

Communication Strategies for Self-regulated Multi-robot Task Allocation

Md Omar Faruque Sarker

University of Wales, Newport

Email: Mdomarfaruque.Sarker@students.newport.ac.uk

May 21, 2010

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Multi-robot task allocation (MRTA) | 1 |
| 1.2 | Communications for self-regulated task-allocation | 3 |
| 1.3 | Contributions | 5 |
| 1.4 | Thesis outline and relevant publications | 5 |
| 2 | Background and Related Work | 7 |
| 2.1 | Definition of key terms | 7 |
| 2.1.1 | Self-regulation | 7 |
| 2.1.2 | Communication | 11 |
| 2.1.3 | Division of labour or task-allocation | 13 |
| 2.2 | Communication in biological social systems | 16 |
| 2.3 | Overview and key issues of multi-robot systems (MRS) | 18 |
| 2.3.1 | MRS research paradigms | 19 |
| 2.3.2 | MRS Taxonomies | 24 |
| 2.3.3 | Swarm Robotics | 24 |
| 2.3.4 | Applications of MRS | 30 |
| 2.4 | Task-allocation in MRS | 31 |
| 2.5 | Communication in MRS | 33 |
| 2.6 | Application of MRS in automated manufacturing | 35 |
| 2.6.1 | Multi-agent based intelligent manufacturing | 35 |
| 2.6.2 | Biology-inspired manufacturing Systems | 36 |
| 3 | Experimental Tools | 38 |
| 3.1 | General Methodological Issues | 38 |
| 3.1.1 | Design of MRS | 38 |
| 3.1.2 | Real robot experiments – No simulation | 41 |
| 3.2 | Hardware | 42 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 3.2.1 | E-puck robots | 42 |
| 3.2.2 | Overhead GigE camera | 43 |
| 3.2.3 | Server PC Configuration | 44 |
| 3.3 | Enabling Software Tools and Frameworks | 45 |
| 3.3.1 | SwisTrack: A Multi-robot Tracking System | 45 |
| 3.3.2 | D-Bus: An Inter-Process Communication Protocol | 48 |
| 3.3.3 | BTCom/Myro: E-puck Robot Control Programs | 52 |
| 3.3.4 | BlueZ: Linux's Bluetooth Communication Stack | 52 |
| 3.3.5 | Python's Multiprocessing: Multi-Threading Made-easy | 52 |
| 3.4 | Multi-robot control architecture | 52 |
| 4 | Attractive Field Model for Self-regulated Task Allocation | 58 |
| 4.1 | Inter-disciplinary motivations | 58 |
| 4.2 | The Attractive Field Model | 60 |
| 4.2.1 | Generic Interpretation | 60 |
| 4.2.2 | Robotic Interpretation | 61 |
| 4.2.3 | A Case Study: Virtual Manufacturing Shop-Floor | 62 |
| 4.3 | Implementation | 65 |
| 4.3.1 | Design of our communication system | 66 |
| 4.3.2 | Our current implementation | 66 |
| 4.4 | Experiment Design | 67 |
| 4.4.1 | Parameters | 68 |
| 4.4.2 | Observables | 68 |
| 4.5 | Results and Discussions | 69 |
| 4.6 | Conclusion and Future works | 70 |
| 5 | Locality-based Decentralized Communication Model | 73 |
| 5.1 | Biological motivations | 73 |
| 5.2 | Geometrical analysis | 73 |
| 5.3 | General characteristics | 73 |
| 5.4 | Implementation algorithm | 74 |
| 5.5 | Implementation | 76 |
| 5.5.1 | Our communication system | 77 |
| 5.5.2 | Our current implementation | 77 |
| 5.6 | Experiment Design | 78 |
| 5.6.1 | Parameters | 78 |
| 5.6.2 | Observables | 79 |
| 5.7 | Results and Discussions | 80 |
| 5.8 | Related Works | 86 |
| 5.9 | CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS | 86 |
| 6 | Conclusions | 88 |
| 6.1 | Summary of contributions | 88 |
| 6.2 | Future work | 88 |

1.1 Multi-robot task allocation (MRTA)

Robotic researchers generally agree that multiple robots can perform complex and distributed tasks more conveniently. Multi-robot systems (MRS) can provide improved performance, fault-tolerance and robustness through parallelism and redundancy (Arkin 1998, Parker & Tang 2006, Mataric 2007). However, in order to get potential benefits of MRS in any application domain, we need to solve a common research challenge i.e., *multi-robot task allocation* (MRTA) (Gerkey & Mataric 2004). MRTA can also be called as *division of labour* (DoL) analogous to DoL in biological social insect and human societies (hereafter the term MRTA is used to denote an instance of social DoL). It is generally identified as the question of assigning tasks in an appropriate time to the appropriate robots considering the changes of the environment and/or the performance of other team members. This is a NP-hard optimal assignment problem where optimum solutions can not be found quickly for large complex problems (Gerkey & Mataric 2003, Parker 2008). The complexities of MRTA arise from the fact that there is no central planner or coordinator for task assignments and the robots are limited to sense, to communicate and to interact locally. None of them has the complete knowledge of the past, present or future actions of other robots. Moreover, they don't have the complete view of the world state. The computational and communication bandwidth requirements

also restrict the solution quality of the problem (Lerman et al. 2006).

Researchers from multi-robot or multi-agent systems, operations research and other disciplines have approached the MRTA or task-allocation in multi-agents issue in many different ways. Traditionally task allocation in a multi-agent systems has been divided into two major categories: 1) Predefined (off-line) and 2) Emergent (real-time) task-allocation (Shen et al. 2001). However predefined task-allocation approach fails to scale well as the number of tasks and robots becomes large, e.g., more than 10 (Lerman et al. 2006). On the other hand emergent task-allocation approach relies on the emergent group behaviours e.g., (Kube & Zhang 1993), such as emergent cooperation (Lerman et al. 2006), adaptation rules (Liu et al. 2007) etc. They are more robust and scalable to large team size. However most of the robotic researchers found that emergent task-allocation approach is difficult to design, to analyse formally and to implement in real robots. The solutions from these systems are also sub-optimal. It is also difficult to predict exact behaviours of robots and overall system performance.

Within the context of the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) project, “Defying the Rules: How Self-regulatory Systems Work”, we have proposed to solve the above mentioned MRTA problem in a new way (Arcaute et al. 2008). Our approach is inspired from the studies of emergence of task-allocation in both biological insect societies and human social systems. Biological studies show that a large number of animal as well as human social systems grow, evolve and generally continue functioning well by the virtue of their individual self-regulatory task-allocation systems. The amazing abilities of biological organisms to change, to respond to unpredictable environments, and to adapt over time lead them to sustain life through biological functions such as self-recognition, self-recovery, self-growth etc. It is interesting to note that in animal societies task-allocation has been accomplished years after years without a central authority or an explicit planning and coordinating element. Direct peer-to-peer (P2P) and indirect communication such as stigmergy is used to exchange information among individuals (Camazine et al. 2001). The decentralized self-growth of Internet and its bottom-up interactions of millions of users around the globe present us similar evidences of task-allocation in human social systems (Andriani & Passiante 2004). These interactions of individuals happen in the absence of or in parallel with strict

hierarchy. Moreover from the study of sociology e.g., (Sayer & Walker 1992), cybernetics e.g., (Beer 1981), strategic management e.g., (Kogut 2000) and related other disciplines we have found that decentralized self-regulated systems exist in nature and in man-made systems which can grow and achieve self-regulated division of labour over time.

From the above mentioned multi-disciplinary studies of various complex systems, we believe that a set of generic rules can govern the self-regulated task-allocation in MRS. Primarily these rules should deal with the issue of deriving local control rules for facilitating the task-allocation of an entire robot team.

The outcome of our research can be applied to solve generic task-allocation problem in numerous multi-agent systems. As an example, our technique can be useful in automated manufacturing (AM) which faces all the existing challenges of traditional centralized and sequential manufacturing processes such as, insufficiently flexible to respond and adapt changes in production styles of high-mix low-volume production environments (Shen et al. 2006). We believe that our approach can help AM industries to overcome many of these challenging issues, such as flexibility to change the manufacturing plant layouts on-the-fly, adaptability for high variation in product styles, quantities, and active manufacturing resources e.g., robots, AGVs etc.

1.2 Communications for self-regulated task-allocation

In MRS research, robotic researchers have been using various forms of communications e.g., (Bonabeau et al. 1999, Labella 2007). Two widely used forms of communications are: 1) direct or explicit communication and 2) indirect or implicit communication. *Direct communication* is an intentional communicative act of message passing that aims at one or more particular receiver(s) (Mataric 1998). It typically exchanges information through physical signals. In contrast, indirect communication, sometimes termed as *stigmergic* in biological literature, happens as a form of modifying the environment (e.g., pheromone dropping by ants) (Bonabeau et al. 1999). In ordinary sense, this is an observed behaviour and many robotic researchers call it as *no communication* (Labella 2007). In order to avoid ambiguity, by the term *self-regulated MRTA* (or *MRTA* for short) we refer to those

MRS where robots can exhibit most common self-regulatory properties (Bonabeau et al. 1999) in their task-allocation process. Also in this thesis, by the term *communication*, we always refer to direct communication and we confine our discussion on MRTA within the context of direct communication only.

In the process of pursuing self-regulated MRTA, robots can receive information from a centralised source (Krieger & Billeter 2000) or from their local peers (Agassounon et al. 2004). In (Sarker & Dahl n.d.), we reported a steady-state convergence of MRTA in a practical MRS using a centralized information source. This centralized communication system is easy to implement. It simplifies the overall design of a robot controller. However this system has disadvantage of a single point of failure and it is not scalable. The increased number of robots and tasks cause inevitable increase in communication load and transmission delay. Consequently, the overall system performance degrades. On the other hand, uncontrolled reception of information from decentralized or local sources is also not free from drawbacks. If a robot exchanges signals with all other robots (hereafter called as *peers*), it might get the global view of the system quickly and can select an optimal or near optimal task. This can produce a great improvement in overall performance of some types of tasks e.g., in area coverage (Rutishauser et al. 2009). But this is also not practical and scalable for a typically large MRS due to the limited communication and computational capabilities of robots and limited available communication bandwidth of this type of system.

A potential alternate solution to this problem can be obtained by decreasing the number of message recipient peers on the basis of a local communication radius (r_{comm}). This means that robots are allowed to communicate only with those peers who are physically located within a pre-set distance. When this strategy is used for sharing task information among peers, MRTA can be more robust and efficient (Agassounon et al. 2004). However it is not well-defined how the selection of communication range can be made despite the significant differences in various implementation of MRS. In case of biological social insects, the concept of *active space* explains how each individual set their dynamic communication radius (Holldobler & Wilson 1990, McGregor & Peake 2000) (see Section ??). In this thesis, we present a locality based dynamic P2P communication model that design a desired communication range by considering both biological inspirations and ge-

ometric relationships of the environment particularly, the shapes and communication capabilities of robots. Along with a practical insight for selecting r_{comm} value, various other design issues have been tackled. The recursion-free design of local communication channels is also achieved by a dynamic publish/subscribe model of communication. We also compare this system with our baseline centralized communication based MRS in terms of convergence of MRTA, communication load, robot motions and their task specializations.

1.3 Contributions

The main contributions of this thesis are as follows:

- Introduction of attractive field model (AFM), an inter-disciplinary generic model of division of labour, as a basic mechanism of self-regulated MRTA.
- Validation of the model through experiments with reasonably large number of real robots.
- Development of a centralized and a local P2P communication model and their respective implementation algorithms that satisfy the requirement of system-wide continuous flow of information for self-regulated task-allocation.
- Comparisons of performances of both communication models in achieving similar self-regulated MRTA.
- Development of a point-to-point signal based multi-robot control architecture using D-Bus inter-process communication technology.

1.4 Thesis outline and relevant publications

This report has been organized as follows. Chapter 2 reviews the related literature on general terms, key issues of MRS and MRTA. This also includes the review of communication for self-regulated task-allocation in biological societies. This chapter concludes by discussing the related work on communication for self-regulated MRTA. Chapter 3 describes the attractive field model in details. Chapter 4 presents our centralized and local communication models and analyse it from the geometric and biological view-point. Chapter 5 includes experiment

tools used in this research. Chapter 6 describes the design of our experiments. Chapter 7 describes the results of our experiments. Chapter 8 concludes this thesis with a summary and future research directions.

