Slides adapted from Dieter Fox, Michael Kaess

SLAM

Sanjiban Choudhury

TAs: Matthew Rockett, Gilwoo Lee, Matt Schmittle

The SLAM problem

Robot is moving through a static unknown environment



Given a series of control and measurements,
estimate state and map

The SLAM problem

Robot is moving through a static unknown environment



Given a series of control and measurements,
estimate state and map

What if I just integrate controls?



What if I just integrate controls?



What we want ...



What we want ...



Need to figure out two things:

What we want ...



Need to figure out two things:

Correct relative movements
between successive measurements

What we want ...



Need to figure out two things:

Correct relative movements between successive measurements

Closing the loop globally

Spilling the beans on SLAM

Let's assume this was the ground truth....



Ground truth

Spilling the beans on SLAM

Odometry is really really noisy!



Ground truth

Odometry

Spilling the beans on SLAM

Measurements can help correct this somewhat



Ground truth

Odometry

Measurement correction

Spilling the beans on SLAM

Relative error accumulates ...



Ground truth

Odometry

Measurement correction

Spilling the beans on SLAM

Eventually robot comes back to a familiar place .... loop closure!



Ground truth

Odometry

Measurement correction

Spilling the beans on SLAM

Eventually robot comes back to a familiar place .... loop closure!



Ground truth Odometry Measurement correction

Spilling the beans on SLAM

If we are filtering, we can only fix the last pose estimate



Ground truth

Odometry

Measurement correction

Spilling the beans on SLAM

If we are optimizing, we can backprop errors in time!



Ground truth → Odometry → Measurement correction

Today's objective

1. How do we solve the chicken-or-egg problem in SLAM?

2. SLAM as an optimization instead of filtering

Bayes filter is a powerful tool

Localization

Mapping

SLAM

POMDP

Assembling Bayes filter

Tasks

Localization

P(pose | data)

Mapping

P(map | data)

SLAM

P(pose, map | data)

Belief Representations



Bayes Filter

Probabilistic Models



Tasks that we will cover

Tasks	**Belief Representation**	**Probabilistic Models**
Localization P(pose | data) (Week 3)	Gaussian / Particles	Motion model Measurement model
Mapping P(map | data) (Week 4)	Discrete (binary)	Inverse measurement model
SLAM P(pose, map | data) (Week 4)	Particles+GridMap (pose, map)	Motion model, measurement model, correspondence model

SLAM as just another Bayes filtering problem

Task: SLAM

P(map, pose | data)

What is the data?



Stream of control and measurements

$u_{1:t}, z_{1:t}$

What is the belief representation?

$$P(x_t, m | u_{1:t}, z_{1:t})$$





Different map representations

We are free to use any of the map representations we discussed



Feature maps

Grid maps



Surface maps

Why is SLAM hard?

Chicken-or-egg problem:

Given a map, we can localize

Given the pose, we can build map

Graphical model of SLAM



If SLAM can be expressed as a Bayes filtering problem, let's use our favorite Bayes filter...

Particle Filter!

Generalized particle filters

Step 0: Start with a set of particles

$$bel(x_{t-1}) = \{x_{t-1}^1, x_{t-1}^2, \ldots, x_{t-1}^M\}$$

Step 1: Sample particles from proposal distribution

$$\overline{bel}(x_t) = \{\bar{x}_t^1, \ldots, \bar{x}_t^M\}$$

Step 2: Compute importance weights

$$w_t^k = \frac{bel(x_t)}{\overline{bel}(x_t)}$$

Step 3: Resampling

Draw M samples from weighted distribution

Problem: Space of maps too large!!

$$P(x_t, m | u_{1:t}, z_{1:t})$$

How big is this space?

Problem: Space of maps too large!!

$$P(x_t, m | u_{1:t}, z_{1:t})$$

How big is this space?

If we were to sample particles, what is the likelihood that they would explain the measurements??

$$P(z_t | m, x_t) = 0$$

Key idea: Exploit dependencies

Even if a space is absurdly large, dependencies within the space can significantly shrink the space of possibilities we should consider.

Key idea: Exploit dependencies

Even if a space is absurdly large, dependencies within the space can significantly shrink the space of possibilities we should consider.



r.v. A B

(need to store 5x12 = 60 numbers)

Key idea: Exploit dependencies

Even if a space is absurdly large, dependencies within the space can significantly shrink the space of possibilities we should consider.



(need to store
5x12 = 60 numbers)



(need to store
5 + 9 = 14 numbers)

Key idea: Exploit dependencies

Is there a dependency in this gigantic combined state space?

