Distributed Pursuit-Evasion with Limited-Visibility Sensors via Frontier-based Exploration

Joseph W. Durham* Antonio Franchi** Francesco Bullo*



*Center for Control, Dynamical Systems, and Computation Department of Mechanical Engineering

University of California at Santa Barbara



**Department of Computer and System Sciences

Università di Roma "La Sapienza"

ICRA Anchorage, Alaska, May 5, 2010

J. W. Durham, A. Franchi, F. Bullo Distributed Pursuit-Evasion via Frontier-based Exploration

Simulation Results

Conclusion

Pursuit-evasion



T34 security bot from tmsuk and Alacom in Japan

Our Pursuit-evasion Problem

Assumptions

- A team of robots with limited-range sensors (pursuers)
- **Unknown** environment (non-polygonal, multiply connected)
- The pursuers start from the same point
- An evader is only detected when seen by a pursuer
- The evaders have unlimited speed and knowledge
- Finite memory-size per pursuer ⇒ no global map

Problem (Distributed pursuit-evasion or environment clearing)

Design a **distributed** method to **guarantee detection** of any evaders in the environment

Pursuit-evasion vs. Exploration



Clearing an environment A constrained form of exploration (no recontamination)

For stationary evaders:

• cleared \equiv explored

Otherwise:

• cleared can be recontaminated

Cooperative Exploration:

Franchi et Al. A Randomized Method for Cooperative Robot Exploration ICRA 2007

Problem sketch

Distributed Algorithm

Simulation Results

Conclusion

Frontier in Pursuit-evasion



For exploration

Frontier = boundary between explored and unexplored areas

For pursuit-evasion

Frontier = boundary between cleared and contaminated areas

Our approach at each step

- Cover the frontier
- Push back the frontier as much as possible

Problem sketch

Distributed Algorithm

Simulation Results

Conclusion

Requirements for Frontier Updating



Robot moves and perceives –

Frontier is updated

Exploration-based methods require:

- Global map
- Global localization (to build global map)

Our method requires:

• Short-term mutual localization between neighboring robots

Distributed Algorithm: Robot Behaviors



Leader behaviors:

Frontier-guard: Cover a local piece of the frontier and dispatch followers to new viewpoints.

Expand: Move to a viewpoint, sense, and update local frontier.

Non-Leader behaviors:

Follow: Shadow a frontier-guard and wait for orders. Wander: Search for a guard to follow.

Distributed Algorithm: Frontier Updating

When an expander reaches its viewpoint, it must:

- Ask for frontier arcs from neighboring guards (requires temporary mutual localization)
- Inform neighbors when their frontier segments lie inside its sensor footprint
- Oetermine local frontier based on intersections



Distributed Algorithm: Viewpoint Planner



A frontier-guard picks new viewpoints *V*:

- Minimizing |V|
- Maximizing area exposed

of viewpoints required for frontier arc with angular width Ω :

• |V| = 1, if $\Omega \leq \frac{2\pi}{3}$

•
$$|V| = 3$$
, if $\Omega = 2\pi$

If $\frac{2\pi}{3} < \Omega < 2\pi$, choice to optimize |V| or the area exposed





Frontier Storage Requirements



- # of frontier cells per guard independent of area cleared
- Distributed storage requires constant memory per agent

Conclusion

Expansion in Empty Space



Summary

Primary contributions

- Online clearing algorithm which works in non-polygonal environments with holes
- Distributed storage and updating of global frontier
- Requires only temporary mutual localization with neighbors
- Requires only constant memory per agent (w.r.t. environment size)

Current directions

- Distributed hardware implementation and experiments
- Viewpoint planner for more general sensor footprints
- Bounds on number of agents necessary to clear a map