Impact of Tactical Variations in the RoboCup Four-Legged League

Michael J. Quinlan and Stephan K. Chalup

School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science,
The University of Newcastle, Callaghan 2308, Australia
{michael.quinlan,stephan.chalup}@newcastle.edu.au,
WWW home page: http://robots.newcastle.edu.au

Abstract. The RoboCup Four-Legged League is a robot soccer league where AIBO robots play in teams of four on a field of size 4m x 6m. In recent years the low level skills of the robots such as vision, localisation, locomotion, and ball handling have improved substantially and the games have become more exciting to watch. However, deliberate passing is extremely challenging and occurs rarely during games. This study investigates for the first time the impact of variations of global team strategies. The experiments employed the system used by the 2006 world champion team, the NUbots. The base strategy was compared against a more offensive and a more defensive variation. All test games were video recorded and evaluated using a variety of metrics including score, shots at goal, and ball position histograms. The results indicate that a team's style of play and low level skills are still the most critical parameters.

1 Introduction

RoboCup is an international research initiative [1, 2] with the vision to "build a team of robot soccer players, which can beat a human World Cup champion team [3]". However, the robots at RoboCup still have a considerable way to go as there are still many significant problems to be solved in hardware development, machine intelligence, and control before the ultimate aim can be achieved. The RoboCup initiative approaches the problem with several different leagues, each of which specialises on a different aspect of the overall task. Currently RoboCup is comprised of five soccer leagues, a rescue league, and an "at home" league.

In human soccer a primary object of discussion is tactics for team play and how to implement successful high-level team strategies in order to beat the opponent team. Several "systems" for team play have been developed by coaches in the international football/soccer community and are described in the relevant literature [4–6].

In this study we investigate the level to which high-level tactics impact the result of a game in the Four-Legged League. Currently the Four-Legged League is the only legged league which contains more than two agents per team. The only other legged league is the Humanoid League, which was founded in 2002 and games consist of either one-on-one or two-on-two matches. In the Four-Legged

League there are four players per team so it is possible to implement a vast array of formations and other tactical decisions.

At RoboCup strategic team play is primarily implemented in the Simulation League and the Small Size League (f-180) where games are played with 11 vs. 11 and 5 vs. 5 players, respectively. However, these two leagues circumvent major problems associated with vision and localisation by avoiding an individual agent based vision system and running either everything in simulation or on a mechanically precise wheeled platform with an overhead camera. These advantages allow teams in these leagues to focus increased attention on the implementation of global team strategies as opposed to low-level skills such as legged walking.

It could be argued that the result of games in the Four-Legged League was more dependent on low-level skills (such as vision, walking speed etc) than on high-level team strategies. In 2004 it was claimed that passing (and hence complex strategies) would not be necessary in Four-Legged League due to the small field size [7]. In 2005 the field size was increased from $2.7m \times 4.2m$ to $3.6m \times 5.4m$ [8, 9] and some research on team strategies was performed [10]. However, it is still not clear if variations of a successful global team strategy (e.g. the NUbots system used at RoboCup 2006) would have significant impact on the performance of a team or whether performance in the Four-Legged League is still primarily dependent on low-level skills of the individual agents such as vision, agility, and ball handling which may be better characterized as "style of play" (see 4.2) rather than global team tactics.

In order to investigate this more closely we take the system of the current RoboCup Four-Legged League world-champion (the NUbots) and experimentally investigate the impact of varying the global team strategy.

This article begins by introducing the high-level global behaviour system of the NUbots in Section 2. The experiments and results are presented in Section 3. The article concludes with a discussion and conclusion in Sections 4 and 5.

2 The NUbot's System for Team Behaviour

When analysing the effect of team strategies it is important to understand where the players are positioned and how the robots perform role, position and strategy switching.

2.1 Positions

The NUbot system defines eight basic positions that the robots can play. These being, *Goal Keeper (GK), Sweeper (SW), Left Back (LB), Centre Back (CB), Right Back (RB), Left Forward (LF), Centre Forward (CF)* and *Right Forward (RF)*.