CHAPTER 2

Background and Related Work

2.1 Definition of key terms

2.1.1 Self-regulation

Animals and flying beings that live on or above earth form social communities like human society (Ali 1995). In recent years, the biological study of social insects and other animals reveals us that individuals of these self-organized societies can solve various complex and large everyday-problems with a few simple behavioural rules relying on their minimum sensing and communication abilities (Garnier et al. 2007, Camazine et al. 2001). Some common tasks of these biological societies include: dynamic foraging, building amazing nest structures, division of labour among workers and so forth. These tasks are done by colonies, ranging from a few animals to thousands or millions of individuals, that exhibit surprising efficiency in their tasks with both robustness and flexibility. Today these findings have inspired scientists and engineers to use this knowledge of biological self-organization in developing solutions for various problems of our man-made artificial systems, such as traffic routing in telecommunication and vehicle networks, design control algorithms for groups of autonomous robots and so forth.

Self-organization in biological and other systems are often characterized in terms of four major ingredients: 1) Positive feedback, 2) Negative feedback, 3) Presence of multiple interactions among individuals and their environment and 4)




Figure 2.1: Self-organization viewed from four (A-D) inseparable perspectives




Figure 2.2: Three major parts of a self-regulated agent

Amplification of fluctuations (random walks, errors, random task-switching etc.) (Bonabeau et al. 1999, Camazine et al. 2001). As illustrated in Fig. 2.1 an external observer can recognize a self-organized system by observing the individual interactions of that system from these four perspectives. The first perspective is a positive feedback or amplification that results from the execution of simple behavioural “rules of thumb”. For example, recruitment to a food source through trail laying and trail following in some ants is a positive feedback that creates the conditions for the emergence of trail network at the global (or an outside observer) level. The second perspective is negative feedback that counterbalances positive feedback usually to stabilize a collective patterns, e.g., crowding at the food sources (saturation), competition between paths to food sources etc. The third perspective is the presence of multiple direct peer-to-peer or indirect stigmergic (e.g., pheromone dropping in ants) interactions. The former is the main concern of this thesis and is discussed latter in detail. Finally, the fourth perspective is the amplification of fluctuations that comes from the stochastic events. For example errors in trail following of some ants may lead some foragers to get lost and later to find new, unexploited food sources and then recruit others. In a self-organized system an individual agent may have limited cognitive, sensing and communication capabilities, but they are collectively capable of solving complex and large problems. Since the discovery of these collective behavioural patterns of self-organized societies scientists observed modulation or adaptation of behaviours in the individual level. For example, in order to prevent a life-threatening humidity-drop in the colony, cockroaches maintain a locally sustainable humidity level by increasing their tendency to aggregate, i.e., by regulating their individual aggregating behaviours (Garnier et al. 2007). As shown in Fig. 2.2 this self-regulation (SR) of an individual agent is depicted through a triangle where it’s base-arm of simple behavioural rules of thumb (e.g., intense aggregation in low humidity in the previous example) is supported by two side-arms: local communication and local sensing. This local sensing is sometimes also referred to as sensing or information gathering from the work in progress (e.g., stigmergy) and the local communication mentioned here is directly linked with peer-to-peer (P2P) communication with neighbours (Camazine et al. 2001).

SR has been studied in many other branches of knowledge. In most places of literature, SR refers to the exercise of control over oneself to bring the self

into line with preferred standards (Baumeister & Vohs 2007). One of the most notable self-regulatory process is the human body's homeostatic process where the human body's inner process seeks to return to its regular temperature when it gets overheated or chilled. Baumeister et al. has referred self-regulation to goal-directed behaviour or feedback loops, whereas self-control may be associated with conscious impulse control. In psychology, SR denotes the strenuous actions to resist temptation or to overcome anxiety. SR is also divided into two categories: 1) conscious and 2) unconscious SR. Conscious SR puts emphasis on conscious, deliberate efforts in self-regulation. On the other hand, unconscious self-regulation refers to the automatic self-regulatory process that is although not nearly as labour intensive, but operate in harmony with unpredictable, unfolding events in the environment, using and transforming the available informational input in ways that help to attain an activated goal.

The concepts of SR is also commonly used in cybernetic theory where SR in inanimate mechanisms shows that they can regulate themselves by making adjustments according to programmed goals or set standards. A common example of this kind can be found in a thermostat that controls a heating and cooling system to maintain a desired temperature in a room. In physics, chemistry, biology and some other branches of natural sciences, the concept of SR is centred around the study of self-organizing individuals. SR has also been studied in the context of human social systems where it originates from the division of social labor that creates SO process that has self-regulating effects (Kppers et al. 1990). Two types of SR have been reported in many places of literature of sociology: 1) SR from SO and 2) SR from activities of components in a heterarchical organization. It is interesting to note that self-regulation in biological species provides the similar evidences of bottom-up approach of self-regulation of heterarchical organization through interaction of individuals or the absence of strict hierarchy Beer1981.

From the above discussion, we see that the term *self-regulation* carries a wide range of meaning in different branches of knowledge. In psychology and cognitive neuroscience point of view, self-regulation is discussed in an individual's perspective whereas, in biological and social contexts the SR is discussed in a context of a group of individuals or the society as a whole. In this thesis, the latter context is more appropriate where SR covers both aspects of monitoring ones own state and

environmental changes in relation to the communal goal and thus making adjustments of self behaviours with respect to the changes found.

2.1.2 Communication

Defining *communication* can be challenging. Due to the use of this term in several disciplines with somewhat different meanings. This has been portrayed in the writing of Sarah Trenholm ((West 2003)) who describes communication as piece of luggage overstuffed with all manner of odd ideas and meanings. This dissertation closely follows the definition of (West 2003) where communication is defined as:

“A social process where individuals employ symbols to establish and interpret meaning in their environment.”

The notion of being a “social process” involves (two or more) individuals and interactions that is dynamic and ongoing. Moreover symbols are simply some sort of arbitrary labels given to a phenomena and they can represent concrete objects or an idea or thought. Encyclopaedia Britannica also defines communication as “the exchange of meanings between individuals through a common system of symbol”. But since it lacks the notion of sociality I consider it incomplete for our purpose. There are many other debates related to communication, such as the intentionality debate (West 2003), symbol grounding and so on. However, in order to draw some tractable boundaries, I consider communication process within the context of symbol or message exchange between two or more parties with a clear intent to influence each others’ behaviours.

The elements of communication can give us the whole picture involved in communication process and this can be explained through the study of the models of communication. There exists a plenty of models of communication. For the purpose of this study, here I discuss three prominent models: 1) linear model, 2) interaction model and 3) transaction model. Fig. ?? combines first two models in a single diagram. In linear model, as introduced by Claude Shanon and Warren Weaver (1949), communication is a one way process where a message is sent from a source to a receiver through a channel. On top of linear view, in interactional model proposed by Wilber Schramm (1954), communication is a two-way process with an additional feedback element that links both source and receiver. This feedback is a response given to the source by the receiver to confirm how the message

is being understood. Here, during message passing, both source and receiver utilize their individual field of experiences that describe the overlap of their common experiences, cultures etc. Unlike separate field of experiences and discrete sending and receiving of message in interactional model, in transactional model, introduced by Barnlund(1970), the sending and receiving of message is done simultaneously and their field of experiences also overlaps to some degree. In all of the above three models a common message distorting element, i.e., noise is present. This noise can be occurred from the linguistic influences (message semantics), physical or bodily influences, cognitive influences or even from biological or physiological influences (e.g., anger or shouting voice while talking) and so on.

The above models of communication describe the incremental complexities of message exchanging in a communication process. Surely the transactional model is comparatively the most sophisticated model that prescribes adjusting the sender's message content while receiving an implicit or explicit feedback in real-time. For example, while speaking with her son for advising to read a story book, a mother may alter her verbal message as he simultaneously "reads" the non-verbal message of her child. However, in case of MRS, such sophistication may not be required or realizable by the current state of art in communication technology. In this study we follow the simple linear model that gives us the ease of implementation. The feedback is not accounted as we assumed that our artificial robotic system has a same shared vocabulary so that a message is understood as it is sent. Sender never waits for an additional feedback to end sending a message.

Following the linear model of communication, the amount of communicated information associated with a certain random variable X can be calculated by the concept of *Shanon entropy*. Adopting the notation of Feldman (Feldman 1997), and indicating a discrete random variable with the capital letter X , which can take values $x \in \chi$, the information entropy is defined as:

$$H[X] = - \sum_{x \in \chi} p(x) \cdot \log_2 p(x) \quad (2.1)$$

where $p(x)$ is the probability that X will take the value of x . $H[X]$ is also called the *marginal entropy* of X , since it depends on only the marginal probability of one random variable. The marginal entropy of the random variable X is zero if X always assumes the same value with $p(X=x)=1$, and maximum if X assumes all

possible states with equal probability.

For example, in order to measure information flow in an elementary communication system, let *bit* be the unit amount of information needed to make a choice between two equiprobable alternates. If n alternates are present, a choice provides the following quantity of information: $H = \log_2 n$. Thus sending of n equiprobable messages reduces $\log_2 n$ amount of uncertainty and thus the amount of information is $\log_2 n$ bit. Similarly, according to Eq. 2.1, the value of $H[X]$ depends on the discretization of x . For instance, if the value of random variable x is discretized into 4, then $p(x)$ becomes $\frac{1}{4}$ leading to $H[X] = -4 \cdot \frac{1}{4} \cdot \log_2 \frac{1}{4} = 2$.

In biological and MRS literature two basic forms of communications often are reported: 1) direct or explicit communication and 2) indirect or implicit communication. As defined in (Mataric 1998), *direct communication* is an intentional communicative act of message passing that aims at one or more particular receiver(s). It typically exchanges information through physical signals. In contrast, *indirect communication*, sometimes termed as *stigmergic* in biological literature, happens as a form of modifying the environment (e.g., pheromone dropping by ants) (Bonabeau et al. 1999). In ordinary sense, this is an observed behaviour and many robotic researchers call it as *no communication* (Labella 2007). In order to avoid ambiguity, in this dissertation, by the term *communication*, I always refer to direct communication. Sec. 2.2 and 2.5 reviews communication in biological social system and MRS respectively.

2.1.3 Division of labour or task-allocation

Encyclopaedia Britannica serves the definition of division of labour as the separation of a work process into a number of tasks, with each task performed by a separate person or group of persons. Originated from economics and sociology the term division of labour is widely used in many branches of knowledge. As mentioned by Scottish philosopher Adam Smith, the founder of modern economics :

The great increase of the quantity of work which, in consequence of the division of labour, the same number of people are capable of performing, is owing to three different circumstances; first, to increase the dexterity in every particular workman; secondly, to the saving of the time which is commonly lost in passing from one species of work

to another; and lastly, to the invention of a great number of machines which facilitate and abridge labour, and enable one man to do the work of many.

(Adam Smith (1776) in (Sendova-Franks & Franks 1999))

In sociology, division of labour usually denotes the work specialization (Sayer & Walker 1992). Basically it answers three questions:

1. *What task?* i.e., the description of the tasks to be done, service to be rendered or products to be manufactured.
2. *Why dividing it to individuals?* i.e., the underlying social standards for this division, such as task appropriateness based on class, gender, age, skill etc.
3. *How to divide it?* i.e., the method or process of separating the whole task into small pieces of tasks that can be performed easily.

In the study of biological insects, a worker usually does not perform all tasks, but rather specializes in a set of tasks, according to its morphology, age, or chance (Bonabeau et al. 1999). This division of labour among nest-mates, whereby different activities are performed simultaneously by groups of specialized individuals, is believed to be more efficient than if tasks were performed sequentially by unspecialised individuals. Division of labour has a great *plasticity* where the removal of one class of workers is quickly compensated for by other workers. Thus distribution of workers among different concurrent tasks keep changing according to the external (environmental) and internal conditions of a colony (Garnier et al. 2007).

In artificial social systems, like multi-agent or MRS, the term “division of labour” is often found synonymous to “task-allocation”. However, some researchers (e.g. (Labella 2007)) argued to distinguish these terms due to the origin and particular contextual use of these terms. Particularly, division of labour adopts the biological notion of collective task performance with little or no communication. On the other hand, task allocation follows the meaning of assigning task(s) to particular robot(s) based on individual robot capabilities, typically through explicit communication, such as *intentional cooperation* (Parker 1998). The former is considered under *swarm robotics (SR)* paradigm and latter is done under *traditional MRS*. Sec. 2.3 covers both of these approaches in more detail.

