map
is denoted $D_s$.

2) $D_s$ is used to compute $C$-space obstacles for each dy-
mamic object as well as for the robot. Then, similarly to
the first step, $E^*$ is invoked to calculate the topologically
correct distance maps $D_i$ to the current centers of
dynamic objects and $D_s$ to the center of the robot.

3) The distance maps are transformed to values that can be fed into the one-dimensional co-occurrence
equations: the $W$-space transform computes $\lambda_i(x) = \min_{y \in A_i(x)} (D_i(y))$, which represents the distance of a
point $x$ to the border of the dynamic object $i$, where
$A_t(x)$ denotes the object shape placed at location $x$. $\lambda_t$ is computed accordingly.

4) $\lambda_i$ and $\lambda_t$ are fed into equation (1) to yield dynamic object co-occurrence maps, that is to say $P_{c,i}$ for each object at each grid cell. $D_s$ is similarly transformed into the static co-occurrence map, after optionally applying a buffer zone which can help to smooth the robot behavior close to walls.

5) Risk fusion is performed as $P_t^{IW} = 1 - \prod (1 - P_t)$ over the dynamic and static co-occurrences in $W$-space, followed by $P_t^C = 1 - \prod (1 - P_t^{IW})$ over the robot shape to expand it to $C$-space. A tunable risk map (typically of sigmoid form) is used to turn $P_t^C$ into region weights.

6) Finally, $E^*$ is used again, this time to compute the navigation function taking into account the cell weights computed with the help of the risk map. The resulting values are the Probabilistic Navigation Function.

The number of dynamic objects and the size and resolution of the $W$ and $C$ representations all influence the computational complexity (see figure 6). Computing $D_s$, $D_t$, and $D_r$ requires $O(IW^{D_W})$, where $I$ is the number of objects and $W$ is the number of cells along one axis in a $D_W$-dimensional $W$-space. The $W$-space transform, risk fusion, and final planning step all take place in $C$, altogether adding $O(IC^{D_C})$, where $C$ is the number of cells along one $C$-axis in $D_C$ dimensions. Without taking into account SLIP and queue-ordering overhead in $E^*$, the overall computational complexity of the core planning algorithm is thus $O(IW^{D_W}C^{D_C})$.

V. RESULTS

Figures 7(a) and 7(b) illustrate how PNF takes into account the environment topology for each object individually, for example in a hallway where objects can loom from rooms. The robot is the circle on the left, with a trace of gradient descent towards the goal on the right. There is a moving object behind the opening. The path is pushed into the free space in order to maximize the distance from the door, but only if the object is actually small enough to fit through. In this example, the robot speed is $v_i = 0.3$, the object moves with $v_i = 0.2$. Figures 7(c) and 7(d) show the effect of adding an object that moves with the same speed as the robot, in this case making the path switch homotopy class.

The various mappings in these figures are very smooth, which is a consequence of the interpolation in $E^*$, and could not be achieved with any strictly graph-based method such as D* [20]. However, it has an increased computational cost (up to 40% increase per operation and up to 65% increase in the number of operations).

VI. DISCUSSION

In general, the robot may travel on arbitrary admissible paths from one point to another. Taking this into account would lead to an iterative approach of path planning and estimating the co-occurrence probabilities. But such a method is not only going to suffer from expensive computations, it may also face non-trivial convergence issues. We avoid the need for iteration by assuming that the robot will reach each point as fast as possible, and that the objects follow shortest admissible paths (with varying but bound velocities). These simplifications make it possible to address on-line planning with dynamic objects in real-time.

The motion model underlying the estimation of $P_t$ could be based on different application-dependent assumptions, or it could be extended to take into account more knowledge about dynamic objects. The effects of changing the motion model are visible on the global and local scale:

Globally: Motion models influence the conditions under
to predict future positions, taking into account the available knowledge for each object and the static environment topology. $E^*$ is used to plan with co-occurrence information. For execution, we rely on lower level reactive obstacle avoidance guided by gradient descent, an interplay between planning and execution that has proven to perform well.
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