

Decision-Theoretic Cooperative Sensor Planning *

Diane J. Cook, Piotr Gmytrasiewicz and Lawrence B. Holder
Department of Computer Science Engineering
University of Texas at Arlington
Email: {cook, piotr, holder}@cse.uta.edu

Abstract

This paper describes a decision-theoretic approach to cooperative sensor planning between multiple autonomous vehicles executing a military mission. For this autonomous vehicle application, intelligent cooperative reasoning must be used to select optimal vehicle viewing locations and select optimal camera pan and tilt angles throughout the mission. Decisions are made in such a way as to maximize the value of information gained by the sensors while maintaining vehicle stealth. Because the mission involves multiple vehicles, cooperation can be used to balance the work load and to increase information gain. This paper presents the theoretical foundations of our cooperative sensor planning research and describes the application of these techniques to ARPA's Unmanned Ground Vehicle program.

1 Introduction

Traditionally, research in multi-agent planning and research in image understanding have been pursued independently. The ARPA Unmanned Ground Vehicle (UGV) program is pulling together these two technologies to autonomously execute multi-vehicle missions. In this paper we describe our component of ARPA's UGV program which combines decision

*Supported by ARPA contract DAAHO4-93-G-0423.

theory, sensor planning, and multi-agent planning with cooperation to direct and focus sensors on-board a unit of military vehicles.

We develop two capabilities for a unit of autonomous vehicles based on these ideas of cooperative sensor planning. The first capability selects points along a path or in a bounded region that provide optimal locations for vehicles to observe a specified objective area. The second capability selects optimal pan/tilt angles, or a *field of view*, for each vehicle's camera as it moves in formation with the vehicle's military unit.

For both of these capabilities, we pursue a decision-theoretic approach to the guidance of sensing based on goals of the military mission. These goals include such possibly-conflicting priorities as maximizing the expected value of information obtained, avoiding exposure of one's presence to the enemy, and balancing sensor planning and processing work between cooperating vehicles. Static and dynamic sensor planning can be achieved in a principled manner using the decision-making techniques developed in the area of multiattribute utility and decision theories.

In this paper, we first describe ARPA's Unmanned Ground Vehicle program, list the capabilities of the vehicles and sensors used in our project, survey related work, and review the principles of multiattribute decision theory. Next, we describe our Observation Point refinement system that selects optimal vehicle positions for observation of a specified area. Section 6 introduces a method of using multi-agent planning techniques with decision theory to dynamically focus sensor attention during a military mission. Section 7 presents experimental evaluations of the contributions. Finally, we conclude with directions for future work.

2 Sensor Planning for Unmanned Ground Vehicles

The United States armed forces continuously seek to increase soldier effectiveness and survivability in the face of increasingly lethal battlefields. The need exists to operate in environments that are hazardous because of enemy actions, to increase survivability, to enhance continuous operation, and to expand the radius of reconnaissance / surveillance units. Unmanned semi-autonomous ground vehicles can meet these needs.

The goal of ARPA's Unmanned Ground Vehicle program is to develop and demonstrate field-deployable semi-autonomous ground vehicles incorporating ARPA-sponsored technologies. A typical unmanned ground vehicle is shown in Figure 1. The capabilities that are currently being demonstrated by these vehicles include autonomous on-road and off-road navigation, obstacle avoidance, path planning, formation control, target detection and recognition, and cooperative sensor planning.

A typical UGV task would be to cooperatively plan a reconnaissance, surveillance, and target acquisition (RSTA) task in which the vehicles move in formation along a specified route. At some point in the mission the vehicles may split up and move to pre-computed spots from which they can maximally view a specified objective area while still maintaining stealth. The vehicles would then reconvene and move in formation to the objective area.

In this problem domain, planning for vehicle movement and planning for sensor movement must be performed in harmony. One reason for this synchronization is the need to maintain 360 degree security around the platoon unit formation. Maintaining this security requires planning the sensor of directions to cover the entire area surrounding the vehicles while minimizing duplicated work among separate vehicles.

Another motivation for controlling vehicle and sensor movement together is active RSTA, or coordinated recognition of enemy targets. Executing such a coordinated effort requires planning of both vehicle positions and camera angles for maximum coverage of the target



Figure 1: ARPA's Autonomous Vehicle

while maintaining formation security. A third reason that plan generation is needed for both vehicle and sensor movement is stealth navigation through unknown terrain, and a fourth reason is that both vehicle and sensor capabilities must be considered to cooperatively compute optimal observation point locations for individual vehicles.

Figure 2 illustrates several unit formations that may be employed throughout a mission. At planning time, each vehicle's sensor space is divided into individual *fields of regard* and weighted to ensure complete 360 degree security around the unit formation while keeping the major focus of attention toward the objective area. The relative amount of time allocated to each field of regard is shown.

The camera suite onboard the vehicles can be controlled in terms of pan, tilt, zoom, and focus. These parameters are controlled by our planning systems.

3 Related Work

Work on active vision has been well established in the field. Bajcsy [3] introduced the idea of active perception as applied to controlling a sensor at any level of abstraction, from







Figure 2: Vehicle Fields of Regard

controlling the focus of the physical device (as we are doing) to controlling the semantic interpretation of information returned from the sensor. Bajcsy notes that the role of active vision is to gain the most information while minimizing resulting cost. This approach lays the foundation for a decision-theoretic approach to sensor planning.