The rules define that only one robot can be a goal keeper (this robot must be identified at the beginning of the game), while the other three robots (to be referred to as *field players*) are free to roam the field. Unlike other implementations [11] the NUbots positions **do not** define roles, for example the robot chasing the ball can still be a sweeper. It is important to keep a distinction between positions and roles as they are not the same in our system. Each position $\mathcal{P}$ is assigned a set of coordindates on the field (x, y) and a heading θ. These define the general area on the field in which the robot should be positioned:

$$\mathcal{P} = \langle x, y, \theta \rangle \in [-300cm, 300cm] \times [-200cm, 200cm] \times [-\pi, \pi]$$

For example the positions of Goal Keeper and Left Forward are defined as:

$$\mathcal{P}_{GK} = \langle -265.0, 0.0, 0.0 \rangle\ , \ \ \mathcal{P}_{LF} = \langle 150.0, 80.0, 0.0 \rangle$$

2.2 Formations and High-level strategies

A formation $\mathcal{F}$ is a vector that contains four positions. When playing a game each robot in the team is instructed to play one of these four positions. A high-level strategy $\mathcal{S}$ contains two formations, in general these are a defensive $\mathcal{D}$ and an offensive $\mathcal{O}$ formation:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F} &= \langle \mathcal{P}_a, \mathcal{P}_b, \mathcal{P}_c, \mathcal{P}_d \rangle\ ,\\ \mathcal{S} &= \langle \mathcal{F}_{off}, \mathcal{F}_{def} \rangle \equiv \langle \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{O} \rangle\end{aligned}$$

The current NUbot system contains six standard formations that combine to form six high-level strategies:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}_{normal} &= \langle \mathcal{D}_{normal}, \mathcal{O}_{normal} \rangle\ , \ \begin{array}{l}\mathcal{D}_{normal} = \langle \mathcal{P}_{GK}, \mathcal{P}_{LB}, \mathcal{P}_{RB}, \mathcal{P}_{CF} \rangle\\ \mathcal{O}_{normal} = \langle \mathcal{P}_{GK}, \mathcal{P}_{CB}, \mathcal{P}_{LF}, \mathcal{P}_{RF} \rangle\end{array}\\
\mathcal{S}_{sweeper} &= \langle \mathcal{D}_{sweeper}, \mathcal{O}_{sweeper} \rangle\ , \ \begin{array}{l}\mathcal{D}_{sweeper} = \langle \mathcal{P}_{GK}, \mathcal{P}_{SW}, \mathcal{P}_{CB}, \mathcal{P}_{CF} \rangle\\ \mathcal{O}_{sweeper} = \langle \mathcal{P}_{GK}, \mathcal{P}_{SW}, \mathcal{P}_{LF}, \mathcal{P}_{RF} \rangle\end{array}\\
\mathcal{S}_{aggressive} &= \langle \mathcal{D}_{aggressive}, \mathcal{O}_{aggressive} \rangle\ , \ \begin{array}{l}\mathcal{D}_{aggressive} = \langle \mathcal{P}_{GK}, \mathcal{P}_{CB}, \mathcal{P}_{LB}, \mathcal{P}_{RB} \rangle\\ \mathcal{O}_{aggressive} = \langle \mathcal{P}_{GK}, \mathcal{P}_{CF}, \mathcal{P}_{LF}, \mathcal{P}_{RF} \rangle\end{array}\\
\mathcal{S}_{offensive} &= \langle \mathcal{D}_{sweeper}, \mathcal{O}_{aggressive} \rangle\\
\mathcal{S}_{defensive} &= \langle \mathcal{D}_{aggressive}, \mathcal{O}_{normal} \rangle\\
\mathcal{S}_{hold} &= \langle \mathcal{D}_{aggressive}, \mathcal{D}_{aggressive} \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathcal{S}_{hold}$ contains two defensive formations, this strategy was designed to be extremely defensive. Using the described framework a new position, formation or strategy can be added in a few lines of code.

