### Socially Acceptable Bipedal Robot Navigation via Social Zonotope Network Model Predictive Control

Abdulaziz Shamsah, Krishanu Agarwal, Nigam Katta, Abirath Raju, Shreyas Kousik\*, and Ye Zhao\* George W. Woodruff School of Mechanical Engineering School of Electrical and Computer Engineering Wallace H. Coulter Department of Biomedical Engineering Georgia Institute of Technology \*co-senior authorships





#### **Motivating Social Navigation**



TL reactive synthesis, belief tracking, formal guarantee on ROM-locomotion and navigation safety

#### **Social Navigation Literature**





#### Zonotopes

Zonotopes are a convex symmetric polytope

- Zonotopes offer efficiencies in:
  - reachability-based planning



• collision checking [5][6]

• uncertainty parameterization







### **Bipedal Robot Social Navigation Framework**





### Social Zonotope Network (SZN)



- Collective effect of the surrounding pedestrians, while keeping a fixed architecture
- Conditioning the prediction of the pedestrian's future path on ego-agent's next step
  - 1. Captures the effect of the ego-agent's control on pedestrians' future path
  - 2. Integrates **SZN-MPC decision's variables** into the neural network



#### **Zonotope Shaping**





Georgia

#### **Locomotion-specific Loss Functions**

Real-crowd data sets **do not consider** bipedal robot locomotion **capabilities** 

Locomotion safety loss: ROM-based loss on step length, velocity and heading change  $\rho(s_t, \phi)$  quantifies the degree of satisfaction or violation of the specification  $\phi$  given a specific signal  $s_t$ 

Safety

Region

 $\Delta y_{2,c} \cdot sin(\Delta \theta)$ 

Safety Region

 $cos(\Delta \theta)$ 

$$\rho(s_t, \phi) = \begin{cases} \geq 0 & s_t \text{ satisfies } \phi \\ < 0 & s_t \text{ violates } \phi \end{cases}$$

#### Locomotion velocity specification:

$$\phi_{\text{sag}} = \Box_{[t+1,t_f]} (s_{[t+1,t_f]}^{v_{\text{sag}}} \leq v_{\max} \wedge s_{[t+1,t_f]}^{v_{\text{sag}}} \geq v_{\min})$$

$$\phi_{\text{lat}} = \Box_{[t+1,t_f]} (s_{[t+1,t_f]}^{v_{\text{lat}}} \leq v_{\text{lat}} \wedge s_{[t+1,t_f]}^{v_{\text{lat}}} \geq -v_{\text{lat}})$$

$$\phi_{\text{vel}} = \phi_{\text{sag}} \wedge \phi_{\text{lat}}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\phi_{\text{vel}}} = \underbrace{\operatorname{ReLU}(-\rho((s_{\text{vsag}}, s_{\text{vlat}}), \phi_{\text{vel}})))}_{velocity\ violation}$$

• Heading change specification:  $\phi_{\Delta\theta} = \Box_{[t+1,t_f]} (s_{[t+1,t_f]}^{\Delta\theta} < \Delta\theta_{\max} \land s_{[t+1,t_f]}^{\Delta\theta} > -\Delta\theta_{\max})$   $\mathcal{L}_{\phi_{\Delta\theta}} = \underbrace{\operatorname{ReLU}(-\rho(s^{\Delta\theta},\phi_{\Delta\theta}))}_{heading \ change \ violation}$ 

> Georgia Tech

#### **Social Path Planner**



Georgia Tech



#### SZN-MPC



$$\begin{split} \min_{X,U} \quad & \sum_{q=0}^{N-1} \Delta \boldsymbol{u}_q^2 + \boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}) + \boldsymbol{J}_{\text{social}}(\boldsymbol{x}_q, \boldsymbol{u}_q) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \boldsymbol{x}_{q+1} = \Phi(\boldsymbol{x}_q, \boldsymbol{u}_q) \\ & \boldsymbol{x}_0 = \boldsymbol{x}_{\text{init}}, \ (\boldsymbol{x}_q, \boldsymbol{u}_q) \in \mathcal{XU}_q \\ & \boldsymbol{x}_{q+1} \in \mathcal{Z}_{q+1}^{\text{ego}}(\Delta \boldsymbol{p}_q^{\text{ego}}, E_q) \\ & \mathcal{Z}_{q+1}^{\text{ego}}(\Delta \boldsymbol{p}_q^{\text{ego}}, E_q) \bigcap \mathcal{Z}_{q+1}^{p_{k_q}}(\Delta \boldsymbol{p}_q^{\text{ego}}) = \emptyset, \ \forall \ k_q \end{split}$$