Decision-theoretic approaches to measuring the utility of gathered knowledge have appeared in active vision research [1, 3, 16, 19], but application to the type of military scenario described in this paper involving both static and dynamic decision making represents a new direction in active vision. A decision-theoretic approach is also motivated by literature in the cognitive science community, which reports that a decision-theoretic approach to sensor planning is also demonstrated in human perception and information gathering [6, 22].

While a majority of reported active vision techniques have been applied to assembly, object recognition, and robot monitoring, Camus et al. [8] describe an application of active vision that is closely related to our UGV work. They have developed a system that employs active vision to perform target detection and retrieval. In their multi-layer approach, a supervisory layer decides to look in high-probability parts of the area based on information returned from low-level sensors. Their approach does not rely on prior probabilities as our approach does. On the other hand, their system can control navigation as well as camera movement, and thus regions can be traversed for maximum information gathering, and can be traversed more than once. Control of navigation as well as sensors would be a good future direction for decision theory-based UGV research.

Although active vision techniques have been used to make centralized decisions about sensor movements, there is very little work that decentralizes sensor planning decisions. Yet as automation of intelligent tasks increases, the need arises for heterogeneous agents to work in a common environment. While the need for multi-agent planning algorithms is apparent, the development of algorithms which meet each agent's goals in a timely fashion, avoid

deadlock, and do not incur heavy communication costs provides a challenging task.

Multi-agent planning and negotiation techniques are common in the AI literature [7, 10, 11, 17, 20, 24], but have not been integrated into computer vision work. Some research [2, 14] has focused on developing centralized and distributed methods for multi-agent planning specifically in the context of the Unmanned Ground Vehicle project. Again, these projects focus on planning for navigation of the vehicles. Very little work has been investigated on multi-agent techniques for sensor planning and information gathering. This paper describes a project that uses ideas from multi-agent planning and from sensor planning to allow centralized allocation of major tasks, local control of individual sensor direction, and distributed cooperation between intelligent perceptual agents.

Ballard and Brown [5] and Bajcsy and Campos [4] both emphasize that learning is an important part of active perception. To date, the probabilities used by our cooperative sensor planning algorithms are hard-coded based on information gathered about the mission and the battlefield area. Future extensions of this project will focus on learning the value of each type of information and the probability distributions from experience. One method of learning probability values is through the use of adaptive probabilistic networks, a subset of belief nets that can learn individual probability values and distributions using gradient descent [18, 21, 23].

4 Decision-Theoretic Foundations

Our approach to intelligent sensing behavior during a military scouting mission is based on the utility and decision theories. Our basic premise is that the guidance of sensing behavior should be based on the rational trade-off between two conflicting priorities (or attributes) of a military scouting mission: to maximize the expected value of information obtained, and

to avoid exposing one's presence to the enemy (minimize information obtainable by enemy). One of the basic results in the multiattribute utility theory states that if the attributes are utility-independent then the global utility can be computed as a multiplicative function over the attributes considered [15]. Thus, for our case of a military scouting mission, the global function that the agent is attempting to maximize, $U(A, S, P)$, of scanning an area A using a sensor S from position P , can be postulated to have the following general form:

$$U(A, S, P) = k_1 U_{Scan}(A, S, P) + k_2 U_{Stealth}(P, S) + k_1 k_2 U_{Scan}(A, S, P) U_{Stealth}(P, S), \quad (1)$$

where $U_{Scan}(A, S, P)$ is the expected value of information obtained during the sensing action, and $U_{Stealth}(P, S)$ is the expected utility of maintaining stealth, i.e., remaining hidden from the enemy while occupying the position P and using the sensor S . Let us note that this value includes not only the danger of being discovered due to occupying an exposed location P , but also the danger of using the sensor S that could itself be detected by the enemy. The values of the constants k_1 and k_2 determine the relative weight with which the desirable attributes of gaining more information and remaining undetected can be traded off against one another. These values can be made to reflect the parameters of a particular military scouting mission at hand.

The following two subsections briefly describe our proposed approach to calculating the values of U_{Scan} and $U_{Stealth}$ during a military scouting mission.

4.1 Determining the Utility of a Sensing Action

The value of information, in general, is equal to the difference between the expected value of an action selected using the information and the expected value of an action selected without using the information. In the UGV domain, the resulting desirable behavior will

be an agent’s attempt to look for objects of greatest concern and relevance to the overall military objective. The calculation of the expected value of a sensing action has to include the likelihood that the interesting object is located within the area scanned, and that the sensor can successfully recognize the object at that location. Following Feldman and Sproull [12], we propose that the general expression for the value of scanning the area A , using sensor S , from the position P , be:

$$U_{scan}(A, S, P) = \int_A \sum_k P1_c(x, y)P2_k(x, y)VI_k dx dy, \quad (2)$$

where $P1_c(x, y)$ is defined as the conditional probability that an object located at (x, y) ($(x, y) \in A$) will be correctly identified from the position P with the sensor S , $P2_k(x, y)$ is defined as the prior probability that an object of type k exists at location (x, y) , and the VI_k is the value of information about the object of type k .