2.3 Roles and Role Allocation

In the NUbot system there are two distinct roles, `chasing` and `positioning`. If a robot is not `chasing` then it must be `positioning`. The ideal situation has exactly one robot per team in the `chasing` role.

$$\texttt{chasing} \cap \texttt{positioning} = \emptyset,\ |\texttt{chasing}| = 1$$

Role allocation is done without negotiation, that is, each robot makes a decision on the information it currently has and hopes that this is the same decision the other robots have made. The role decision is based on a number, *bvrMessage*, that every robot shares with each other. At every point in time (every 1/30 sec) each robot calculates and stores what it believes the roles of all robots in the team should be. The robot with the lowest *bvrMessage* is assigned the `chasing` role.

bvrMessage is defined as being 10000 (i.e. I should not chase) when the ball has not been seen for a number of frames. If the ball is visible (or been seen recently) then *bvrMessage* = ball distance.

Previous experiments have biased this number, for example to make robots that are not lined up with the goal less likely to chase.

bvrMessage is also used to encode additional information such as attempting a grab, dribbling and kicking. This extra information allows the `positioning` robots to perform different actions depending on what the `chasing` robot is actually doing. For example, the robots should position differently when the `chasing` robot has gained control of the ball and is dribbling (see section 2.6).

It is possible that none or multiple robots might momentarily believe they are `chasing`, but in practice the noise and the dynamic nature of the environment means the problem rarely occurs and it is fixed extremely quickly (fractions of a second). An additional problem occurs when a robot loses sight of the ball at close range. In this case it is likely that a second robot will rapidly enter the fray which may causes collisions until the non-chasing robot is able to move back to its assigned position. This issue is something of a trade-off in that a less aggressive strategy would prevent this from occurring but it would mean extended periods of time could exist where nobody is moving towards the ball (our chasing code relies on the ball being recently seen). Historically the NUbots have preferred to have a `chasing` robot at all times, and have therefore constructed low-level skills that deal with the possible obstructions caused by close robots.

2.4 High-Level Strategy Switching

Currently the rules for automatic strategy switching are fairly simple. This is primarily due to the lack of information available to the robot. The robots rely solely on the current score and the time remaining in the match; the assumption being that the score is indicative of the effect of a strategy.

Prior to the match the coaches (humans) select a strategy ($\mathcal{S}_{current}$). A hierarchy of rules is then used to change this strategy, for example a rule taken directly from our 2006 RoboCup code was

```
if (secondHalf and (oppScore > ownScore)):
  scoreDiff = oppScore - ownScore
  if (timeLeft/60.0 < scoreDiff):
    newStrategy = AGGRESIVE
```

In principle the current rules cover two scenarios, winning and losing. In the case of winning the team could choose to become more defensive, i.e. $\mathcal{S}_{current} \leftarrow$

($\mathcal{S}_{defensive}$ or $\mathcal{S}_{hold}$). If the team is losing then the robots could become more aggressive in order to score more goals, i.e. $\mathcal{S}_{current} \leftarrow (\mathcal{S}_{offensive}$ or $\mathcal{S}_{aggressive})$.

For the purpose of this paper we will not discuss the entire rule set, rather emphasise that rules should remain flexible. Our system was designed to make it easy to modify or create new rules for different situations and opponents. It was not designed to completely remove the human element from the strategy decision. This differs from the work of McMillen et al [10] in which the strategies are cycled until a good strategy is found. While this should result in the discovery of a good strategy there exists the possibility of conceding a goal (or two) while rotating through inferior strategies.

2.5 Position Switching

In real football each player is physically different and has different skills and for these reasons they are suited to play particular positions. For all practical purposes each AIBO is identical, and hence the position switching algorithm does not need to consider the attributes of each individual robot. This allows us to base our position switching purely on the physical locations of the robots and the position of the ball on the field.

Again no form of negotiation is used, instead the robots rely on the shared world model being consistent between each other. The system essentially relies on the fact that each robot is capable of replicating the decision of the other robots, and thus the team should function as one. While it is possible to have multiple robots trying to play the same position, this should only occur when a localisation problem has occurred on one (or more) robots. The use of negotiation would not prevent this problem as any negotiated solution will be prone to the same error.