In this dissertation, I closely follow the SR approach for the defining division of labour, but I do not put any restriction on the use of communication. In fact, I view division of labour as a group-level phenomenon which occur due to the individual agent's self-regulatory task selection behaviour. But, unlike SR approach that view communication as expensive and hence try to find solutions avoiding it, I do not advocate for restricting the use of communication. Rather, for the following reasons, along with our generic mechanism of division of labour, i.e. AFM (Chapter 4), I propose some self-regulatory communication strategies to vary communication load dynamically (Chapter 5).

Firstly, from our understanding of different kinds of communication strategies of biological social systems (Sec. 2.2), this is obvious that the role of communication can not be ignored for achieving division of labour in MRS. Instead of being too much addicted to communication-less algorithms, perhaps due to the limitation of current communication technology (such as mimicking biological stigmergy), we need to exploit the existing state of the art in communication technology for developing functional and robust division of labour mechanisms for future MRS. By selecting a suitable communication strategy and enabling robots to self-regulate their certain behaviours, we can significantly reduce the communication load of a MRS.

Secondly, Whatever be the objectives of a target MRS under any of the above approaches, e.g., maximizing robustness, scalability and/or task performance, the issue of task-allocation of an individual robot remains same, i.e., what task should it select at a particular time point considering dynamically changing task requirements, choices of peer robots and environmental conditions. In this issue, unlike traditional MRS approach, I emphasize on maintaining the overall group level performance and robustness, not just focusing on the instantaneous maximum benefit (or minimum cost) of a robot by performing a particular task.

Finally, by combining the above two points, I define division of labour in MRS as a self-regulated task allocation process of a group of robots, where robots can dynamically select suitable tasks, or can switch from one task to another based on continuously sensed and communicated information of tasks, states etc. through their respective sensory and communication channels. Thus, by adopting this self-regulated task selection and communication strategies, some of the robots can have

chances to specialize on some particular tasks, and as a whole, the system can maintain a level of plasticity without producing unnecessary communication burden on the system.

2.2 Communication in biological social systems

Communication plays a central role in self-regulated division of labour of biological societies. In this section communication among biological social insects are briefly reviewed within the context of self-regulated division of labour.

Communication in biological societies serves many closely related social purposes. Most peer-to-peer (P2P) communication include: recruitment to a new food source or nest site, exchange of food particles, recognition of individuals, simple attraction, grooming, sexual communication etc. In addition to that colony-level broadcast communication include: alarm signal, territorial and home range signals and nest markers, communication for achieving certain group effect such as, facilitating or inhibiting a group activity (Holldobler & Wilson 1990). Biological social insects use different modalities to establish social communication, such as, sound, vision, chemical, tactile, electric and so forth. Sound waves can travel a long distance and thus they are suitable for advertising signals. They are also best for transmitting complicated information quickly (Slater 1986). Visual signals can travel more rapidly than sound but they are limited by the physical size or line of sight of an animal. They also do not travel around obstacles. Thus they are suitable for short-distance private signals such as in courtship display. In ants and some other social insects chemical communication is dominant. Any kind of chemical substance that is used for communication between intra-species or inter-species is termed as semiochemical (Holldobler & Wilson 1990). A pheromone is a semiochemical, usually a glandular secretion, used for communication within species. One individual releases it as a signal and others responds it after tasting or smelling it. Using pheromones individuals can code quite complicated messages in smells. For example a typical ant colony operates with somewhere between 10 and 20 kinds of signals (Holldobler & Wilson 1990). Most of these are chemical in nature. If wind and other conditions are favourable, this type of signals emitted by such a tiny species can be detected from several kilometres away. Thus chem-

ical signals are extremely economical of their production and transmission. But they are quite slow to diffuse away. But ants and other social insects manage to create sequential and compound messages either by a graded reaction of different concentrations of same substance or by blends of signals. Tactile communication is also widely observed in ants and other species typically by using their body antennae and forelegs. It is observed that in ants touch is primarily used for receiving information rather than informing something. It is usually found as an invitation behaviour in worker recruitment process. When an ant intends to recruit a nestmate for foraging or other tasks it runs upto a nestmate and beats her body very lightly with antennae and forelegs. The recruiter then runs to a recently laid pheromone trail or lays a new one. In this form of communication limited amount of information is exchanged. In underwater environment some fishes and other species also communicate through electric signals where there nerves and muscles work as batteries. They use continuous or intermittent pulses with different frequencies learn about environment and to convey their identity and aggression messages. The concept of active space is widely used to describe the propagation of signals by species. In a network environment of signal emitters and receivers, active space is defined as the area encompassed by the signal during the course of transmission (McGregor & Peake 2000). In case of long-range signals, or even in case of short-range signals, this area include several individuals where their social grouping allows them to stay in cohesion. The concept of active space is described somewhat differently in case some social insects. In case of ants, this active space is defined as a zone within which the concentration of pheromone (or any other behaviourally active chemical substances) is at or above threshold concentration (Holldobler & Wilson 1990). Mathematically this is denoted by a ratio: The amount of pheromone emitted (Q) The threshold concentration at which the receiving animal responds (K) Q is measured in number of molecules released in a burst or in per unit of time whereas K is measured in molecules per unit of volume. The adjustment of this ratio enables individuals to gain a shorter fade-out time and permits signals to be more sharply pinpointed in time and space by the receivers. In order to transmit the location of the animal in the signal, the rate of information transfer can be increased by either by lowering the rate of emission of Q or by increasing K , or both. For alarm and trail systems a lower value of this ratio is used. Thus, according to need, individ-

ants regulate their active space by making it large or small, or by reaching their maximum radius quickly or slowly, or by enduring briefly or for a long period of time. For example, in case of alarm, recruitment or sexual communication signals where encoding the location of an individual is needed, the information in each signal increases as the logarithm of the square of distance over which the signal travels. From the precise study of pheromones it has been found that active space of alarm signal consists of a concentric pair of hemispheres. (FIG). As the ant enters the outer zone she is attracted inward toward the point source; when she next crosses into the central hemisphere she becomes alarmed. It is also observed that ants can release pheromones with different active spaces.

Active space has a strong role in modulating the behaviours of ants. For example, when workers of *Acanthomyops claviger* ants produce alarm signal due to an attack by a rival or insect predator, workers sitting a few millimetres away begin to react within seconds. However those ants sitting a few centimetres away take a minute or longer to react. In many cases ants and other social insects exhibit modulatory communication within their active space where many individuals involve in many different tasks. For example, while retrieving the large prey, workers of *Aphaenogaster* ants produce chirping sounds (known as stridulate) along with releasing poison gland pheromones. These sounds attract more workers and keep them within the vicinity of the dead prey to protect it from their competitors. This communication amplification behaviour can increase the active space to a maximum distance of 2 meters.

2.3 Overview and key issues of multi-robot systems (MRS)

Historically the concept of multi-robot system comes almost after the introduction of behaviour-based robotics paradigm (Brooks 1986, Arkin 1990). In 1967, using the traditional sense-plan-act or hierarchical approach (Murphy 2000), the first Artificially Intelligent (AI) robot, Shakey, was created at the Stanford Research Institute. In late 80s, Rodney A. Brooks revolutionized this entire field of mobile robotics who outlined a layered, behaviour based approach that acted significantly differently than the hierarchical approach (Brooks 1986). At the same time, Valentino Braitenberg described a set of experiments where increasingly complex

vehicles are built from simple mechanical and electrical components (Braitenberg 1984). Around the same time and with similar principle, Reynolds developed a distributed behavioural model for a bird in a flock that assumed that a flock is simply the result of the interactions among the individual birds (Reynolds 1987). Early research on multi-robot systems also include the concept of cellular robotic system (Fukuda & Nakagawa 1987), (Beni 1988) multi-robot motion planning (Arai et al. 1989, Premvuti & Yuta 1990, Wang 1989) and architectures for multi-robot cooperation (Asama et al. 1989).

From the beginning of the behaviour based paradigm, the biological inspirations influenced many cooperative robotics researchers to examine the social characteristics of insects and animals and to apply them to the design multi-robot systems (Arkin 1998). The underlying basic idea is to use the simple local control rules of various social species, such as ants, bees, birds etc., to the development of similar behaviours in multi-robot systems. In multi-robot literature, there are many examples that demonstrate the ability of multi-robot teams to aggregate, flock, forage, follow trails etc. (Bonabeau et al. 1999, Mataric 1994). The dynamics of ecosystem, such as cooperation, has also been applied in multi-robot systems that has presented the emergent cooperation among team members (McFarland 1994), (Martinoli et al. 1996). On the other hand, the study of competitive behaviours among animal and human societies has also been applied in multi-robot systems, such as that found in multi-robot soccer (Asada et al. 1999).

2.3.1 MRS research paradigms

As discussed above, there are several research groups who follow different approaches to handle multi-robot research problems. Parker (Parker 2008) has summarized most of the recent research approaches into three paradigms:

1. Bioinspired, emergent swarms paradigm,
2. Organizational and social paradigm and
3. Knowledge-based, ontological and semantic paradigm

Bioinspired, emergent swarms paradigm

In bio-inspired, emergent swarms paradigm local sensing and local interaction forms the basis of collective behaviors of swarms of robots. Many researchers addressed the issues of local interaction, local communication (i.e., stigmergy) and other issues of this paradigm (Mataric 1995), (Kube & Zhang 1993). Today, this paradigm has been emerged as a sub-field of robotics called swarm robotics (Sahin & Spears 2005). This is a powerful paradigm for those applications that require performing shared common tasks over distributed workspace, redundancy or fault-tolerance without any complex interaction of entities. Some examples include flocking, herding, searching, chaining, formations, harvesting, deployment, coverage etc.

Swarm robotics is a relatively new branch of robotics where a large number of collective robots are studied from the inspiration of the observation of social insects ants, termites wasps and bees (Sahin & Spears 2005). The term swarm intelligence was first coined by Gerardo Beni (Beni 2005) in late 1980s and during recent years the term swarm robotics emerged as an application of swarm intelligence to multi-robot systems with emphasis on physical embodiment of entities and realistic interactions among the entities and between the entities and their environment. In order to distinguish swarm robotics from other branches of robotics such as collective robotics, distributed robotics, robot colonies and so forth, Sahin proposed a formal definition and a set of criteria for swarm robotics research (Sahin & Spears 2005). According to him, swarm robotics is the study of how large number of relatively simple physically embodied agents can be designed such that a desired collective behaviour emerges from the local interactions among agents and between the agents and the environment. And the notable criteria of swarm robotics research are listed as follows.

Autonomous robots that exclude the sensor networks and may include metamorphic robotic system without having no centralized planning and control element.

Large number of robots, usually ≥ 10 robots, or at least having provision for scalability if the group size is below this number.

Mostly homogeneous groups of robots that typically exclude the multi-robot soc-

cer teams having heterogeneous robots.

Relatively incapable of inefficient robots that is the task complexity enforces either cooperation among robots or increased performance or robustness without putting no restriction on individual robot's hardware/software complexity.

Robots with local sensing and communication capabilities that does not use global coordination channel to coordinate among themselves, rather enforces distributed coordination.

Modelling the swarms is a key issue in swarm robotics. This is aimed for investigating suitable models and algorithms for control and task-allocation of swarms of robots. A review of models and approaches for coordination and control of dynamic multi-agent systems by (Gazi & Fidan 2006) presented that a number of approaches can be used to model swarm robotic systems with the specific focus on major issues like stability, performance, robustness and scalability. Based on the relevance to our study, we have discussed them as follows.

Behaviour-based approaches: The ease of implementation of a behaviour-based robotic system has inspired researchers to follow behaviour-based approaches for modelling swarm robotic systems using variety of specific swarm behaviours. Early research of Reynold provided the example of a behaviour-based approach for swarm coordination such as, flocking of birds (Reynolds 1987). Recent studies on behaviour-based approaches include the work of (Balch & Arkin 1998) where they have evaluated the formation acquisition and stabilization of multi-robot systems. Several other researchers used other techniques, such as use of adaptation rules (Liu et al. 2007), collective behaviours (Cianci et al. 2007) etc., for implementing a behaviour-based swarm robotic system.