Intuitively, the probability $P1_c(x, y)$ contains information about the sensing ability of sensor S given the current conditions c (day, night, fog, smoke, etc.), and the distance involved, i.e., how well and how far the sensor can currently “see”. The probability $P2_k(x, y)$ contains the prior information as to where various kinds of objects are likely to be located. Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield (IPB) information contains information gathered about an area before the mission is executed. Information such as elevation maps, vegetation grids, and locations of roads and streams is used to initially derive prior probabilities of enemy locations and visibility factors. This probability is also continually updated as the sensing actions are performed, so that it correctly represents the up-to-date state of the system’s knowledge about the environment. The updating function on which we will concentrate is Bayes’ rule; however, alternative methods are currently being investigated.

The value of information VI_k about the object of type k reflects the importance of knowing the location of an object of type k . The kinds of objects the system may be interested

in include the various kinds of enemy forces in the area (tanks, HMMWVs, trucks, etc.), the locations of friendly forces and other scouting vehicles, and the locations of obstacles and other relevant elements of the terrain.

As an example, suppose that we are trying to select one of two areas, A_1 and A_2 , to scan. Assume that A_1 and A_2 are each composed of two discrete locations. Relevant parameter values are listed below.

- $A_1 = \{(100, 100), (100, 150)\}$
- $A_2 = \{(1000, 1000), (1000, 1050)\}$
- $S_1 = \text{Infrared}$
- $S_2 = \text{Color CCD Camera}$
- $k = \{\text{M1 tank, M2 tank, HMMWV}\}$
- $VI_{M1} = 10$
- $VI_{M2} = 8$
- $VI_{HMMWV} = 5$
- $P = (0, 0)$
- $c = \text{clear, early evening, 60 degrees}$
- Using Sensor S_1 :
 - $P1_c(100, 100) = .9$
 - $P1_c(100, 150) = .9$
 - $P1_c(1000, 1000) = .7$
 - $P1_c(1000, 1050) = .6$

- For every location (x, y) :

$$P2_{M1}(x, y) = .001$$

$$P2_{M2}(x, y) = .001$$

$$P2_{HMMWV}(x, y) = .01$$

The value of scanning areas A_1 and A_2 can be computed using equation 2. Because of the time of day, assume that the infrared sensor is used. U_{scan} is computed below.

$$\begin{aligned} U_{Scan}(A_1, S_1, P) &= .9 * .001 * 10 + .9 * .001 * 8 + .9 * .01 * 5 + \\ &\quad .9 * .001 * 10 + .9 * .001 * 8 + .9 * .01 * 5 \\ &= .1224 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} U_{Scan}(A_2, S_1, P) &= .7 * .001 * 10 + .7 * .001 * 8 + .7 * .01 * 5 + \\ &\quad .6 * .001 * 10 + .6 * .001 * 8 + .6 * .01 * 5 \\ &= .0884 \end{aligned}$$

Area A_1 thus provides a higher scan utility over area A_2 . The probability distributions $P1$ and $P2$, as well as the values of information VI , will depend on the goals of the mission as well as the nature of the battlefield area. Once the goals and locations are established, these values can be generated and used for sensor planning. Although this example demonstrates the application of utility theory to detection of enemy targets, the underlying formulas can be used to direct sensor planning for a variety of applications.

For our UGV field exercises, the value VI_k of each type of potential target (M113 APC, M35 Truck, M60 Tank, HMMWV) was assigned an constant value of 1.0. Factors affecting the calculation of $P1$ were largely terrain features. For example, information regarding

locations of trees, shrubs, grass, and elevation was available. Vegetation locations and elevation values were used to determine visibility of a region, which in turn affected the ability of a sensor to view a given region. The prior probability P_2 of each potential target was precomputed given vegetation and elevation information. The prior probability of a target at location (x, y) was increased if the location was on the border of a forested area (± 2 meters from the forest boundary) or just below the crest of a hill (2...3 meters below peak), and the prior probability was decreased if the slope at location (x, y) was greater than a threshold value.

4.2 Utility of Maintaining Stealth

We can postulate that the utility of maintaining the stealth of the scouting vehicle is the negative of the expected cost, $EC_{Disc}(P, S)$, of being discovered by the enemy:

$$U_{Stealth}(P, S) = -EC_{Disc}(P, S). \quad (3)$$

The expected cost of being discovered is the probability $p_{Disc}(P, S)$ of being discovered while at position P and using sensor S , multiplied by the cost itself:

$$EC_{Disc}(P, S) = p_{Disc}(P, S)C_{Disc}(P, S). \quad (4)$$

The probability of the vehicle being discovered, $p_{Disc}(P, S)$, depends on the location of the enemy forces relative to the location P and their line of sight, and on the detectability of the sensor used. Thus, the same location can be safe or dangerous, depending on whether the enemy's expected position allows for a clear line of sight of this location. Also, some sensors can be safer due to the fact that they are more difficult to detect by the enemy. Thus, the probability $p_{Disc}(P, S)$ can be computed from prior information about the possible locations of the enemy forces, and from an estimate of detectability of the sensor used.