The first step of the position switching algorithm is to select the relevant formation from the current strategy. Currently this is done by determining a position on the field in which the team should be offensive or defensive. For RoboCup 2006 the following rule was used:

$$\mathcal{F}_{current} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_{current} & \text{ball in defensive half} \\ \mathcal{O}_{current} & \text{ball in offensive half} \end{cases}$$

The goal keeper can not be switched so the algorithm need only consider the positions for the three field players. This is done by using the following rules:

- The `chasing` robot is assigned the position closest to the ball. Note: The goal keeper will never switch positions.
- The `positioning` robots are then free to play any of the remaining positions. This decision is made by minimising the total distance that these robots would need to travel.

2.6 Potential Field Based Positioning

In the NUbot system only off ball positioning is controlled by the potential field. The potential field is not used for path planning, and as a result we are only interested in the potential at the robot at the present time. This allows us to save on computation as the gradient of the potential at this point gives the direction and size of the movement required.

The potential field system has two types of attractors/repulsors: those being points and lines. In both cases the attractiveness/repulsiveness is modelled under a normal distribution and controlled by two parameters, σ (spread) and α (height). A negative α implies a repulsive point or line.

Points Points are common in most potential field systems [12] and are used for object such as other robots, the ball, the goal etc. The current system models: *ball, homePosition, keeper, team1, team2, team3, ownGoal, oppGoal, closeball.* The home position is that decided upon in the formation and position subsections above. In general the robots are attracted to the ball, attracted to their home position, repulsed from their keeper and teammates. The opponent goal and close ball are only used when required, i.e. when dribbling a ball the opponent goal is an attractor and if the robot is a keeper the close ball is also attractive.

Lines and Line Segments To our knowledge the NUbots are the first team to use potential lines. These are very powerful, and greatly assist in the generation of rules. The repulsive lines exist for all the edges of the field. By having a low σ and high α it can be made it impossible for the robots to drift off the field while positioning (barring a localisation mistake). This enables the construction of the other points of potential without giving thought to a robot leaving the field, i.e. if the robot is repulsed from the ball and the ball is nearing the sideline, then the robot will not walk off the field to avoid the ball rather it will move in some direction (forwards or backwards) to avoid both the ball and the line. Lines of repulsiveness were particularly useful for controlling the dribbling behaviour. The original line implementation only contained lines of infinite length, which were useful for the edge of field but proved inadequate for more complicated structures such as the penalty box. This limitation was overcome by introducing line segments [13].

2.7 Low-Level Strategies

In addition to high-level strategies the same decision code allows for low-level strategy modifications. Currently the modifications allow us to adjust our underlying aggressiveness through the following variables: *Slap Defensive, Slap Offensive, Veer* or adjust to rule interpretations: *Illegal Defender Chase, Illegal Defender Position, Ram Over Line, Stop Dribble Over Line* and finally turn on/off some experimental code: *Chase Velocity, Chase Grab Adjust.*

The general concept of low-level strategies was to define a central place to control how an individual robot plays soccer as opposed to high-level strategies which are more concerned with the global team approach. By incorporating code for both low-level strategy decisions and high-level strategy decisions the robots have the ability to change many aspects of their play to suit the current state of the game.

3 Experiments and Results

RoboCup 2006 should have provided the ideal test bed for the strategy switching code, but unfortunately (for this paper) the NUbots never trailed in a game. As a consequence it was not possible to gain any real-world data as to the effect of strategy switching against an unknown opponent. To compensate a set of experiments was derived to test the effectiveness of different strategies.

The experiments took place in two phases. First, control games were run to gather key information on the performance of the standard strategy. For example, the average game score and the variance in this score. Secondly, the strategy of one team was varied, therefore measuring the impact of the strategy change on the result of the game.

3.1 Setup of the Experiment

- Two identical teams[1] play 10 games, each game will go for 5 minutes.
- The games will be 4 on 4, but the goal keeper on each side will remain stationary. The motionless aspect allows more goals and hence will provide more statistical information. Note that the keeper is identical in each strategy and therefore the stationary decision equally affects both teams.
- Calculate the variance in results when both teams play with our "preferred"-known strategy ($\mathcal{S}_{Sweeper}$).
- Change $\mathcal{S}$ on one of the teams, and play a number of games with this varied strategy. Calculate the variance in results of these games to answer the key question:

  Do global tactics decide the result of a match or are the low-level skills the determining factor?