Probabilistic approaches: Probabilistic approaches and Markov models also present attractive alternatives for modelling of swarm behaviour. They typically use the population level swarming dynamics in a non spatial way in terms of frequency distributions of groups of various size (Gazi & Fidan 2006). A recent

review of probabilistic approaches for swarm modelling is presented in (Lerman et al. 2005).

Asynchronous swarm model based approaches: Asynchronous multi-agent dynamic systems are difficult to tract for analysis and are not widely found in literature. One of the pioneer study by (Beni & Liang 1996) provided sufficient conditions for the asynchronous convergence of linear swarm to a synchronously achievable configuration. Some other recent studies can be found in (Gazi & Fidan 2006).

Control theoretic approaches: Control theoretic approaches include potential field, feedback linearisation, sliding mode, and various non-linear control approaches, e.g., Fuzzy, Neural nets, Knowledge-based/Rule-based, Lyapunov analysis etc. In recent years, combined or hybrid approaches, e.g., neuro-fuzzy, are also being adopted for modelling swarm behaviours and learning parameter settings of a system (Sahin et al. 2007).

Artificial Physics based approaches: Artificial physics based approaches use the fundamental laws of physics such as the Newton's laws of motion to model swarm robotic systems. In a pioneering work by (Spears & Gordon 1999), this approach has been illustrated and since then many development has been taken place under this framework to address the issue of formation stabilization, surveillance, coverage of a region etc.

Multi-agent based and other approaches: Since the field of swarm intelligence and swarm robotics is expanding contentiously many researchers are putting efforts to bring newer swarm models based on multi-agent based other techniques which are not reviewed here explicitly.

Organizational and social paradigm

Organizational and social paradigms are typically based on organization theory derived from human systems that reflects the knowledge from sociology, economics, psychology and other related fields. To solve complex problems this paradigm usually follows the cooperative and collaborative forms of distributed intelligence. In multi-robot systems the example of this paradigm is found in two major formats:

the use of roles and value system and market economics. In multi-robot applications under this paradigm, an easy division of labor is achieved by assigning roles depending on the skills and capabilities in individual team member. For example, in multi-robot soccer (Stone & Veloso 1999, Asada et al. 1999) positions played by different robots are usually considered as defined roles. On the contrary, in market economics approach (Gerkey & Mataric 2002, Dias et al. 2006) task allocation among multiple robots are done via market economics theory that enables the selection of robots for specific tasks according to their individual capabilities determined by a bidding process.

Knowledge-based, ontological and semantic paradigm

The third paradigm, commonly used for developing multi-agent systems, is knowledge-based, ontological and semantic paradigm. Here knowledge is defined as ontology and shared among robots/agents from disparate sources. It reduces the communication overhead by utilizing the shared vocabulary and semantics. Due to low bandwidth, limited power, limited computation and noise and uncertainty in sensing/actuation, the use of this approach is usually restricted in multi-robot systems. Although this approximate classification includes most of the research directions it is very hard to specifically categorize all diverse researches on multi-robot systems. However, most of the researchers select a suitable paradigm to abstract the problem from an specific perspective with a fundamental challenge to determine how best to achieve global coherence from the interactions of entities at the local level.

Whatever the principle characteristics of a MRS, e.g., homogeneity, coupling, communication methods etc., each MRS must address some basic problems to some degree. For example, usually every MRS adopts a control architecture under a specific paradigm. Similarly every MRS address the issues of communication, localization, interaction in a way specific to the application and underlying design principles (or philosophies). In the following subsections, we have attempted to summarize the key MRS research issues that would influence the selection and implementation our research. In this initiative we have deliberately omitted the non-central or very specific issues, such as collaborative transport or reconfigurable MRS, that does not directly relate to our research.

2.3.2 MRS Taxonomies

2.3.3 Swarm Robotics

Architecture and control

In MRS, two high-level control strategies are very common: 1) centralized and 2) decentralized or distributed. Under a specific control strategy, traditionally three basic system architectures are widely adopted: deliberative, reactive and hybrid. Deliberative systems based on central planning are well suited for the centralized control approach. The single controller makes a plan from its Sense-Plan-Act (SPA) loop by gathering the sensory information and each robot performs its part. Reactive systems are widely used in distributed control where each robot executes its own controller maintaining a tight coupling between the system's sensors and actuators, usually through a set of well-designed behaviours. Here, various group behaviour emerges from the interactions of individuals that communicate and co-operate when needed. Hybrid systems are usually the mixture of the two above approaches; where each robot can run its own hybrid controller with the help of a plan with necessary information from all other robots. (Mataric 2007) described behaviour-based control architecture as a separate category of distributed control architecture where each robot behaves according to a behaviour-based controller and can learn, adapt and contribute to improve and optimize the group-level behaviour. Although most of the MRS control architectures share some common characteristics (such as distributed and behaviour-based control strategy) based on their difference of underlying design principles we have put them into three groups:

1. Behaviour-based classical architectures
2. Market-based architectures
3. Multi-agent based architectures

Due to the overwhelming amount of literature on MRS architectures it is not possible to include most of them. However, below some representative key architectures strictly designed for MRS are described.

Behaviour-based classical architectures

The ALLIANCE architecture (Parker 1998) is one of the earliest behaviour-based fully distributed architectures. This architecture has used the mathematically modelled behaviour sets and motivational system. The primary mechanism for task selection of a robot is to activate the motivational behaviour partly based on the estimates of other robots behaviour. This architecture was designed for heterogeneous teams of robots performing loosely coupled tasks with fault-tolerance and co-operative control strategy. Broadcast of local eligibility (BLE) (Werger & Mataric 2001) is another behaviour-based architecture that uses port-attributed behaviour technique through broadcast communication method. It was demonstrated to perform coordinated tasks, such as multi-target observation tasks. Major differences between this two behaviour-based systems include the need in ALLIANCE for motivational behaviours to store information about other individual robots, the lack of uniform inter-behaviour communication, and ALLIANCE's monitoring of time other robots have spent performing behaviours rather than BLE's local eligibility estimates. Similar to the above two architectures, many other researchers proposed and implemented many variants of behaviour-based architectures. Some of them used the classic three layer (plan-sequence-execute) approach, e.g., (Simmons et al. 2002) used a Layered Architecture where each layer interact directly to coordinate actions at multiple levels of abstraction.

Market-based architectures

Using the theory of market economics and well-known Contract Net Protocol (CNP) (Davis & Smith 1988), these architectures solve the task-allocation problem by auction or bidding process. Major architectures following market-based approaches include MURDOCH (Gerkey & Mataric 2002), M+ system (Botelho et al. 1999), first-piece auction (Zlot et al. 2002), dynamic role assignments (Chaimowicz et al. 2002) among others.

Multi-agent based architectures

Some MRS architectures are influenced by multi-agent systems (MAS). For example, CHARON is a hierarchical behaviour-based architecture that rely on the notion of agents and modes. Similarly CAMPOUT is another distributed behaviour-based

architecture that provide high-level functionality by making use of basic low-level behaviours in downward task decomposition of a multi-agent planner. It is comprised of five different architectural mechanisms including, behaviour representation, behaviour composition, behaviour coordination, group coordination and communication behaviours.

Interaction and learning

Interaction

According to the Oxford Dictionary of English the term interaction means reciprocal action or influence. In MRS research, such as in (Mataric 1994), interaction is referred to as mutual influence on behaviour. Following this definition, it is obvious that objects in the world do not interact with agents, although they may affect on their behaviour. The presence of an object affects the agent, but the agent does not affects the object since objects, by definition, do not behave, only agents do. However many other researchers acknowledge that interactions of robots with their environment (as found in stigmergic communication) have a great impact on their behaviours. Therefore, we adopt the broad meaning of interaction that is reciprocal action or influence among robots and their environment. From the above review of MRS system architecture, task allocation and communication, it is obvious that interaction among robots and their environment is the core of the dynamics of MRS. Without this interaction, it can not be a functioning MRS. While analysing the role and application of distributed intelligence on MRS, Parker (Parker 2008) presented an excellent classification of interactions of entities of MRS. She viewed the interactions along three different axes:

1. the types of goals of entities (either shared goal such as, cleaning a floor, or, individual goal)
2. whether entities have awareness of others on the team (either aware such as, in cooperative transport, or, unaware such as, in a typical foraging)
3. whether the action of one entity advances the goal of others (e.g., one robot's floor cleaning helps other robots not to clean that part of the floor)

Based on this approximate observation Parker classified interactions into four categories:

Collective interaction: Entities are not aware of others on the team, yet do share goals and their actions are beneficial to team-mates. Mostly, swarm-robotic work of many researchers follow this kind of interaction to perform biologically-relevant tasks, such as foraging, swarming, formation keeping and so forth.

Cooperative interaction: Entities are aware of others on the team, they share goals and their actions are beneficial to their team-mates. This type of interaction is used to reason about team-mates capabilities multiple robots works together, usually in shared workspace, such as cleaning a work-site, pushing a box, performing search and rescue, extra-planetary exploration and so forth.

Collaborative interaction: Having individual goals (and even individual capabilities), entities aware of their team-mates and their actions are beneficial to their team-mates. One example of this kind of interaction is a team of collaborative robots where each must reach a unique goal position by sharing sensory capabilities to all members such as illustrated as coalition formation in (Parker & Tang 2006).

Coordinative interaction: Entities are aware of each other, but they do not share a common goal and their actions are not helpful to other team members. For example, in a common workspace robots try to minimize interference by coordinating their actions as found in multi-robot path planning techniques, traffic control techniques and so on. Beyond this four most common types of interactions Parker also described another kind of interaction in adversarial domain where entities effectively work each other such as multi-robot soccer. Here entities have individual goals, they are aware of each other, but their actions have a negative affect on others goal.

Learning

A great deal of research on multi-robot learning has been carried out since the inception of MRS (Mataric 2001, Yang & Gu 2004, Parker 1995). Learning, identified as the ability to acquire new knowledge or skills and improve one's performance, is useful in MRS due to the necessity of robots to know about itself, its environment and other team-members (Mataric 2007). Learning can improve per-

formance since robot controllers are not perfect by design and robots are required to work in an uncertain environment that all possible states or actions can not be predicted in advance. Besides learning a new skill or piece of knowledge it is also important to forget learned things that are no longer needed or correct as well as, to make room for new things to be learned and stored in a finite memory space of a robot.

Several learning techniques are available in robotics domain, such as reinforce or unsupervised learning, supervised learning and learning by imitation (Mataric 2007). Although reinforce learning, or learning based on environmental or peer feedback, is a good option for MRS, it has been found that in large teams the ability to learn in this way is restricted due to large continuous state and action space (Yang & Gu 2004). Several other learning techniques are also available to explore in MRS domain including Markov models, Q-learning, fuzzy logic, neural nets, game theory, probabilistic or Bayesian theory among others.

Based on a specific model of swarm behaviours researchers generally adopt similar communication methods to enable interaction of swarms as discussed in Section ???. In (Balch 2005) three kinds of communication including, indirect stigmergic communication, direct robot to robot state communication, and goal communication were performed and it was found that in some tasks communication provided performance improvements while others did not. Since then, researchers emphasize on both the necessity and cost of communication in a swarm robotic system. Indirect communication approaches, e.g. virtual pheromone (Payton et al. 2005, Hamann & Worn 2006) by which mobile robots communicated through directional infrared messaging or LEDs, are mainly tried for large teams with the spatially distributed applications such as search and rescue, de-mining etc. More recently, (Cianci et al. 2007) reported a IEEE 802.15.4-compatible radio-communication module in e-puck robot for achieving multiple interactions simultaneously, as demonstrated in their collective decision making scenario. Although research on learning in swarm robotic teams was not explored widely, (Balch 2005) presented an example of reinforcement-based learning in multi-robot soccer and foraging tasks. He concluded that in a team of homogeneous robots with diverse behaviours, communication, interaction and learning are well interconnected and depending on the selection of global or local learning means, learning can be ef-

fectively employed in a swarm robotic system.

Conflict resolution

In MRS, conflicts occur if a resource is required by or, a unique single task is distributed to, more than one robot at any given time. Several resources such as bandwidth, space etc. may be needed by more than one robot. The space sharing problem was treated as traffic control problem in urban areas, but the robots are never restricted in road networks in case of behaviour-based control application (Cao et al. 1997). In explicit communication mode in MRS, the sharing of bandwidth among robots is a great problem in case of applications like multi-robot mapping (Konolige et al. 2003). In large multi-robot team such as in Centibots system (Ortiz et al. 2005), task interference and high bandwidth communication between 100s of robots appear as a significant research challenge.