The cost of being discovered by the enemy at the given location is also a combination of several factors. There is the immediate danger that the given vehicle will become a target of enemy forces, as well as the danger associated with how the information about the location of the vehicle could be used by the enemy to harm and obstruct the mission of other friendly forces.

The exact algorithms for computing $p_{Disc}(P, S)$ and $C_{Disc}(P, S)$ remain among the active research areas within the UGV project. The obvious question is the appropriate level of detail that should be included in these calculations. Our ongoing research will initially answer this question by examining the elements of the very rigorous and detailed view, as outlined above, and proceed by successive approximations to find the sensitivity of the resulting performance to the details neglected, given the real-time control requirements of the modern battlefield.

5 Decision-Guided Observation Point Refinement

The observation-point refinement algorithm (OP) is used to select optimal observation points from which vehicles can observe a specified area of interest. OP is provided with polygonal descriptions of the area to be observed (*area of interest*) and the selected regions where the vehicles will perform observation. OP will return a sorted list of observation-point sets (a set contains a single observation point for each vehicle), where each set is rated by its visibility/stealth measure.

The OP framework applies decision-theoretic techniques to guide observation point refinement. Here, we are applying the basic idea to select an observation point so as to optimize the expected value of the information obtained using the sensors from that location, while maintaining stealth. When selecting an observation point, therefore, an agent should trade off the expected value of information acquired on one hand, and the dangers of revealing the

agent's presence, on the other hand. In accordance with the multiattribute utility formulation discussed in the previous section, we use Equation 1 to rate the suitability of candidate vehicle locations, given an area of interest to be scanned, and given the suite of sensors onboard the vehicle.

In our implementation we assume that a sensor can successfully recognize an object if there exists a clear line of sight between the sensor and object and if the object is within the sensor's range. The likelihood of recognizing the object decreases with the increase in obstructions (such as vegetation) between the sensor and the object. The likelihood of recognizing an object increases as the number of vehicles that can view the object increases. Prior information as to where various kinds of objects are likely to be located can be initially derived from the prior Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield (IPB). In our field exercises, information such as the location of vegetation (trees, shrubs, grass) and elevation data were used to determine visibility. The average height and density of each type of vegetation were fed to the system. As a ray passed through vegetation, the visibility was decremented by an amount proportional to the density of the corresponding vegetation. The visibility of a ray passing through the ground is always calculated as 0.0.

The stealth of a vehicle is inversely proportional to the ability of an enemy, assumed to be located inside the area of interest, to sense the vehicle at the observation point. While visibility of a potential target inside the area of interest is measured from the top of the vehicle (where the sensor is located), the visibility of a vehicle is measured with respect to the center of the vehicle.

Consider as an example two position observation locations, $OP1 = (200, 900)$ and $OP2 = (150, 350)$, shown in Figure 3. The vehicle is trying to scan a single area of interest point, $AOI = (750, 400)$. Although the vehicle can see AOI from OP2, the vehicle itself is also clearly seen. On the other hand, OP1 allows the vehicle to position itself behind the crest




Figure 3: Optimal Observation Point

of a hill, so it cannot be seen well from the area of interest point. The point can be viewed from the vehicle, though a tree along the path impedes visibility.

To calculate the utility of points OP1 and OP2, we assume the following information.

- There is one type of known object k
- $VI_k = 10$
- $P2_k = .1$
- $C_{Disc}(P, S) = 50$
- $k_1 = .9$
- $k_2 = .3$

To calculate $P1_c$, we calculate the visibility between the camera position at an observation point and the area of interest point. The camera is positioned cam meters above the OP point, or the center of gravity of the vehicle. The visibility value is initialized to 1.0. The ray is traversed from the origin to destination, and each time the ray is obstructed, the visibility is adjusted using the formula $vis = vis * (1 - density_{obstruction})$. The density of a

tree is assumed to be 0.3, and the density of the ground is 1.0. The calculation of $p_{Disc}(P, S)$ follows a similar ray traversal from the area of interest point to the vehicle's center of gravity, or the OP point. The calculations for our sample case are provided below.

For OP1:

$$P1_c(750, 500) = vis(OP1 + cam, AOI) = 1 * (1 - .3) = .7$$

$$p_{Disc}(OP1, S) = vis(AOI, OP1) = 1 * (1 - .3) * (1 - 1) = 0$$

For OP2:

$$P1_c(750, 500) = vis(OP2 + cam, AOI) = 1$$

$$p_{Disc}(OP2, S) = vis(AOI, OP2) = 1$$

Thus

$$U(AOI, S, OP1) = .9(.7 * .1 * 10) + .3(0 * 50) + .27(.7 * .1 * 10 * 0 * 50) = 0.63$$

$$U(AOI, S, OP2) = .9(1 * .1 * 10) + .3(1 * 50) + .27(1 * .1 * 10 * 1 * 50) = -28.41$$

As expected, the utility of OP1 is greater than the utility of OP2, and OP1 is selected as the preferred observation point.

In total, three types of operations are executed by OP. All three operations rely on the formulae described earlier.

Selection of observation points within an area. For this operation, observation regions are selected by the user for each vehicle. OP then collects sample points within each region, and computes visibility/stealth measures for each *combination* of observation points. The sorted list of sets is returned to the user to be integrated into the mission plan.