Each match will be video recorded and further statistics gathered, for example, *shots at goal* and *ball position*. These additional statistics may assist in the analysis.

3.2 Results

The set of 10 control matches played with both teams using $\mathcal{S}_{sweeper}$ resulted in 4 wins for the *Red* team, 3 wins for the *Blue* team and 3 *draws*. The two teams scored 13 and 14 goals respectively (see Tables 1 and 2). The distribution of the *ball position* in an average match (a 1-1 draw) can be found in Figure 1a. It can be seen that the ball spent the majority of the match in the midfield ($-100 \leq x \leq 100$). The scores of the matches and the evenness of the ball distribution indicates that the two teams were playing at an equal level.

The second set of matches involved the strategy for the *Red* being changed to $\mathcal{S}_{offensive}$. This strategy was designed to be played when the team is trailing in a match and required quick goals. The key difference between $\mathcal{S}_{sweeper}$

[1] The software is identical but the physical condition of the AIBOs may vary slightly between teams.

Team	Control Matches	*Red* Offensive	*Red* Defensive
Red	4	0	1
Blue	3	3	2
Draw	3	2	2

Table 1: Number of wins by each team during the experiments.

Team	Control Matches	*Red* Offensive	*Red* Defensive
Red	1.3 ± 1.160	$\mathbf{0.6 \pm 0.894}$	1.0 ± 0.707
Blue	1.4 ± 0.9949	2.0 ± 1.225	1.4 ± 0.894
Margin	1.1 ± 0.994	1.4 ± 1.341	$\mathbf{0.6 \pm 0.548}$

Table 2: Average goals scored by each team during the experiments.

and $\mathcal{S}_{offensive}$ is on the offence aspect of the game, now all three field players will position inside the offensive half. Defensively $\mathcal{S}_{sweeper}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{offensive}$ are identical. It was expected that $\mathcal{S}_{offensive}$ would score more goals (with three attackers), but it would also be extremely susceptible to counter-attacks.

In practice $\mathcal{S}_{offensive}$ performed poorly in comparison to the standard strategy. The *Red* team failed to win a game (Table 1) and its goal average halved from 1.3 to 0.6 goals per game. In contrast the scoring of the *Blue* team increased from 1.4 to 2.0 goals per game (Table 2). A sample *ball position* distribution (Figure 1b) indicates that the possession was again in the midfield but the key difference was the lack of defensive support, therefore situations occurred where the *Blue* team could quickly progress the ball from midfield to the area surrounding the yellow goal ($x \approx 300$). This fact is evident when comparing the *shots at goal.* In the control games the average *shots at goal* for the two teams was 2.05. When *Red* was playing offensively the *Blue* team increased this to 3.8 *shots at goal* per game (Table 3).

The third set of experiments had the *Red* strategy changed to $\mathcal{S}_{hold}$. This is an extremely defensive strategy, at all stage of the games at least two field players will be in the defensive half. When the ball is in the defensive half all three field players will be playing defence, while on offence a loan attacker will be allowed to move into the offensive half. $\mathcal{S}_{hold}$ was designed to be used when ahead, and the intention was to 'play' out the game without conceding any further goals.

Somewhat surprisingly $\mathcal{S}_{hold}$ was quite competitive with our standard strategy. In the 5 games, *Red* won 1 game, *Blue* won 2 games and the teams drew on 2 occasions (Table 1). The scoring in the matches was similar to that of the control matches, *Red* scored on average 1.2 goals (in comparison to 1.3) while *Blue* scored an identical 1.4 goals per game. The key difference was in the margin (Table 2), that is, the average goal difference in each match. In the control matches games were won by an average of 1.1 ± 0.994 goals, this is basically saying that the while the results were even (4 wins, 3 wins and 3 draws) the actual matches were decided by a margin of anywhere between 0 and 2 goals. In the $\mathcal{S}_{hold}$ matches the margin was 0.6 ± 0.548 goals per game, this indicates that the matches were much closer (decided by 0 or 1 goals). The plot of the *ball*