Key idea: Exploit dependencies

Is there a dependency in this gigantic combined state space?

Yes!

The map depends on the history of poses of the robot

Rao-Blackwellization

Factorization to exploit dependencies between variables

$$P(a, b) = P(b|a)P(a)$$

If P(b|a) can be computed efficiently

Represent

$$P(a)$$

with samples

Compute

$$P(b|a)$$

for every sample

Applying the factorization trick

$$P(x_{1:t}, m | z_{1:t}, u_{1:t})$$

state history — map — data

Applying the factorization trick

$$P(x_{1:t}, m | z_{1:t}, u_{1:t})$$

state history, map, data

$$= P(x_{1:t} | z_{1:t}, u_{1:t}) \; P(m | x_{1:t}, z_{1:t}, u_{1:t})$$

state history, data; map, state history, data

Applying the factorization trick

$$P(x_{1:t}, m | z_{1:t}, u_{1:t})$$

state history: $x_{1:t}$ — map: m — data: $z_{1:t}, u_{1:t}$

$$= P(x_{1:t} | z_{1:t}, u_{1:t}) \; P(m | x_{1:t}, z_{1:t}, u_{1:t})$$

state history: $x_{1:t}$ — data: $z_{1:t}, u_{1:t}$ — map: m — state history: $x_{1:t}$ — data: $z_{1:t}, u_{1:t}$

$$= P(x_{1:t} | z_{1:t}, u_{1:t}) \; \prod_{i=1}^{N} P(m_i | x_{1:t}, z_{1:t})$$

state history: $x_{1:t}$ — data: $z_{1:t}, u_{1:t}$

(Particle filter to estimate this) (Occupancy map)

How do we compute a PF over state history?

For simplicity, each particle only stores the current state at timestep t

(just like you did in you assignment)

However the weights of the particle are computed based on

it's path through time.

How do we compute a PF over state history?

Let's jump straight to the importance sampling step

How do we compute a PF over state history?

Let's jump straight to the importance sampling step

$$w_t = \frac{bel(x_{1:t})}{\overline{bel}(x_{1:t})} = \frac{P(x_{1:t}|z_t, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}{P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}$$

How do we compute a PF over state history?

Let's jump straight to the importance sampling step

$$w_t = \frac{bel(x_{1:t})}{\overline{bel}(x_{1:t})} = \frac{P(x_{1:t}|z_t, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}{P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}$$

$$\propto \frac{P(z_t|x_{1:t}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}{P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}$$

How do we compute a PF over state history?

Let's jump straight to the importance sampling step

$$w_t = \frac{bel(x_{1:t})}{\overline{bel}(x_{1:t})} = \frac{P(x_{1:t}|z_t, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}{P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}$$

$$\propto \frac{P(z_t|x_{1:t}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}{P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}$$

$$\propto P(z_t|x_t, x_{1:t-1}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})$$

How do we compute a PF over state history?

Let's jump straight to the importance sampling step

$$w_t = \frac{bel(x_{1:t})}{\overline{bel}(x_{1:t})} = \frac{P(x_{1:t}|z_t, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}{P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}$$

$$\propto \frac{P(z_t|x_{1:t}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}{P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}$$

$$\propto P(z_t|x_t, x_{1:t-1}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})$$

$$\propto \sum_m P(z_t|x_t, m)P(m|x_{1:t-1}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})$$

How do we compute a PF over state history?

Let's jump straight to the importance sampling step

$$w_t = \frac{bel(x_{1:t})}{\overline{bel}(x_{1:t})} = \frac{P(x_{1:t}|z_t, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}{P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}$$

$$\propto \frac{P(z_t|x_{1:t}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}{P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}$$

$$\propto P(z_t|x_t, x_{1:t-1}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})$$

$$\propto \sum_m P(z_t|x_t, m)P(m|x_{1:t-1}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})$$

$$\approx P(z_t|x_t, \hat{m})$$

(meas) (most likely map from prev timestep)

How do we compute a PF over state history?