Localization and exploration

Mobile robot systems highly rely on precise localization for performing their autonomous activities in indoor or outdoor. Localization is the determination of exact pose (position and orientation) with respect to some relative or absolute coordinate system. This can be done by using proprioceptive sensors that monitor motion of a robot or exteroceptive sensors that provide information of world representation, such as global positioning system (GPS) or indoor navigation system (INS). Many other methods are also available, such as landmark recognition, cooperative positioning and other visual methods.

Localization issue of MRS also invites researchers to examine specific areas like exploration and map generation. In exploration problem, robots need to minimize the time needed to explore the given area. Many researchers use various kinds of exploration algorithms for solving this NP-hard problem, such as line-of-sight constrained exploration algorithm (Arkin & Diaz 2002), collaborative multi-robot exploration (Burgard et al. 2000) and so on. In mapping problem, mostly inaccurate localization information from teams of robots are accumulated and combined to generate a map by various techniques, such as probabilistic approaches (Thurn et al. 2000). Similar to in a MRS, localization is one of the hardest problem in swarm robotics. Without the presence of any centralized localization module,

such as GPS or INS, it is not easy to localize precisely and locally the position of a robot with respect to other robots or environment. (Spears et al. 2006) presented a novel technique based on trilateration for localization of swarm robots using ultrasonic and RF transceivers without relying on global information from GPS, beacons, landmarks or maps. This system localize a robot with respect to other nearby robots and this is done using ultrasonic and RF signals. (Schmickl et al. 2006) reported hop-count and bio-inspired strategies for collective perception or how a swarm robot can join multiple instances of individual perception to get a global picture. Distributed mapping is another important application using swarms. (Rothermich et al. 2005) presented a collaborative localization algorithm using landmark based localization technique.

2.3.4 Applications of MRS

MRS systems have been put to numerous application domains that all can not be listed together. Rather than listing all of areas explored by researchers, below we have included few major areas that have received highest attention in the MRS research community. Sahin also listed a set of promising applications for swarm robots including spatially distributed tasks (e.g., environment monitoring), dangerous tasks (e.g., robotic de-miner), tasks that scale-up or scale-down over time, and tasks that require redundancy (Sahin & Spears 2005).

Object Transport

Cooperative transport of large objects (that one robot is unable to handle) by multi-robots was investigated by many researchers such as, following a formal model of cooperative transport in ants (Kube & Zhang 1993), box-pushing by six-legged robots (Mataric et al. 1995). Another kind of object transport problem include clustering objects into piles e.g., (Beckers et al. 1994), collecting waste or trash e.g., (Parker 1994), sorting coloured objects e.g., (Melhuish et al. 1998), constructing a building site collectively (?) and so on.

Mining

It has also been observed that multi-robot teams as micro or mini machines are helpful to improve the control and efficiency of mining and its processing opera-

tions (Dunbar & Klein 2002).

Military and Space Applications

Many researchers address MRS research issues under the requirements of a military or space application. Behaviour-based formation control (Balch & Arkin 1998), landmine detection (Franklin et al. 1995), multiple planetary rovers for various missions (Huntsberger et al. 2004) and so forth, all are the examples of this areas.

2.4 Task-allocation in MRS

Since 90s multi-robot task allocation (MRTA) is a common research challenge that tries to define the preferred mapping of robots to tasks in order to optimize some objective functions (Gerkey & Mataric 2004). Many MRS control architectures have been solely designed to address this task-allocation issue. In 2003 Gerkey et al. formally analysed the complexity and optimality of key architectures (e.g., ALLIANCE, BLE, M+, MURDOCH, First piece auctions and Dynamic role assignment) for this MRTA issue and it has been found that MRTA is an instance of the so-called optimal assignment problem (Gerkey & Mataric 2003) and generally known as NP-hard where optimal solutions can not be found quickly for large problems (Gerkey & Mataric 2004). If we look the MRTA problem from multi-agent system's perspective we can find it is broadly divided into two major categories (Shen et al. 2001):

1. Predefined (off-line) task-allocation and
2. Emergent (real-time) task-allocation.

Usually predefined task allocation method uses either centralized coordination or distributed task-allocation approach. Distributed predefined task-allocation approach is again subdivided into three subcategories:

1. Direct allocation,
2. Task allocation by delegation
3. Task allocation through bidding

In MRS domain, early research on predefined distributed task-allocation approach has been dominated mainly by intentional coordination (Gerkey & Mataric 2004, Parker 1998), the use of dynamic role assignment e.g., (Chaimowicz et al. 2002), and market-based bidding approach (Dias et al. 2006). In intentional coordination e.g., (Parker 1998), robots use direct allocation method to communicate and to negotiate for assigning tasks. This is preferred approach among MRS research community since it is easily understood, easier to design, implement and analysis formally. Task allocation through bidding is mainly based on the Contract Net Protocol (Davis & Smith 1988). Predefined Task allocation through other approaches are also present in literature. For example, inspired by the vacancy chain phenomena in nature, (Torbjrn S. Dahl & Sukhatme 2003) proposed a vacancy chain scheduling (VCS) algorithm for a restricted class of MRTA problems in spatially classifiable domains.

On the other hand emergent task-allocation approach relies on the emergent group behaviours e.g., (Kube & Zhang 1993), such as emergent cooperation (Lerman et al. 2006), adaptation rules (Liu et al. 2007) etc., that lead to task allocation with local sensing, local interactions. It typically uses little or no explicit communication or negotiations between robots. They are more scalable to large team size and more robust via parallelism and redundancy.

MRTA problem can be addressed in many different ways depending upon the paradigm selected to abstract the problem and its relevant constraints and requirements (Parker 2008). Firstly, in emergent task allocation in bioinspired swarms paradigm MRTA homogeneous robots are employed to perform mostly similar tasks only by local sensing and indirect stigmergic (or no) communication. Secondly, in organizational and social paradigm MRTA can follow one of the two major approaches: 1) task allocation by making use of roles and 2) task allocation through bidding. For example, in multi-robot soccer, each role encompasses several specific tasks and heterogeneous robots select their roles based on their position and capabilities. In market-based approach, robots can negotiate with other team-mates to collectively solve a set of tasks. Finally, in knowledge-based approach, also known as intentional coordination, MRTA is done through the modelling of team-mate capabilities, such as by observing the performance of other team-members performance with or without explicit communication.

2.5 Communication in MRS

Communication between robots is an important issue in MRS (Arkin 1998). This is not a prerequisite for the group to be functioning, but often useful component of MRS (Mataric 2007). Let us now investigate why communication is important, how this is usually archived in MRS and related other issues.

Researchers generally agree that communication in MRS usually provides several major benefits, such as:

Exchange of information and improving perception: Robots can exchange potential information (as discussed below) based on their spatial position and knowledge of past events. This, in turn, leads to improve perception over a distributed region without directly sensing it.

Synchronization of actions: In order to perform (or stop performing) certain tasks simultaneously or in a particular order robots need to communicate, or signal, to each other.

Enabling interactions: Communication is not strictly necessary for coordinating team actions. But communication can help a lot to interact (and hence influence) each-other in a team that, in turn, enables robots to coordinate and negotiate their actions.

Since a MRS can be comprised of robots of various computation and communication capabilities, it is also necessary to define the communication content and range (Arkin 1998, Mataric 2007). Usually robots can communicate about various states (e.g., task-related, individual, environmental etc.), their individual intentions and goals.

Robots communicate in a number of ways available under a specific application. This communication methods can be divided into two major categories:

Explicit communication: This is also known as intentional communication. This is done purposefully and usually using wireless radio. Based on the number of recipients of message, the communication process is termed differently. Such as, Broadcast communication: where all other robots receive the message. Peer-to-peer communication: where only a single robot receive the message. Publish-

subscribe communication: where only a selected (previously subscribed) number of robots receive the message. Because explicit communication is costly in terms of both hardware and software, robotic researchers always put extra attention to design such a system by analysing strict requirements such as communication necessity, range, content, reliability of communication channel (loss of message) etc.

Implicit Communication: This is also known as indirect stigmergic communication. This is a powerful way of communication where individuals leave information in the environment. This method was adopted from the social insect behaviour, such as stigmergy of ants (leaving of small amount of pheromone or chemicals behind while moving in a trail). Some researchers also tried to establish communication among robots through vision (Kuniyoshi et al. 1994).

In multi-robot communication researchers have identified several issues. Some of the major issues are discussed here. **Kin Recognition** Kin recognition refers to the ability of a robot to recognize immediate family members by implicit or explicit communication or sensing. In case of MRS, this can be as simple as identifying other robots from objects and environment or as finding team-mates in a robotic soccer. This is a useful ability that helps interaction, such as cooperation among team members.

Representation of Languages

In case of effective communication several researchers also focused on representation of languages and grounding of these languages in physical world.

Fault-tolerance, Reliability and Adaptation

Since every communication channel is not free from noise and corruption of messages significant attention has been also given to manage these no communication situations, such as by setting up and maintaining communication network, managing reliability and adaptation rules when there is no communication link available. In terms of guaranteeing communication, researchers also tried to find ways for a deadlock free communication methods (Arkin 1998), such as signboard communication method (Wang 1989).

2.6 Application of MRS in automated manufacturing

In order to examine the feasibility of our approach of emergent DoL, we have selected the distributed automated manufacturing application domain. Most of the research in this area is inspired by intelligent multi-agent technology (Shen et al. 2001). A few other researchers also tried to apply the concepts of biological self-organization (Ueda 2006, Lazinica & Katalinic 2007). In this section we have reviewed these concepts and technologies mainly focusing on physical embodiment of agents, i.e., the use of multiple mobile robots or automated guided vehicles (AGV).

2.6.1 Multi-agent based intelligent manufacturing

Since early 80s researchers have been applying agent technology to manufacturing enterprise integration, manufacturing process planning, scheduling and shop floor control, material handling and so on (Shen et al. 2006). An agent as a software system that communicates and cooperates with other software systems to solve a complex problem that is beyond the capability of each individual software system (Shen et al. 2001). Most notable capabilities of agents are autonomous, adaptive, cooperative and proactive. There exists many different extensions of agent-based technologies such as Holonic Manufacturing System (HMS) (Bussmann et al. 2004). A holon is an autonomous and cooperative unit of manufacturing system for transporting, transforming, sorting and/or validating information and physical objects.

Agent based technologies have addressed many of the problems encountered by the traditional centralized method. It can respond to the dynamic changes and disturbances through local decision making. The autonomy of individual resource agents and loosely coupled network architecture provide better fault-tolerance. The inter agent distributed communication and negotiation also eliminate the problem of having a single point of failure of a centralized system. These facilitate a manufacturing enterprise to reduce their response time to market demands in globally competitive market. Despite having so many advantages, agent-based systems are still not widely implemented in the manufacturing industry comparing to the other similar technologies, such as distributed objects and web-based technologies due to the lack of integration of this systems with other existing systems particularly real-

time data collection system, e.g., RFID (radio frequency identification), SCADA (supervisory control and data acquisition) etc (Shen et al. 2006). Another barrier is the increased cost of investment in exchange of some additional flexibility and throughput (Schild & Bussmann 2007).

2.6.2 Biology-inspired manufacturing Systems

The insightful findings from biological studies on insects and organisms have directly inspired many researchers to solve problems of manufacturing industries in a biological way. These can be categorized into two groups: one that allocates task with explicit potential fields (PF) and another that allocate tasks without specifying any PF. Below we have discussed both types of BMS.

Explicit potential field based BMS

The biological evidences of the existence of PF between a task and an individual worker such as, a flower and a bee, a food source and an ant, inspired some researchers to conceptualize the assigning of artificial PF between two manufacturing resources. For example, PF is assumed between a machine that produce a material part and a worker robot (or AGV) that manipulates the raw materials and finished products. (Ueda 2006) conceptualized this PF as the attractive and repulsive forces based on machine capabilities and product requirements. Task allocation is carried out based on the local matching between machine capabilities and product requirements. Each machine generates an attractive field based on its capabilities and each robot can sense and matches this attractive field according to the requirements of a product. PF is a function of distance between entities. Here, self-organization of manufacturing resources occurred by the process of matching the machine capabilities and requirements of moving robots. Through computer simulations and a prototype implementation of a line-less car chassis welding (Ueda 2006) found that this system was providing higher productivity and cost-effectiveness of manufacturing process where frequent reconfiguration of factory layout was a major requirement. This approach, was also extended and implemented in a supply chain network and in a simulated ant system model where individual agents were rational agents who selected tasks based on their imposed limitations on sensing.