Team	Shots at Goal	Pass (catch)	Pass (near)	Pass (self)
Control				
Red	2.2 ± 1.317	0.1 ± 0.317	0.7 ± 0.483	1.0 ± 1.054
Blue	1.9 ± 1.287	0.2 ± 0.422	0.8 ± 0.634	0.8 ± 1.033
Red Offensive				
Red	0.8 ± 0.837	0.0 ± 0	0.6 ± 0.578	1.0 ± 0.707
Blue	**3.8 ± 1.095**	0.4 ± 0.578	1.0 ± 1.0	**2.4 ± 1.817**
Red Defensive				
Red	1.6 ± 1.140	0.0 ± 0	0.0 ± 0.0	1.4 ± 1.140
Blue	1.6 ± 0.894	0.2 ± 0.447	0.4 ± 0.5478	0.6 ± 0.548

Table 3: Statistics gathered during the experiment. *Shots at goal* are any deliberate kicks at goal, both on target and off target shots are counted. *Pass (catch)* is any situation where a robot kicks the ball directly to a team-mate who then makes a clean catch on the ball. *Pass (near)* occurs when a robot kicks a ball in the direction of a team-mate, the team-mate then moves to gain control of the ball (through-pass). *Pass (self)* describes a robot kicking the ball up the field (into the clear) and then running onto the ball re-gaining possession.

position (Figure 1c) indicates that *Blue* had slightly better control of the ball ($x > 0$) but the score indicates that the increased presence of the *Red* defenders was enough to handle the additional pressure.

4 Discussion

In this section we will discuss the result of playing the different strategies and why they performed the way they did. The concept of "style of play" is introduced, we feel this concept should always be raised in any discussion about team strategies and tactics.

4.1 Global Strategies

The results section indicates that changing the global strategy of a team *can* affect the result. Often the true effect cannot be measured by statistics alone, but rather it requires human observation.

The league has **no** offside rule, therefore attacking robots can position as far up the field as they choose. The robots can not move as quickly or as fluidly as human players, and therefore the off-ball positioning of the robots becomes more critical. Additionally the ball does not travel in the air (due to the physical properties of the robots); the effect being that robots can not simply kick the ball over the head of an opponent to gain field position, rather they have to move the ball along the ground at all times.

As a result it appears that the key aspect of any strategy is to keep players behind the ball. While this is true in all forms of soccer, it appears to be even more true in this form. This fact became evident by observing how poorly the $S_{offensive}$ strategy performed.



(a) Control Match (1-1) (b) *Red* Offensive (0-2)

(c) *Red* Defensive (1-2)

Fig. 1: Histogram of ball position during a typical match of each experiment type. The blue goal (defended by the *Blue* team) is at $x = 300$ while the yellow goal (defended by the *Red* team) is at $x = -300$. The field size is 400cm $\times$ 600cm

This leaves two options: Should all the robots attempt to position behind the ball (i.e. $\mathcal{S}_{hold}$) or should an attacker be positioned further up field (i.e. $\mathcal{S}_{sweeper}$)? The results indicate that both strategies have merit and this decision may actually depend on the "style of play" discussed below. The NUbots have chosen the more offensive strategy (an upfield attacker) since we believe two defenders are capable of controlling the ball. Other teams such as the German Team have been extremely successful in employing the more defensive strategy. These experiments have confirmed that successful strategies (and teams) are built on a solid defense, a fact supported by observing that the top RoboCup teams concede the fewest goals.

4.2 "Style of Play"

One important factor that is often overlooked when discussing robot team strategies is the *style* of play that each team employs. In real football each coach, manager, club etc has an underlying style that tends to guide the approach taken by the team. For example, it is commonly accepted that Brazil play a free-spirited attacking style of football, and as a result their players have developed extremely strong individual ball skills. In contrast, many European countries play a more physical defensive-minded game resulting in players developing a different and more defensive set of underlying skills. For this reason any discussion on strategy selection should include a discussion on the general style of play and the skill set that has been developed for this style.

In the Four-Legged League there are a few distinct styles of play, but in recent years the dominating styles have been the *Australian* and *German* styles. In fact the past four RoboCup champions[2] and eight of the last nine place holders have played one of these two styles[3].