Let's jump straight to the importance sampling step

$$w_t = \frac{bel(x_{1:t})}{\overline{bel}(x_{1:t})} = \frac{P(x_{1:t}|z_t, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}{P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}$$

$$\propto \frac{P(z_t|x_{1:t}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}{P(x_{1:t}|z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})}$$

$$\propto P(z_t|x_t, x_{1:t-1}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})$$

$$\propto \sum_m P(z_t|x_t, m)P(m|x_{1:t-1}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t})$$

$$\approx P(z_t|x_t, \hat{m})$$

(meas) (most likely map from prev timestep)

$$\text{where } \hat{m} = \arg\max_m P(m|x_{1:t-1}, z_{1:t-1}, u_{1:t-1})$$

FastSLAM

Proposed by Montemerlo 2002

Particle 1 | x, y, θ | **Occupancy grid map**

Particle 2 | x, y, θ | **Occupancy grid map**

⋮

Particle *N* | x, y, θ | **Occupancy grid map**

FastSLAM Algorithm

1: **Algorithm FastSLAM_occupancy_grids($\mathcal{X}_{t-1}, u_t, z_t$):**

2: $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_t = \mathcal{X}_t = \emptyset$

3: *for* $k = 1$ *to* M *do*

4: $x_t^{[k]} = \textbf{sample\_motion\_model}(u_t, x_{t-1}^{[k]})$

5: $w_t^{[k]} = \textbf{measurement\_model\_map}(z_t, x_t^{[k]}, m_{t-1}^{[k]})$

5: $m_t^{[k]} = \textbf{updated\_occupancy\_grid}(z_t, x_t^{[k]}, m_{t-1}^{[k]})$

6: $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_t = \bar{\mathcal{X}}_t + \langle x_t^{[k]}, m_t^{[k]}, w_t^{[k]} \rangle$

7: *endfor*

8: *for* $k = 1$ *to* M *do*

9: *draw* i *with probability* $\propto w_t^{[i]}$

10: *add* $\langle x_t^{[i]}, m_t^{[i]} \rangle$ *to* $\mathcal{X}_t$

11: *endfor*

12: *return* $\mathcal{X}_t$

FastSLAM in action!



Haehenl et al.

FastSLAM in action!



Haehenl et al.

SLAM resources

https://openslam-org.github.io/

Do we really need a probability distribution?

$$P(x_{1:t}, m)$$

Do we really need a probability distribution?

$$P(x_{1:t}, m)$$

Or are does a maximum a posteriori estimate suffice?

$$\hat{x}_{1:t}, \hat{m} = \arg\max_{x_{1:t}, m} P(x_{1:t}, m)$$

SLAM as a pure optimization problem



SLAM as a set of relationships

Robot

Landmark measurement

Landmark

Courtesy M.Kaess

SLAM as a set of relationships

Odometry measurement

Robot



Landmark measurement

Landmark 1

Landmark 2

Courtesy M.Kaess

SLAM as a set of relationships



Courtesy M.Kaess

SLAM as a set of relationships

Odometry measurement

Landmark measurement



Courtesy M.Kaess

Factor Graph representation of SLAM

Odometry measurement



Landmark measurement

Bipartite graph with ***variable nodes*** and ***factor nodes***

Courtesy M.Kaess

Factor Graph representation of SLAM

The variables in the optimization are poses of robot at all time steps and all landmarks

$$\theta = [x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n, l_1, \ldots, l_m]$$

Factorization of probability density

- Conditional independence:

$$p(z_1 z_2|\Theta) = p\,(z_1|\Theta)\,p\,(z_2|\Theta)$$



$$\Leftrightarrow \quad \text{argmax}_\Theta \prod_{z \in Z} p\,(z|\Theta)$$

$$\text{argmax}_\Theta\ p(p|\Theta)\,p\,(u_1|\Theta) \cdots p(u_n|\Theta)\,p\,(m_1|\Theta) \cdots p(m_4|\Theta)$$

Courtesy M.Kaess

How do we solve such optimization?

Large scale
sparse
non-linear
least squares
optimization

+

incrementally
growing
factors

How do we solve such optimization?

Large scale
sparse
non-linear
least squares
optimization

+

incrementally
growing
factors

Option 1: Using sparse matrix algebra

(Kaess et al. 2008)

How do we solve such optimization?

Large scale
sparse
non-linear
least squares
optimization

+

incrementally
growing
factors

Option 1: Using sparse matrix algebra

(Kaess et al. 2008)

Option 2: Using probabilistic graphical models

(Kaess et al. 2011)

Top: The Bayes tree.
The parts affected by the new variables are colored in red.

Bottom: Color coded trajectory.
Green corresponds to a low number of variables, red to a high number.

iSAM2, Kaess et al. 2012

Top: The Bayes tree.
The parts affected by the new variables are colored in red.

Bottom: Color coded trajectory.
Green corresponds to a low number of variables, red to a high number.

iSAM2, Kaess et al. 2012

Application: Kintinuous 2.0 (Whelan et al.)



Application: Kintinuous 2.0 (Whelan et al.)