Selection of observation points along a path. Although an explicit observation task is often integrated into the mission plan, the operator may desire for vehicles to scan an area of interest throughout the entire plan, from a variety of vantage points along the specified mission route. As a result, OP can be used to sample points along a specified path and select a set of these points that maximizes information gain and information value. The entire formation would stop at these locations to scan the area of interest.

Division of objective area among vehicles. The current efficiency of target recognition algorithms prevents a quick perusal of the objective area by unmanned ground vehicles. Therefore, the work must be divided as efficiently as possible among the vehicles involved in the mission. Given a polygonal description of the area of interest, OP divides the polygon into separate contiguous regions, one per vehicle. These regions are selected to maximize visibility of the region by the vehicles while also trying to balance the work load between vehicles.

To date, the objective area is split into separate regions along lines parallel to the x or y axis. In the future, piecewise linear regression algorithms [25] can be used to yield a more effective split.

All of these operations can be computationally expensive because of the large number of rays that must be traced. The procedure can be made more efficient by reducing the number of sample points considered within the observation regions and within the area of interest. The number of sample points is reduced by either utilizing a coarse-grain sampling technique or by selecting sample points with the highest prior probability. Once a few potential observation points are selected, the selected points can be refined recursively using a more detailed sampling. Parallel processing techniques can also be used to improve efficiency by calculating visibility/stealth measures for individual points in parallel.

6 Dynamic Zone Security

The RSTA planning system is used to cooperatively maintain 360-degree camera security around a moving unit formation and to cooperatively search for targets. Both capabilities use a decision-theoretic approach to select the current camera field of view throughout mission execution. In this section we describe the field of view selection method and cooperative reasoning methods that are central to our cooperative sensor planning system called MADSP (Multi-Agent Dynamic Sensor Planning).

6.1 Decision-Based Field Of View Selection

Zone security is accomplished by defining multiple fields of regard for each vehicle according to the current formation (line, wedge, diamond, column) and the vehicle's position in the formation. Weights assigned to each field of regard allow the vehicle to spend more time looking in higher-interest areas.

Each vehicle's field of regard is divided into individual *fields of view (FOV)*. Associated with each field of view is a location (in terms of pan/tilt angles or a world coordinate focus location), a weight indicating the priority of the FOV, and the desired angular width of the FOV. Each time the camera is ready to move to a new location, the weights of the fields of view are updated and the current FOV is selected.

The weights of each individual field of view are adjusted dynamically. As we mentioned, the value of a particular field of view area A viewed with sensor S from position P can be calculated as

$$U_{Scan}(A, S, P) = \int_A \sum_k P1_c(x, y)P2_k(x, y)VI_k dx dy,$$

where $P1_c(x, y)$ is the probability that an object located at (x, y) will be correctly identified from the position P with the sensor S under conditions c , $P2_k(x, y)$ is the prior probability

that an object of type k is located at (x, y) , and VI_k is the value of information about the object of type k .

There are several factors that affect $P1$ and $P2$, including security, continuity, focus of attention, and terrain reasoning. A priority of a multi-vehicle reconnaissance mission is to maintain 360-degree security around the unit at all times. The computational demands of current target detection and recognition algorithms prevent rapid processing of each image frame. Because each vehicle cannot quickly scan the entire area around the unit, vehicles must make use of teamwork to effectively divide the work. Each vehicle is assigned the portion of the unit security that can best be handled from that position in the unit formation.

The second factor is continuity. Continuity ensures smooth motion of the camera pan/tilt, because fields of view that neighbor the current FOV are more heavily weighted than other fields of view. Continuity is important when the camera pan/tilt motion is slow, when information shared between neighboring fields of view is useful for the target detection/recognition algorithms, and when pan/tilt limits prevent easy movement between non-neighboring views.

The third factor affecting FOV weights is focus of attention. Prior probabilities can be established for target locations based on database information, and these probabilities can be updated as vehicles detect potential targets throughout the mission. Any region identified as a high-probability region will receive increased priority in the FOV-selection algorithm.

Finally, terrain reasoning can be used to dynamically update FOV weights. Military vehicles often make use of terrain for maximal stealth as well as ease of navigation. These terrain features will thus affect the probability that a target is located in a given region. For example, target vehicles are more likely to be found along tree lines than in an open field. In addition, vehicles are less likely to be found on a steep slope, where the vehicle would be unstable. Figure 4 demonstrates this type of terrain reasoning.

On the other hand, terrain obstructions can limit the amount of information obtainable




Figure 4: FOV adjustment based on terrain

from a FOV, and thus the corresponding weight should be decremented. Figure 4 demonstrates a case in which a tree obstructs the view from the vehicle, and the weight of the corresponding FOV is decremented accordingly. Because the terrain surrounding the unit changes as the unit moves along the specified route, the terrain-based weights must be updated dynamically throughout the mission. Each of these four factors can contribute much or little to the overall values of $P1$ and $P2$, depending on how heavily the user weights each parameter.

When a new field of view is requested, a *biased roulette wheel* is spun. Roulette wheel methods have proven to be effective in a variety of adaptive algorithm applications [13]. Using this selection method, potential fields of view are assigned a portion of the wheel corresponding to their fraction of the total possible weight. The probability of selecting a given FOV is proportional to the FOV's share of the roulette wheel.