BMS without explicit potential fields

Several other researchers did not express the above PF for task allocation among manufacturing resources explicitly, rather they stressed on task selection of robots based on the task-capability broadcasts from the machines to the worker robots. In case of (Lazinica & Katalinic 2007), task capabilities are expressed as the required time to finish a task in a specific machine. They used assigned priority levels to accomplish the assembly of different kinds of products in the computer simulation of their bionic manufacturing system. In another earlier computer simulated implementation of swarm robotic material handling of a manufacturing work-cell, (Doty & Van Aken 1993) pointed out several pitfalls of such a BMS system, such as dead-lock in manufacturing in inter-dependant product parts, unpredictability of task completion, energy wastage of robots wandering for tasks etc. Although most of these problems remain unsolved researchers are still exploring the concepts BMS in order to achieve a higher level of robustness, flexibility and operational efficiency in a highly decentralized, flexible, and globally competent next generation automated manufacturing system.

CHAPTER 3

Experimental Tools

3.1 General Methodological Issues

3.1.1 Design of MRS

Before setting up a MRS platform for doing any practical research, one needs to decide the answers of a few basic questions. Firstly, what is the target application domain of this MRS ? Some MRS researches may try to implement and verify the performance of an algorithm inspired from biological social systems, while others may not. Some MRS may focus to solve real-life problems like emergency search and rescue in a disaster site, while others may concentrate on increasing productivity of a manufacturing shop-floor. The selection of this application domain will most likely determine the tasks to be done by individual or group of robots. This will lead to select suitable robots for doing that particular tasks. These tasks and robot group characteristics can be described by using any existing MRS taxonomies, e.g., taxonomies provided by (Gerkey & Mataric 2004) and (Dudek et al. 1996) are widely used for this purpose.

Secondly, what are the organizing principles (i.e., control architecture) of the robot group in question ? From the task requirements and robot capabilities, one need to fit the MRS into a suitable paradigm of architecture and control. In Sec. 2.3 we reviewed three most common architectural paradigms of MRSs: classic knowledge-based, traditional market-based/role-based and bio-inspired swarm

robotic paradigm. Upon selecting a paradigm, most important characteristics of target MRS: e.g., design of individual robot controller, robot-robot and robot-environment communication and coordination patterns etc. will be revealed.

Thirdly, what enabling tools and technologies (hardware and software) are required to function the whole robot group autonomously ? Whatever is the architectural design of a MRS, we need to ensure that whole group can maintain the necessary level of task performance through the desired interaction and communication strategies. For reducing cost and other practical reasons, individuals robots may not have the capabilities to localize itself without the help of an external GPS or camera etc. The enabling technologies will make-up this individual robot's shortcomings. Moreover, based-on a selected communication technology we need to set-up necessary robot-robot and robot-environment inter-networking infrastructure, e.g., network switches, gateways etc.

Finally, what extra hardware and software are necessary to observe and record experiments and its data for further analysis and improvement ? This extra system becomes an essential part of the target MRS.

We intend to design our target MRS for emulating multi-robot manufacturing scenario where robots do some shop-tasks in different machines. The notion of tasks has been kept very simple as our robots are not capable of doing many high-level practical tasks e.g. gripping or recognizing objects, carrying loads etc. Many researchers use additional hardware modules with their robots (e.g., gripper to collect pucks or any small objects from floors). We have not put any effort for emulating that kind of trivial activities, rather we concentrated on the performance of our algorithm, e.g. in task-allocation, from high-level perspectives. Doing real manufacturing tasks has been kept as a future research issue. Thus by "doing a task" our robots usually perform two functions: 1) navigate to a fixed task-location in the experiment arena (hereafter called *navigation*), and 2) they do so by avoiding any dynamic obstacle hereafter called *obstacle avoidance*. Depending on the time-out value of doing a task, a robot can wait at task-location if it arrives earlier or may switch to a different task and change direction on-the-fly. These symbolic tasks can be mapped to any suitable real task in multi-robot manufacturing domain, such as, material handling or attending a machine for various production or maintenance jobs e.g., welding different machine parts, cleaning or doing maintenance

work of a machine etc.

Based on the task-requirements we have selected a simple miniature mobile robot, Epuck, that can do the above navigation tasks avoiding any dynamic or static obstacle. According to the classification of (Dudek et al. 1996) our system can be described as:

SIZE-INF: The robot team size is larger than 2 robots and the number of the tasks. Actually we have kept the robot team size as multiple times larger than the number of tasks.

COM-INF: Robots can communicate with any other robot.

TOP-ADD: Every robot can communicate with any other robot by name or address (link path). Naming of robot's communication link path is assumed to follow any simple convention, e.g., /robot1, /robot2 etc.

BAND-INF: Every robot can communicate with other robot with as much bandwidth as necessary. Since our robots need to exchange simple messages we ignore this bandwidth issue.

ARR-DYN: Robot can change the arrangement dynamically.

CMP-HOM: Each robot is initially identical in both hardware and software, but they can become different gradually by learning different tasks by different degrees (in software).

We have closely followed the swarm robotic principles for controlling the group. Although we do not impose any necessity for local communication and interaction. The details of our control architecture has been described in Sec. expt-tools:arch. Since our robots can not localize themselves by their own hardware we provided them their instant position and orientation (hereafter called *pose*) data information from a multi-robot tracking system (MRTS). Sec. 3.3.1 describes about our tracking system. This system also helps us in recording and logging individual robot's task performance and pose information. We use Bluetooth communication technology, built-in with our E-puck robots, for host PC to robot communication. Robot can also communicate with each-other physically over Bluetooth. However, we do not use that mode of communication. Instead, inter-robot communication is done in host PC's virtual inter-process communication channel. This has been illustrated in Sec. 3.3.1.

3.1.2 Real robot experiments – No simulation

Traditionally robotic researchers use software simulation to validate their model before stepping into real-robot experiments. Simulating a model by software code is easier and much faster compared to real-world experiments. It does not require any sophisticated hardware setup or time-consuming debugging. However, in modern times the abundance of real hardware systems and tools encourage researchers to test their work in real systems from the inception of their models. Here we briefly summarize the reasons why we do not follow the traditional “simulation first” approach. Instead of comparing both approaches extensively, we present our rationale behind doing all our experiments in real hardware.

Firstly, contemporary state-of-the-art agent-based simulation packages are essentially discrete-event simulators that execute models serially in a computer’s CPU (?). However in real-world systems agents act in parallel and give us the “what you see is what you act upon” environment. In simulations that might not be case.

Secondly, the robot-robot and robot-environment interactions are complex and completely unpredictable than their simulations. Unexpected failures and inter-agent interactions will not occur in simulations that can either cause positive or negative effects in experimental results (Krieger & Billeter 2000).

Thirdly, it is not easy to faithfully model communication behaviours of agents in simulations. In our case, we use short-range Bluetooth communication system which is subject to dynamic noise and limited bandwidth conditions.

Fourthly, the dynamic environment conditions, e.g., increased physical interferences of larger team of robots, can also influence the experiment’s outcome which is obvious in simulations.

Finally, we believe that the algorithm tested in real-robots can give us strong confidence for implementing in real-systems and later on, this can also be extended or verified in simulations. However, conversely speaking, algorithm implemented in simulation has no warranty that this will work practically with robots.

3.2 Hardware

3.2.1 E-puck robots

We use E-puck ¹ robots developed by Swiss Federal Institute of Technology at Lausanne (EPFL) and now produced by Cyberbotics ² and some other companies. The upside of using E-puck is: it is equipped with most common sensing hardware, relatively simple in design, low cost, desktop-sized and offered under open hardware/software licensing terms. So any further modification in hardware/software is not limited to any proprietary restriction. However, the downside of using E-puck robot is: its processor is based on dsPIC micro-controller (lack of standard programming tool-chains), limited amount of memory (lack of on-board camera image processing option) and default communication module is based-on Bluetooth (limited bandwidth and manual link configuration). So the programming of E-puck can be done through C language and uploaded from PC to robot through wire: I^2C and RS232 channel or, through Bluetooth wireless communication channel. This can be tedious and time-consuming if one needs to change the robot controller frequently. However, we intend to keep the robot's functionalities very simple and limited to two main tasks: avoiding obstacles and navigating from one place to another. Thus the default hardware of E-puck seems enough for our experiments.

Table 3.1 lists the interesting hardware information about an E-puck robot. The 7 cm diameter desktop-sized robot is easy to handle. Its speed and power autonomy is also reasonable compared with similar miniature robots such as Khepera and its peers (?). The IR sensors provide an excellent capabilities for obstacle avoidance task. Although we do not make use of the tiny camera of E-puck, the combination of sound and LEDs can be very effective to detect low-battery power or any other interesting event. By default, E-puck is shipped with a basic firmware that is capable of demonstrating a set of its basic functionalities. Using the supplied Bluetooth serial communication protocol (hereafter *BTCom protocol*), it is possible to establish serial communication link between host PC and robot firmware at a maximum possible speed of 115 kbps. Using this protocol, one can remotely send command to robot, e.g., set the speed of the motors, turn on/off

¹www.e-puck.org

²<http://www.cyberbotics.com>

Table 3.1: E-puck robot hardware

| Feature | Description |
|---------------|--|
| Diameter | about 7 cm |
| Motion | max. 15 cm/s speed (2 stepper motors) |
| Battery power | about 3 hours (5Wh LiION rechargeable battery) |
| Processor | 16 bits micro-controller with DSP core, Microchip dsPIC 30F6014A at 60MHz (about 15 MIPS) |
| Memory | RAM: 8 KB; FLASH: 144 KB |
| IR sensors | 8 IR sensors measuring ambient light and proximity of obstacles in a range of 4 cm |
| LEDs | 8 red LEDs on a ring and 1 green LED in the body |
| Camera | colour camera (max. resolution of 640x480) |
| Sound | 3 omni-directional microphones and on-board speaker capable of playing WAV or tone sounds |
| Bluetooth | for robot-computer and robot-robot wireless communication |

LEDs and read the sensor values, e.g., read the IR values or capture image of the camera etc.

3.2.2 Overhead GigE camera

In order to set-up a multi-robot tracking system (MRTS), we have selected a state-of-the-art GE4900C colour camera from Prosilica³. The Prosilica GE-Series camera, are very compact, high-performance machine vision cameras with Gigabit Ethernet interface. This has following main features:

CCD technology convert light into electric charge and process it into electronic signals. Unlike in a complementary metal oxide semiconductor (CMOS) sensor, CCD provides a very sophisticated image capturing mechanism that gives high uniformity in image pixels. The high resolution enables us to track a relatively large area e.g., 4m X 3m. In this case, 1 pixel dot in image roughly can represent approximately 1mm X 1mm area. Although the frame rate may seem low initially, but this small frame-rate gives optimum image processing performance with large image sizes, e.g. 16 MB/frame. Prosilica offers both Windows and Linux SDK for image capture and other necessary operations. Using this SDK, we have converted

³<http://www.prosilica.com>

Table 3.2: Features of Prosilica GigE Camera GE4900C

| Feature | Description |
|------------------|--|
| Type | Charge-coupled device (CCD) Progressive |
| CCD Sensor | Kodak KAI-16000 |
| Size (L x W x H) | 66x66x110 (in mm) |
| Resolution | 16 Megapixels (4872x3248) |
| Frame rate | Max. 3 frames per second at full resolution |
| Interface | Gigabit Ethernet (cable length up to 100 meters) |
| Image output | Bayer 8/12 bit |

Table 3.3: Server PC Configuration

| | |
|---------------|---|
| Processor | Quad-Core Intel Xeon Processor up to 3.33GHz (1333MHz FSB, 64-bit, 2X 6MB L2 cache) |
| RAM | 32GB (4GB ECC DIMMS x 8 slots) |
| Graphics Card | NVIDIA Quadro FX 570 (Memory: 256MB) |
| Hard-disk | SATA 3.0Gb/s 7200RPM 2 x 250 GB |
| OS | Ubuntu Linux 9.10 64bit |

default Bayer8 format image into RGB format image and used that in our tracking software.

