

Meeting

08/13/2020

Shuo Zhang

Fixed issues of PPO training (Gazebo Hand 0.1% model)

- 1) Smaller learning rate
- 2) Sparse reward setting (-1 and 0)
- 3) Goal location separate training
- 4) Only use the best policy within 10M steps training for best seed

Datasize for Dynamics Model	A* planning +Rollout	PPO from model + Offline planning + Rollout	Online vanilla PPO	AIP
100%	Done + Done	Done + Done + Done	Not yet	Not yet
0.1%	Done + Done	Done + Done + Not yet	Not yet	Not yet

GPS

- Dynamics Model:
 - time-varying local linear models
 - iteratively trained
- Features:
 - the controller be updated iteratively
 - the controller itself works well
 - linear gaussian controller (iLQR)
 - force policy to exactly follow controller with $KL=0$
 - train policy by using Dual Gradient Descent (updating Lagrange multiplier)
- Usage of KL:
 - KL between old and new controller
 - KL between controller and policy

AIP (based on ideas so far)

- single global nonlinear neural network model
- just one model from the very beginning
- the controller be never updated
- execution in real env using the controller works not well
- A* controller deterministic, PPO controller nonlinear. Both are not applicable in the derivation equations in the GPS paper.
- better new policy trained in a model-free fashion
- train policy in traditional actor-critic RL way (for PPO, just SGD, unconstrained optim.)
- KL between old and new policy

GPS

- Policy:

$u_{\text{final}} = \pi_{\theta}(x)$

$KL(\pi_{\theta} || \text{controller}) = 0$

- Controller:

Update

- under newly trained dynamics
- using newly collected data
- considering old controller distribution

$KL(\text{controller}_{\text{new}} || \text{controller}_{\text{old}}) < \epsilon$

- Objective:

- train an arbitrary parameterized policy π_{θ} under the guide of linear gaussian controller policies
- if the controller policies from the dynamics model performs not well in the real env, the parameterized policy will also work not well

AIP (based on ideas so far)

$u_{\text{final}} = \pi_{\theta}([x, u_{\text{controller}}])$

$KL(\pi_{\theta_{\text{new}}} || \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}) < \epsilon$

??? $KL(\pi_{\theta} || \text{controller}) < \omega$??

No Update

- Just one fixed global dynamics

- Train an improved (a better) policy based on the controller policy
- We want to get a policy which works well in the real env, though the controller policy from the dynamics model might work not well

AIP against TRPO

Difference 1:

AIP: $u_{\text{final}} = \pi_{\theta}([x, u_{\text{controller}}])$

TRPO: $u_{\text{final}} = \pi_{\theta}([x])$

Difference 2:

AIP:

$KL(\pi_{\theta_{\text{new}}} || \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}) < \epsilon$

$KL(\pi_{\theta} || \pi_{\theta_{\text{controller}}}) < \omega$

TRPO:

$KL(\pi_{\theta_{\text{new}}} || \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}) < \epsilon$