Once a field of view is selected, the width of the field of view is dynamically computed to fit the corresponding terrain. A sampling of rays is collected that centers around the FOV direction. Each ray is traced to the point where the ray intersects the ground, and average distance to the ground is calculated for the FOV. If the average ray length is greater than

the sensor range, the camera elevation is adjusted slightly or the view is re-selected, based on current terrain features. The width of the FOV is then computed in such a way that the amount of pixel information per FOV is constant, as given by the formula

$$\text{ViewWidth} = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\text{NumDesiredPixels}}{\text{AverageRayLength}}\right).$$

Figure 4 demonstrates how the hill forces the ray lengths for the top FOV to be short and thus the width will be greater than for the other fields of view.

6.2 Multi-Vehicle Cooperative Reasoning

For a military RSTA mission, multiple vehicles must be utilized. The use of multiple vehicles increases the chance of a successful mission because of the increased robustness, increased security, and increased number of observation points for scouting an area.

Cook [9] describes three types of multi-agent control schemes: central control, distributed control, and local control (no communication). Central control is shown to be effective when communication is reliable, and local control is effective if no communication is needed; otherwise, distributed control is necessary.

Our cooperative sensor planning system has elements of all three control schemes. The initial partitioning of the fields of regard and the weighting of each of the four selection factors is controlled by a central force: the mission leader. The selection of each FOV and the dynamic updating of weights and view widths is performed at a local level. Distributed coordination schemes, while often the most robust, are also very complex. This section describes the distributed cooperation that is necessary to our cooperative sensor planning system.

There are several tasks that required distributed decision-making and coordination, including:

- target confirmation,
- security handoff, and
- health checks.

Target confirmation. For every target that vehicle A detects, vehicle A asks for confirmation from all other vehicles. All other vehicles that are available to help and are in line of sight of the potential target interrupt their work to focus on the target region. All target detection information is passed to the requesting vehicle.

Security handoff. If a detected target is stationary, target detection and recognition can be done quickly enough to maintain the integrity of the unit security camera movements. If a detected target is moving, all other camera work is abandoned while the vehicle tracks the detected target. Unit security is a cooperative task and the responsibility is shared by all vehicles. If vehicle A needs to track a target, vehicle A hands off its security work to another available vehicle (vehicle B). After tracking is complete, vehicle A finds the owner of the shared security fields of regard (vehicle B may have handed the work over to yet another vehicle) and resumes its original security work.

Shifting security work responsibilities from one vehicle to another is fairly straightforward. A description of the fields of regard and their weights must be communicated from vehicle A to vehicle B. Vehicle B adds the corresponding fields of view to the existing list, in effect dividing the roulette wheel into a greater number of pieces. When the security work is returned to vehicle A, the shared fields of view are removed from vehicle B's list.

Health checks. Although it is not desirable for a vehicle to malfunction or be destroyed during a mission, the success of the mission should not depend entirely on the health of any one vehicle. To ensure that the goals of the mission are met, the leader of the unit periodically performs health checks on the other vehicles. If a vehicle does not respond

in a timely manner, the sensor plan is reconfigured for one less vehicle and new work is partitioned among the unit. In this way, no work is lost because of a missing vehicle. As long as one vehicle is remaining, the mission can be accomplished. If the vehicle comes back to life, the plan can be reconfigured to include the revived vehicle.

7 Evaluation of Techniques

7.1 Evaluation of Observation Point Refinement

The purpose of the observation point refinement algorithm is to select observation points for a set of vehicles that optimizes the cooperative viewing of an area of interest while minimizing the risk of being viewed from the area of interest.

While this computation is crucial to the success of a RSTA mission, OP refinement for multiple vehicles can also prove to be computationally expensive. In this section, we demonstrate how the computation time and the utility of the selected observation point change with the number of sample points considered.

For this experiment, we perform a uniform sampling strategy over the observation regions. Two different problem sizes are considered. In the first problem size, two observation 250x250 meter areas are refined to select one point from each area. The two vehicles will be positioned at these selected locations, both viewing the 250x250 meter area of interest. In the second problem set, the observation regions and the area of interest cover a 500x500 meter area. For both problem sets, the results are averaged over three randomly-selected sets of regions and are compared to a single observation point located in the center of the observation areas. These experiments are run for a two-vehicle case. In this situation, we look for an optimal *pair* of points that produces the optimal combined result of visibility and stealth.

As Figure 5 indicates, both the utility of the observation point and the computation time




Figure 5: Time and utility for OP refinement

increase with the number of sample points considered. There exist a number of implemented methods that can save computation time without endangering performance. First, prior probability values are often assigned to location points based on local factors such as elevation and surrounding vegetation. The prior values help narrow down optimal observation points. Second, an iterative refinement strategy has been implemented. Using this strategy, a coarse sampling is first performed. A more refined sampling can then be collected surrounding the most promising observation locations.

Field trials of the OP refinement system were conducted during the spring and summer of 1995. In each trial, an operator selected an observation region and a suggested observation point for each vehicle. The OP system refined the point, suggesting a different point in each case. In each trial, the utility of the OP point was calculated as higher than the operator-selected point. In addition, manual confirmation with line-of-sight testing verified that the point selected by OP yielded better visibility and stealth than the operator-selected point.