3.2.3 Server PC Configuration

We use Dell Precision T5400 server-grade PC with the following main technical specifications: This high performance PC has supported us implementing our algorithms without having any fear of running out of RAM. Since the maximum supported RAM of a 32 bit PC architecture is limited to 2 GB we select Ubuntu Linux 9.10 64bit OS. As an open-source OS, Ubuntu offers excellent reliability, performance and community support. In order to enable Bluetooth communication in our host PC, we have added 8 USB-Bluetooth adapters (Belkin F8T017) through a suitable USB-Bluetooth hub.

3.3 Enabling Software Tools and Frameworks

3.3.1 SwisTrack: A Multi-robot Tracking System

SwisTrack: a multi-agent tracking system In almost all types of robotic experiments, vision-based tracking becomes the standard feasible solution for tracking robot positions, orientations and trajectories. This is due to the low cost of camera hardware and availability of plenty of standard image-processing algorithms from computer vision and robotic research community. However, setting-up a real-time multi-agent tracking platform using existing software solutions are not a trivial job. Commercial systems tend to provide sub-millimetre level high precision 3D tracking solutions with a very high price ranging from tens of thousands of pounds which is typically greater than the annual research budget of a medium sized research lab in UK! Besides robotics researchers prefer open-source solution to closed-source proprietary one due to the need for improving certain algorithms and applications continuously. Another line of solution, namely borrowing certain open-source tracking code from XYZ lab, typically ends up with a lot of frustration while tuning parameters manually, fixing the lab lighting conditions, seeing bad performance of programs that frequently leak memory or show segmentation fault and so forth. GUI or camera calibration can hardly be found in those so-called open-source applications. The third option for solving this tracking issue becomes “re-inventing the wheel” or hiring some research students to build a system from scratch. Certainly this is also not feasible due to the limited time, resource and skill in this field. Another big issue is the expiration of research fellowship before doing any practical research!

In the beginning of our research we met the all three types of scenario stated above. We got very high price quotes from several commercial motion capture solution providers including, Vicon ⁴ and some others. We tested some well-known and some not-so-well-known open-source object tracking systems including ARTag ⁵, ARToolKitPlus ⁶. We also developed our own versions of Open-CV ⁷ algorithms for tracking colour blobs based on a GNOME application Cynbe’s

⁴www.vicon.com

⁵www.artag.net

⁶http://studierstube.icg.tu-graz.ac.at/handheld_ar/artoolkitplus.php

⁷<http://opencv.willowgarage.com>

vision-app⁸. However, our algorithms failed to scale well due to the fluctuations in lighting conditions, lack of proper integration of all related components and some other issues (Sarker 2008). Finally, we settled with SwisTrack (Lochmatter et al. 2008), a state-of-the-art open-source multi-agent tracking platform developed at Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne (EPFL), Switzerland. Thanks to the hard working developers and generous sponsors of EPFL who offer this excellent tool to scientific research community and empower many research labs to track multi-agent systems out-of-the-box.

With the improved version 4 released in February 2008, SwisTrack is now becoming the *de-facto* standard tool for multi-robot tracking. Being open-source, flexible, modular and customizable, SwisTrack provides a clean development and deployment path for tracking marked or marker-less objects in real-time. SwisTrack is written in C++ using common C++ libraries and frameworks. The component-based modular development style is very powerful for developing a custom algorithm and wrap it in a custom component. In Sec. 3.3.2 we show that how we append our custom communication components in the image processing pipeline. This pipeline can be compared with Unix command processing where output of one command becomes the input of another subsequent command and many commands form a chain or pipeline. Here in SwisTrack, at first an image capturing component grab camera image using USB, IEEE1394/Firewire, GigE or other supported interfaces (see Fig. ??). Then subsequent SwisTrack components work on this image and do various processings e.g., background subtractions, colour conversions, blob-detection, tracking etc. These components follow standard computer-vision algorithms and can be used without any code modification. But if necessary they can also be modified or optimized though changing source code and/or tuning parameters on-the-fly. As shown in Fig. ?? SwisTrack GUI can take parameters in real-time and update images. Final output from images, e.g., object position, orientation, trajectory etc. can be sent over standard communication interfaces, e.g. TCP/IP, NMEA etc. SwisTrack has a lot of other features, such as multi-camera tracking, remote-control of SwisTrack over TCP/IP etc. which are documented in SwisTrack Wiki-book documentation⁹.

⁸<http://muq.org/cynbe/vision-apps>

⁹<http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/SwisTrack>

We have set-up SwisTrack with our Prosilica GigE camera GE4900C and configured it for tracking about 40 E-puck robots with their on-top markers. These markers are binary-coded numbers (aka em circular bar-codes) that have certain binary bits or chip-lengths. We have used 20 bits and 15 bits chip-lengths. In order to uniquely identify the position and orientation of these markers these numbers are encoded with a fixed hamming distance, i.e. differences in bits of any two numbers. We have used a fixed hamming distance of 6 bits. As seen in Fig. ?? these markers are 8cm diameter and clearly identified and tracked by SwisTrack from a camera image resolution of 4872x3248. SwisTrack has no component for grabbing our Prosilica GigE camera and we have developed a Prosilica GigE input component using Prosilica SDK and Open-CV library. The version of SwisTrack that we have used (late May 2008 version, SVN no.) has worked pretty well except a few minor things, such as real-time configuration changing was very unstable due to our large camera image size (16MB/frame). In order to avoid that we use static configuration files that is loaded by SwisTrack in the beginning of our experiment runs.

Fig. ?? shows the components that we have used throughout our experiments. Along with the standard blob detection and circular bar-code reading components, we use our custom D-Bus server communication component that send pose information to D-Bus IPC channels (see Sec. 3.3.2). These components require a little tuning of few parameters, e.g. blob size, blob counts etc. They can be done once and saved in component configuration files for loading them in next runs. Although SwisTrack provides a wide range of components for object trajectory tracking we have not used them yet. we have not saved grabbed camera images as video from within SwisTrack due to heavy CPU load and memory usage. Besides, the video output component of our version of SwisTrack can not produce smooth video files in our set-up. So, we occasionally save image frames in files and most of our experiments, we use Ubuntu Linux's standard desktop tool, *recordmydesktop*¹⁰ for capturing screen as video. The standard fluorescent lightings of our lab seem sufficient for our overhead GigE camera and we have prevented interferences of outside sun-lights by putting black blinds in the window. Our camera has been configured automatically through standard configuration files while program start-up.

¹⁰<http://recordmydesktop.sourceforge.net/>

3.3.2 D-Bus: An Inter-Process Communication Protocol

Inter-process communications (IPC) among various desktop software components enable them to talk to each other and exchange data, messages or request of services. Technological advancements in computer and communication systems now allow robotic researchers to set-up and conduct experiments on multi-robot systems (MRS) from desktop PCs. Many compelling reasons, including open licensing model, availability of open-source tools for almost free of cost, community support etc., make Linux as an ideal operating system for MRS research. However the integration of heterogeneous software components in Linux desktop becomes a challenging issue, particularly when each robot-control software needs sensory and other data input from various other software components (e.g. pose data from a tracker server, task information from a task server etc).

Traditional IPC solutions in a standard Linux desktop, e.g. pipes, sockets, X atoms, shared memory, temporary files etc. (hereafter called *traditional IPCs*), are too static and rigid to meet the demand of a dynamic software system ((Wittenburg 2005)). On the other hand, complex and heavy IPC like CORBA fails to integrate into a development tool-chain efficiently. They also require a steep learning curve due to their complex implementations. Besides, the failure of Desktop Communication Protocol (DCOP) in system-wide integration and interoperability issues encouraged the development of the D-Bus message bus system, D-Bus for short ((Pennington et al. 2010)). This message bus system provides simple mechanisms for applications to talk to one another (see details in Section 2). In this paper we describe how we exploit the simplicity and power of D-Bus for running a large MRS.

In pursuing a suitable multi-robot control architecture for our large number of robots, we have found that traditional IPCs are inadequate to support the important requirements of IPC among several heterogeneous software components of a large MRS. Firstly, real-time support in IPC is critical for connecting time-critical control applications. For example, a multi-robot tracking system (MRTS) can share robot pose information with a robot-controller client (RCC) through shared memory (SHM). This pose information can be used to help navigating a robot in real-time. However if MRTS crashes and stops writing new pose information into the SHM, RCC has no default mechanism to know that SHM data is outdated. Some form of

reference counting mechanism can be used to overcome this issue, but that makes the implementation of RCC complicated and error-prone.

Secondly, IPC must be scalable so that adding more software components (thus more robots, sensors, etc.) in the information sharing game does not affect the overall system performance. But clearly this can not be achieved through traditional IPCs, e.g. SHM or temporary files, as the access to computer memory and disk space is costly and time consuming. Thirdly, IPC should be flexible and compatible enough to allow existing software components to join with newly developed components in the information sharing without much difficulties. Again existing IPC mechanisms are too static and rigid to be integrated with existing software components. Besides, incompatibility often arises among different applications written in different programming languages with different semantics of IPC. Fourthly, IPC should be robust, fault-tolerant and loosely coupled so that if one ceases to work others can still continue to work without strange runtime exceptions. Finally, IPC should be implemented simply and efficiently in any modern high level programming languages, e.g., C/C++, Java, Python etc. Practically this is very important since IPC will be required in many places of code and application programmers have little time to look inside the detail implementation of any IPC.

Here we present a scalable and distributed multi-robot control architecture built upon D-Bus IPC. D-Bus IPC works asynchronously in real-time. It has virtually no limit how many software components participate in information sharing. In fact, to the best of our knowledge, the performance of D-Bus daemon does not vary if the number of participating software components varies. In this paper we have shown that by using only the signalling interfaces, SwisTrack ((Lochmatter et al. 2008)), an open-source multi-robot tracking tool can be integrated with our multi-robot control framework. All software components are loosely coupled and unlike traditional IPCs, one does not depend on another for setting up and shutting down IPC infrastructure. For example, in case of SHM one software component explicitly needs to set-up and clean-up SHM spaces. In case of D-Bus any software component can join and leave in the information sharing process at any time. Each component implements its own fall-back strategy if desired information from another component is unavailable at any time. Based on a thin C API, D-Bus also provides many binding in common programming languages. In this work, we use




Figure 3.1: A typical view of D-Bus message bus system

dbus-python, a Python binding for D-Bus, that provide us a very clean and efficient IPC mechanism.

D-Bus Overview

D-BUS was designed from scratch to replace CORBA and DCOP to fulfil the needs of a modern Linux system. D-BUS can perform basic application IPC as well as it can facilitate sending events, or signals, through the system, allowing different components in the system to communicate. D-BUS is unique from other IPC mechanisms in several ways, e.g. 1) the basic unit of IPC in D-BUS is a message, not a byte stream, 2) D-BUS is bus-based and 3) It has separate system-wide and user/session-wide bus ((Love 2005)). The simplest form of D-Bus communication is process to process. However, it provides a daemon, known as the message bus daemon, that routes messages between processes on a specific bus. In this fashion, a bus topology is formed (see Fig. 3.1), allowing processes to speak to one or more applications at the same time. Applications can send to or listen for various events on the bus.

D-Bus specification ((Pennington et al. 2010)) provides full details of D-Bus message protocols, message and data types, implementation guidelines and so forth. Here we discuss some relevant part of this specification. As we have already mentioned D-Bus provides a system-wide system bus and user-level session bus. Fig. 3.1 an example of this bus structure. In this paper we have limited our discussion to the latter one and skipped some advance topics like D-Bus security and so on. Here a few basic D-Bus terminologies have been introduced from D-Bus literature. **D-Bus Connection:** *DBusConnection* is the structure that a program first uses to

| |
|---------------------------------|
| TYPE = "Signal" |
| INTERFACE = "uk.ac.newport.RIL" |
| PATH = "/Epuck1246" |
| MEMBER = "RobotStatus" |
| BODY |
| UNIT32 1 |
| STRING "Available" |

Figure 3.2: A typical structure of a D-Bus signal message

initiate talking to the D-Bus daemon, Programs can either use `DBUS_BUS_SYSTEM` or `DBUS_BUS_SESSION` to talk to the respective daemons.

DBus Message: It is simply a message between two process. All the DBus intercommunication are done using *DBusMessage*. These messages can have the following four types: method calls, method returns, signals, and errors. The DBusMessage structure can carry data payload, by appending boolean integers, real numbers, string, arrays, etc. to the message body.