- $\min \sum_{i=1}^{i} \frac{\text{Control effort + Distance to goal}}{\text{+ Social path deviation}}$ 
  - s.t. Dynamics constraint Ego-agent's CoM is inside social zonotope Ego-agent's zonotope does not intersect with pedestrians' zonotope





#### **Uncertainty Quantification**



$$G^{\mu}=inom{\mu_x & 0\ 0 & \mu_y}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{Z}}^{ ext{ego}} = \mathscr{Z}(oldsymbol{c}^{ ext{ego}}, [G^{ ext{ego}} \ G^{\mu}])$$



- Introduce a GP that takes as an input: •
  - Digit's current velocity •
- SZN-MPC optimal solution
  Outputs the expected mean deviation

 $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_x, \mu_y)$ 





### **Simulation Results**



#### **Results: SZN-MPC**









### **Results: Social Acceptability Metric and Locomotion** Loss



#### **Results: Benchmarking**

Compare two versions of our proposed SZN-MPC with baseline DCBF-MPC [8]

 $h(\boldsymbol{p}_{q+1}^{\mathrm{ego}}, \boldsymbol{p}_{k_{q+1}}) \ge (1-\gamma)h(\boldsymbol{p}_{q}^{\mathrm{ego}}, \boldsymbol{p}_{k_{q}}) \ \forall \ k_{q}$ 

- Coupled SZN-MPC
  - SZN-MPC optimizes through both PPN and ESN networks



PPN prediction is affected by the ego-agent's future path

- Decoupled SZN-MPC
  - SZN-MPC optimizes through **ESN**, while PPN output is fixed



PPN prediction is fixed based on SZN-MPC last optimal solution



$$\min_{X,U} \sum_{q=0}^{N-1} J(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}) + J_{\text{social}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{q}, \boldsymbol{u}_{q})$$
s.t.  $\boldsymbol{x}_{q+1} = \Phi(\boldsymbol{x}_{q}, \boldsymbol{u}_{q})$ 
 $\boldsymbol{x}_{0} = \boldsymbol{x}_{\text{init}}, (\boldsymbol{x}_{q}, \boldsymbol{u}_{q}) \in \mathcal{XU}_{q}$ 
 $\boldsymbol{x}_{q+1} \in \mathcal{Z}_{q+1}^{\text{ego}}(\Delta \boldsymbol{p}_{q}^{\text{ego}}, E_{q})$ 
 $\mathcal{Z}_{q+1}^{\text{ego}}(\Delta \boldsymbol{p}_{q}^{\text{ego}}, E_{q}) \bigcap \mathcal{Z}_{q+1}^{pk_{q}}(\Delta \boldsymbol{p}_{q}^{\text{ego}}) = \emptyset, \forall k_{q}$ 

$$\min_{X,U} \sum_{q=0}^{N-1} J(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}) + J_{\text{social}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{q}, \boldsymbol{u}_{q})$$
s.t.  $\boldsymbol{x}_{q+1} = \Phi(\boldsymbol{x}_{q}, \boldsymbol{u}_{q})$ 
 $\boldsymbol{x}_{0} = \boldsymbol{x}_{\text{init}}, (\boldsymbol{x}_{q}, \boldsymbol{u}_{q}) \in \mathcal{XU}_{q}$ 
 $\boldsymbol{x}_{q+1} \in \mathcal{Z}_{q+1}^{\text{ego}}(\Delta \boldsymbol{p}_{q}^{\text{ego}}, E_{q})$ 
 $\mathcal{Z}_{q+1}^{\text{ego}}(\Delta \boldsymbol{p}_{q}^{\text{ego}}, E_{q})$ 



[8] Narkhede, Kunal S., et al. RA-L (2022)

### **Results: Benchmarking**



- Conservativeness and success rate: SZN-MPC produce more consistent velocity, more efficient.
- Social Acceptability: Predictable behavior of the ego-agent.
- Safety and optimality: SZN-MPC produce comparable safety performance, in fewer steps.
- Computational cost: DCBF is computationally efficient, SZN-MPC can be solved in real-time for hardware implementation.



# **Standing Group**



## **Moving randomly**

# **Moving randomly**

# Moving in a row

# **Moving in groups**



#### **Social Navigation Summary**



### **Authors:**



Abdulaziz Shamsah



Krishanu Agarwal

Nigam Katta



**Thank You** 

Abirath Raju

Shreyas Kousik

Ye Zhao

#### This work is funded by:

Office of Naval Research Award #N000142312223 NSF grants #IIS-1924978, #CMMI-2144309