The two styles differ in a few key areas, but the most evident difference is when a robot is in possession of the ball. The *Australian* style can be roughly defined as 'grab, turn (maybe dodge) then kick'. In contrast the *German* style tends to favour an approach of 'quick and powerful kicks but with less precision'. As a consequence the teams that play the *Australian* style (i.e. NUbots, rUNSWift, UTS Unleashed) have spent substantial time refining their code base to be good at 'chasing and grabbing' the ball. This requires a lot of specific vision, localisation, behaviour and locomotion development that other teams may not have needed. Therefore the NUbot set of strategies (and the selection policy) tends to favour an aggressive 'must-control the ball' philosophy that suits the developed skill set.

5 Conclusion

This is the first study in the Four-Legged League league to experimentally compare different global team strategies, the key question being asked is "has the league progressed to a point in which team strategies really affect the game?".

In these experiments the control strategy was a proven strategy (2006 RoboCup champion). Therefore the control strategy should exploit a weaker strategy but also provide stiff competition to a solid alternate strategy. The result has shown that a change in global strategies can indeed affect the result of a game. However, the difference between the alternative strategies employed in the experiments is

[2] rUNSWift 2003, German Team 2004 & 2005, NUbots 2006.

[3] UPenn finished second in 2003.

minor: 40% of the games with different strategies ended up in a draw (30% of the control games were drawn). This indicates that the "style of play" and skills of the robot are still the most critical aspect of the robot system. The answer to the key question would be "strategies can affect the game but only when the two teams are already evenly matched".

This study has discovered metrics that can easily be programmed into the robots' strategy selection code. For example, the *score*, the *shots at goal* and the *ball position* histogram can be calculated during the game by the robots (the three *passing* statistics will be harder calculate). Further analysis of the videos and the gathering of more statistics (mainly *intercepts* and *tackles*) should provide for a more complex set of rules that govern the strategy switching code. The future development of the metrics and heuristics is key to successfully implementing adaptable strategies.

References

1. Kitano, H., Asada, M., Kuiyoshi, Y., Noda, I., Osawa, E., Matsubara, H.: Robocup: A challenge problem for AI and robotics. [3]
2. Kitano, H., Asada, M., Kuniyoshi, Y., Noda, I., Osawa, E., Matsubara, H.: Robocup: A challenge problem for AI. AI Magazine **18** (1997) 73–85
3. Kitano, H., ed.: RoboCup-1997: Robot Soccer World Cup I. Volume 1395 of LNCS., Springer (1998)
4. Bauer, G.: New Soccer Techniques, Tactics & Teamwork. Sterling Publishing (2002)
5. Allison, M.: Soccer for Thinkers. Pelham Books (1967)
6. Wade, A.: Soccer Strategies. Heinemann Kingswood (1988)
7. Dylla, F., Ferrein, A., Lakemeyer, G., Murray, J., Obst, O., Röfer, T., Stolzenburg, F., Visser, U., Wagner, T.: Towards a league-independent qualitative soccer theory for robocup. In Nardi, D., Riedmiller, M., Sammut, C., Santos-Victor, J., eds.: RoboCup 2004: Robot Soccer World Cup VIII. Volume 3276 of Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence (LNAI). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York (2005) 611–618
8. RoboCup Technical Committee: Sony Four Legged Robot Football League Rule Book. May 20, 2004 edn. (2004)
9. RoboCup Technical Committee: RoboCup Four-Legged League Rule Book. April 20, 2006 edn. (2006)
10. McMillen, C., Veloso, M.: Distributed, play-based role assignment for robot teams in dynamic environments. In: DARS 2006. (2006)
11. Veloso, M., Rybski, P., Chernova, S., Vail, D., Lenser, S., McMillen, C., Bruce, J., Tamburrino, F., Fasola, J., Carson, M., Trevor, A.: CMPack04: Team report. Technical report, Carnegie Mellon University (2004)
12. Laue, T., Röfer, T.: A behavior architecture for autonomous mobile robots based on potential fields. In: RoboCup 2004: Robot world Cup VIII. Volume 3276 of LNAI., Springer-Verlag (2005)
13. Knorn, F.: Algorithm development & testing for four legged league robot soccer passing. Diplomarbeit, Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg, Deutschland (undertaken at the University of Newcastle, Australia) (2006)