7.2 Evaluation of Dynamic Zone Security

The purpose of dynamic zone security is to achieve the stated mission goals in a cooperative fashion. Two mission goals are prevalent among scouting missions: unit security and target detection. The experiments described in this section evaluate the ability of the Multi-Agent Dynamic Sensor Planning (MA-DSP) program to fulfill these goals.

All of the experiments in this section were run using the MissionLab simulator developed at Georgia Tech University and adapted by UTA to include sensor operations. The MissionLab program allows simulation of independent vehicles (controlled by separate processes) while executing a military mission. Formation control, inter-vehicle communication, topology, obstacle avoidance, and target detection are included in the simulator. A view of the simulator is shown in Figure 6. In this simulation, four vehicles are moving in a diamond formation. Targets T16, T3, T20, T7, T18, T13, T12, and T10 have been detected so far.

In the first experiment, we evaluate the ability of MA-DSP to maintain 360 degree security around the unit. To do this, we divided the area around the unit into 36 equal parts. An ideal sensor plan would spend an equal amount of time in each area. The actual distribution of camera snapshots is compared to the ideal distribution, and the deviation is graphed below. The performance of MA-DSP is compared to two other methods: random selection and continuous scan. The results for each technique are averaged over three independent trials. The performance is measured for each of the four formations introduced in Figure 2.

The results of this experiment are shown in Figures 7 and 8. When a single vehicle is used, continuous scan performs well because the mission runs long enough to allow a single complete scan around the vehicle. However, as the number of vehicles increases, uniform and complete coverage around the formation becomes more difficult. Because of the multi-agent planning involved in our system, MA-DSP outperforms the other methods as the number of vehicles increases. This is due to the ability of MA-DSP to balance the work evenly between



Figure 6: MissionLab simulator




Figure 7: MA-DSP security results for line and diamond formations




Figure 8: MA-DSP security results for column and wedge formations

vehicles, reducing redundant work and preventing vehicles from obscuring each other's views.

In the second experiment, we demonstrate the ability of MA-DSP to detect enemy targets during a mission. Once again, we compare MA-DSP to random selection and continuous scan. In this experiment, we randomly place 20 targets over the mission area. The results are averaged over three independent distributions of targets, and three trials are run per distribution. The results are graphed in Figures 9 and 10.

Again, MA-DSP outperforms the other methods because of the systematic coverage of the area *outside* the unit. Non-cooperative methods tend to spend time looking at already-searched areas and at each other. The best results overall occur in the line, diamond, and wedge formations. The column formation does not perform target detection as well as other formations, because less area is covered by the unit as a whole. However, column formations are necessary for some maneuvers such as on-road navigation.

Field trials of the dynamic zone security algorithm were conducted using two vehicles during the spring and summer of 1995. The two vehicles were able to successfully maintain 360 degree coverage around the unit formation using MA-DSP. On-board target detection





Figure 9: MA-DSP target detection results for line and diamond formations





Figure 10: MA-DSP target detection results for column and wedge formations

algorithms were not available at that time, so target detection was simulated.

8 Conclusions

In this paper we present a cooperative sensor planning system that unifies research from active vision and sensor planning, decision theory, and multi-agent planning and communication.

The work described in this paper has been implemented in the context of the ARPA Unmanned Ground Vehicle program and successfully used on-board a unit of two HMMWVs. Although the work to date demonstrates effective cooperative decision-guided sensor planning, there are a number of avenues we plan to pursue in the future.

First, we would like to extend this research to investigate methods of controlling vehicle navigation as well as sensor pointing. A decision-theoretic system can most effectively collect information when both navigation and sensors are under the same control. This decision-theoretic approach to navigation and sensor planning can be applied to a variety of domains such as assembly, target retrieval (as with Camus' work), planetary and underwater exploration, and automated highways.

Another important extension of this project is to add temporal reasoning to the sensor planning algorithm. In general, the probability of a given object existing at a specified location should increase if the object has been captured with a sensor, but should decrease as time passes since the object was last perceived. Thus, if a vehicle detects a target at one point in the mission, the target is not guaranteed to remain at the same location through the rest of the mission, and the associated probabilities should be continuously adjusted.

The probabilities used for the utility measures in this work are static; that is, the probability distributions collected before the mission begins are used throughout the mission.

However, new information is constantly being received that should be used to update the probabilities. Such information includes information from a human operator, information from other vehicles, new terrain features, and changes in mission goals. We are currently investigating methods of automatically updating probability maps for use in the cooperative sensor planning system.

Finally, from our existing work in this research area we have found that calculating sensor utility factors for several vehicles over a large area is computationally very expensive. As more and more factors are included in the decision process, this computational burden will increase. However, considering each set of sensor parameters in great detail is not always profitable — some decisions will quickly show themselves to be wasteful or inappropriate for a given task. Directing and limiting the search and calculations involved in cooperative sensor planning is a future research direction for this project.

References

- [1] J. Aloimonos, I. Weiss, and A. Bandyopadhyay. Active vision. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 1(4):333–356, 1988.
- [2] R. C. Arkin and D. MacKenzie. Temporal coordination of perceptual algorithms for mobile robot navigation. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, 10(3):276–286, 1994.
- [3] R. Bajcsy. Active perception. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 76(8):996–1005, 1988.
- [4] R. Bajcsy and M. Campos. Active and exploratory perception. *CVGIP: Image Understanding*, 56(1):31–40, 1992.

- [5] D. H. Ballard and C. M. Brown. Principles of animate vision. *CVGIP: Image Understanding*, 56(1):3–21, 1992.
- [6] K. R. Boff, L. Kaufman, and J. P. Thomas. *Handbook of Perception and Human Performance, Volume 1*. John Wiley and Sons, 1986.
- [7] W. Briggs and D. J. Cook. Flexible social laws. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (to appear)*, 1995.
- [8] T. Camus, J. Monsarrat, and T. Dean. Planning and selective perception for target retrieval. In *Proceedings of the Image Understanding Workshop*, pages 593–597, 1993.
- [9] D. Cook. Reconfiguration of multi-agent planning systems. In *Proceedings of Artificial Intelligence Planning Systems*, pages 225–230. AIPS, 1994.
- [10] E. H. Durfee and T. A. Montgomery. Coordination as distributed search in a hierarchical behavior space. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 21(6):1363–1378, Nov/Dec 1991.
- [11] E. Ephrati, M. E. Pollack, and S. Ur. Deriving multi-agent coordination through filtering strategies. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (to appear)*, 1995.
- [12] J. A. Feldman and R. F. Sproull. Decision theory and artificial intelligence ii: the hungry monkey. *Cognitive Science*, 1(2):158–192, April 1977.
- [13] D. E. Goldberg. *Genetic Algorithms in Search, Optimization and Machine Learning*. Addison Wesley, 1989.
- [14] M. J. Huber and P. G. Kenny. The problem with multiple robots. In *CIRFFSS*, 1994.

- [15] R. L. Keeney and H. Raiffa. *Decisions with multiple objectives: preferences and value tradeoffs*. John Wiley and Sons, 1976.
- [16] E. Krotkov. *Active Computer Vision by Cooperative Focus and Stereo*. Springer-Verlay, 1989.
- [17] Y. Moses and M. Tennenholtz. On formal aspects of artificial social systems. Technical Report CS91-01, Weizmann Institute, 1991.
- [18] J. Pearl. *Probabilistic Reasoning in Intelligent Systems: Networks of Plausible Inference*. Morgan Kaufmann, 1988.
- [19] R. D. Rimey and C. M. Brown. Control of selective perception using bayes nets and decision theory. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 12:173–207, 1994.
- [20] J. S. Rosenschein and G. Zlotkin. Designing conventions for automated negotiation. *AI Magazine*, 15(3):29–46, Fall 1994.
- [21] S. Russell and P. Norvig. *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*. Prentice Hall, 1995.
- [22] M. L. Shaw and P. Shaw. Optimal allocation of cognitive resources to spatial locations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 3(2):201–211, 1977.
- [23] D. Spiegelhalter, P. Dawid, S. Lauritzen, and R. Cowell. Bayesian analysis in expert systems. *Statistical Science*, 8:219–282, 1993.
- [24] F. von Martial. *Coordinating Plans of Autonomous Agents*. Springer-Verlag, 1992.
- [25] S. M. Weiss and C. A. Kulikowski. *Computer Systems That Learn*. Morgan Kaufmann, 1990.

Index Terms

sensor planning, decision theory, multi-agent planning, Unmanned Ground Vehicle, active vision

Figure Captions

1. ARPA's Autonomous Vehicle
2. Vehicle Fields of Regard
3. Optimal Observation Point
4. FOV adjustment based on terrain
5. Time and utility for OP refinement
6. MissionLab simulator
7. MA-DSP security results for line and diamond formations
8. MA-DSP security results for column and wedge formations
9. MA-DSP target detection results for line and diamond formations
10. MA-DSP target detection results for column and wedge formations

Technical Biographies

Diane Cook is currently an Assistant Professor in the Computer Science and Engineering Department at the University of Texas at Arlington. Her research interests include artificial intelligence, machine planning, machine learning, robotics, and parallel algorithms for artificial intelligence. Dr. Cook received her B.S. from Wheaton College in 1985, and her M.S. and Ph.D. from the University of Illinois in 1987 and 1990, respectively. Her current home page address is <http://www-cse.uta.edu/~cook/home.html>.

Piotr Gmytrasiewicz is an Assistant Professor at the University of Texas at Arlington. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in 1992. His research interests include decision theory, operations research, philosophies of agenthood, and applications of rational autonomous agents. His current home page address is <http://www-cse.uta.edu/~piotr/www/piotr.html>.

Lawrence Holder is currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of Computer Science and Engineering at the University of Texas at Arlington. His research interests include artificial intelligence and machine learning. Dr. Holder received his M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Computer Science from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1988 and 1991. He received his B.S. degree in Computer Engineering also from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1986. His current home page address is <http://www-cse.uta.edu/~holder/home.html>.

Author Information

Diane J. Cook

Office: (817) 273-3606

Fax: (817) 273-3784

Piotr Gmytrasiewicz

(817) 273-3334

Fax: (817) 273-3784

Lawrence B. Holder

Fax: (817) 273-3784

(817) 273-2596