D-Bus Path: This is the path of a remote *Object* (hereafter, this is capitalized to avoid ambiguity) of target process, e.g. `orgfreedesktopDBus`.

D-Bus Interface: This is the interface on a given Object to talk with, e.g. `org.freedesktop.DBus`.

D-Bus Method Call: This is a type of DBus message that used to invoke a method on a remote Object.

D-Bus Signal: This is a type of DBus message to make a signal emission. As stated in D-Bus specification, Signal messages must have three header fields: `PATH` giving the object the signal was emitted from, plus `INTERFACE` and `MEMBER` giving the fully-qualified name of the signal. The `INTERFACE` header is required for signals, though it is optional for method calls. The structure of a signal is shown Fig. 3.2 and it shows the design of robot-status signal that emits over specified interfaces and paths with a data payload of an integer and a string containing robot-status message.

D-Bus Error: This is the structure that holds the error code which occurs by calling a DBus method.

Strategies for Application Integration

Under D-Bus, there are two basic mechanisms for applications to interact with each other: by calling a remote Object of target application and by emitting a signal for interested applications. To perform a method call on a D-BUS Object, a method call message must be sent to that Object. It will do some processing and return either a method return message or an error message. Signals are different in that they cannot return anything: there is neither a "signal return" message, nor any other type of error message see this ¹¹ for some example use-cases. Thus on D-Bus everything can be done asynchronously without the need of polling.

D-Bus provides several language bindings for integrating D-Bus to any native application. The core D-BUS API, written in C, is rather low-level and large. On top of this API, bindings integrate with programming languages and environments, including Glib, Python, Qt and Mono. On top of providing language wrappers, the bindings provide environment-specific features. For example, the Glib bindings treat D-BUS connections as GObjects and allow messaging to integrate into the Glib mainloop. The preferred use of D-BUS is definitely using language and environment-specific bindings, both for ease of use and improved functionality ((Love 2005)).

3.3.3 BTCom/Myro: E-puck Robot Control Programs

3.3.4 Bluez: Linux's Bluetooth Communication Stack

3.3.5 Python's Multiprocessing: Multi-Threading Made-easy

3.4 Multi-robot control architecture

Controlling a robot in a well-organized manner involves following a control architecture. As defined by (Mataric 2007), a robot control architecture is a set of guiding principles and constraints for organizing a robot's control system. Since last few decades, robot control architectures has been evolving from deliberative to reactive and hybrid (combination of deliberative and reactive), behaviour-based and to some other forms. It has been well established that hybrid control can bring together the best aspects of both reactive and deliberative control by combining the

¹¹<http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/linux/library/l-dbus.html>




Figure 3.3: Classical three layer robot control architecture




Figure 3.4: Our abstract multi-robot control architecture

real-time low-level device control and high-level deliberative action control. Only reactive (or deliberative) control approach is not enough for enabling robots to do complex tasks in a dynamic environments ((Gat et al. 1997)).

As shown in Fig. 3.3, this is usually achieved by a three-layer architecture composed of deliberator, sequencer and controller. Controller usually works under real-time reactive feedback control loops to do simple tasks by producing primitive robot behaviours, e.g. obstacle avoidance, wall following etc. Deliberator performs time-consuming computations, e.g. running exponential search or computer vision processing algorithms. In order to achieve specific task goals, the middle component, sequencer, typically integrates both deliberator and controller maintaining consistent, robust and timely robot behaviours.

Characteristics of *HEAD*

We organized our multi-robot control architecture, *HEAD* into three layers as shown in Fig. 3.4. Although *HEAD* has been designed by adopting the principles of hybrid architecture it has many distinct features that are absent in a classical hybrid architecture. Firstly, with respect to controller layer, *HEAD* broadly views sensing and control as communication with external entities. Communication as sensing is not new, e.g. it has been reported in multi-agent learning

((Mataric 1998)) and many other places. When robots' on-board computing resources are limited communication can effectively make up their required sensing capabilities. On the other hand, low-level device control is also a series of communication act where actuator commands are typically transmitted over a radio or physical link. Thus, at the bottom layer of HEAD is the communication layer where all external communication takes place over any suitable medium. Components sitting in this layer either act as sensors that can receive environmental state, task information, self pose data etc. via suitable communication link or do the real-time control of devices by sending actuator commands over a target communication channel.

Secondly, the apparent tight coupling with sensors to actuators has been reduced by introducing a data and event management (DEM) layer. DEM acts as a short-term storage of sensed data and various events posted by both controller and deliberator components. Task sequencing has been simplified by automated event triggering mechanism. DEM simply creates new event channels and interested components subscribe to this event for reading or writing. If one components updates an event DEM updates subscribed components about this event. Controller and deliberator components synchronize their tasks based on this event signals. DEM efficiently serves newly arrived data to controller and deliberator components by this event mechanism. Thus neither specialized languages are needed to program a sequencer nor cumbersome if/else checks are present in this layer.

Finally, deliberator layer of HEAD has been described as an application layer that runs real-application code based on high-level user algorithms as well as low-level sensor data and device states. In classic hybrid architecture the role of this layer has been described mainly in two folds: 1) producing task plan and sending it to sequencer and 2) answering queries made by sequencer. Application layer of HEAD follows the former one by generating plan and queuing it to DEM layer, but it does not support the latter one. DEM layer never makes a query to an application since it acts only as a passive information gateway. Thus this reduced coupling between DEM and application layer has enhanced HEAD with additional robustness and scalability. Additional applications can be added with DEM layer's existing or new event interfaces. Any malfunction or failure in application layer or even in communication layer can be isolated without affecting others.




Figure 3.5: General outline of *HEAD*. Robot-Controller-Client application has been splitted into two parts: one runs locally in server PC and another runs remotely, e.g., in embedded PC

D-Bus Signal Interfaces and Software Integrations

D-Bus IPC allows us to completely decouple the interaction of different parts of software components of *HEAD*. Here we use the term *software component* or application to denote the logical groupings of several sub-processes or threads that works under a mother process or main thread (here we use the term thread and process interchangeably). Software components that follows our three-layer architecture for grouping its processes are called *native component* whereas existing software applications are called *external component*. As shown in Fig. 3.5, RCC and TPA are native software components of *HEAD* whereas SwisTrack, a multi-robot tracking tool ((Lochmatter et al. 2008)) used with *HEAD*, is called an external component.

In order to integrate both native and external components with *HEAD*. We have designed two separate communication process: a D-Bus signal reception process, SignalListener, and a D-Bus signal emission process, SignalEmitter. Inside a native component both of this process can communicate with data and event man-

agement process, DataManager, by using any suitable mechanisms, such as, multi-threading, multi-processing (offered in Python multiprocessing¹¹), TCP or any other networking protocol.

Any external component that intend to act as a sensing (actuating) element of HEAD need to implement a SignalEmitter (SignalListener). For example, we extend SwisTrack with D-Bus signal emitting code (aka SignalEmitter) so that it can emit robot pose messages to individual robots D-Bus path under a common interface (uk.ac.newport.SwisTrack). This emitted signal is then caught by SignalListener of individual robot's RCC. Thus the tight-coupling between SwisTrack and RCC has been removed. During run-time SwisTrack can flexibly track variable number of robots and broadcast their corresponding pose messages without any re-compilation of code. Moreover, in worse cases, if SwisTrack or RCC crashes it does not affect any other component at run-time.

Expanding SignalEmitter and SignalListener for more D-Bus signals does not require to make any change the IPC implementation code. Let us first look at how to setup a signal emission process.

Steps for setting up signal emission:

Step 1: Connect to a D-Bus daemon. Sample C code:

```
DBusError error;
DBusConnection *conn;
dbus_error_init (&error);
conn = dbus_bus_get (DBUS_BUS_SESSION, &error);
```

Step 2: Optionally reserve a D-Bus path or service name (this is not required if the same path is not used by any other process).

Step 3: Send signal to a specified path. Sample C code:

```
DBusMessage *message;
message = dbus_message_new_signal (
    "/target/dbus/path", "target.dbus.interface",
    "Config");
/* Send the signal */
dbus_connection_send (connection, message, NULL);
dbus_message_unref (message);
```

In order to add more signals we just need to repeat step 3 as many times as we need. On the other hand, signal listening can be done by setting up a suitable event

¹¹<http://docs.python.org/library/multiprocessing.html>

loop under any supported language bindings. A basic implementation of both of these processes in Python language can be found in this tutorial ¹².

¹²<http://dbus.freedesktop.org/doc/dbus-python/doc/tutorial.html>

Attractive Field Model for Self-regulated Task Allocation

4.1 Inter-disciplinary motivations

Scientific studies show that a large number of animal as well as human social systems grow, evolve and generally continue functioning well by the virtue of their individual self-regulatory mechanism of division of labour (DOL) (Bonabeau et al. 1999). This has been accomplished without any central authority or any explicit planning and coordinating element. Indirect communication such as stigmergy is instead used to exchange information among individuals. In robotic systems, *multi-robot task allocation* (MRTA) is a common research challenge (Gerkey & Mataric 2004). It is generally identified as the problem of assigning tasks to appropriate robots at appropriate times taking into account potential changes in the environment and/or the performance of the robots. MRTA is an optimal assignment problem that has been shown to be NP-hard, so optimal solutions can not be expected for large problems (Parker 2008). In addition to the inherent complexity of MRTA, the problem is also commonly restricted to avoid central planners or coordinators for task assignments. The robots are also commonly limited to local sensing, communication and interaction (Lerman et al. 2006) where no single robot has complete knowledge of the past, present or future actions of other robots or a complete view of the world state. For larger teams of robots the bandwidth of local communication channels is also limited. In practical implementations the

computational and communication bandwidth requirements restrict the quality of the solutions to MRTA problems (Gerkey & Mataric 2004, Lerman et al. 2006).

Traditionally MRTA solutions are divided into two major categories: 1) Predefined (off-line) and 2) Emergent (real-time) task-allocation (Shen et al. 2001). Early research on predefined task-allocation approaches was dominated by intentional coordination, use of dynamic role assignment (Parker 2008) and market-based bidding approach (Dias et al. 2006). In the intentional approaches the robots use direct task-allocation method to communicate and to negotiate tasks. This approach is intuitive, comparatively straightforward to design and implement and can be analysed formally. However, this approach typically works well only when the number of robots is small (Lerman et al. 2006). The emergent task-allocation approach on the other hand, relies on the emergence of group behaviours, e.g., emergent cooperation (Lerman et al. 2006), using mechanisms such as *adaptation rules* (Liu et al. 2007). This approach typically handles systems with local sensing, local interactions and typically little or no explicit communication or negotiations between robots. Emergent systems are more scalable and robust due to their inherent parallelism and redundancy. However in these systems, solutions are unintuitive and thus difficult to design, analyse formally and implement practically (Gerkey & Mataric 2004, Lerman et al. 2006). The solutions found by these systems are typically sub-optimal and, as the emergence is a result of interactions among robots and their environment, it is also difficult to predict exact behaviours of robots and overall system performance. The current challenges in emergent task allocation approaches have lead us to look for a suitable alternative. In nature we find that task allocation in animal or insect societies can be governed by non-centralized rules and that they are self-regulating and self-stabilizing (Bonabeau et al. 1999). Moreover studies in sociology (Sayer & Walker 1992), strategic management (Kogut 2000) and related disciplines show that decentralized self-regulated systems exist and that they can survive and grow over time.

As a part of a collaborative project, we have studied the behaviour of ants, humans and robots and have developed the attractive field model (AFM), a common formal model of division of labour in social systems (?). In this paper, we present an application of AFM in a robotic system. Section 4.2 presents AFM and an associated communication model that allows us to implement AFM as a MRTA mechanism.

Section 5.5 introduces our implementation of MRTA including the interactions between the hardware, software and communication modules. Section 5.6 presents the design of our experiments including specific parameters and observables. Section 5.7 discusses our experimental results and section 5.9 draws conclusions.

4.2 The Attractive Field Model

4.2.1 Generic Interpretation

AFM provides an abstract framework for self-regulatory DoL in social systems (?). In terms of networks, the model is a bipartite network, meaning that there are two different types of nodes. One set of nodes describes the sources of the attractive fields and the other set describes the agents. Links only exist between different types of nodes and they encode the flow of information so that, even if there is no direct link between two agents, their interaction is taken into account in the information flow. The strength of the field depends on the distance between the task and the agent. This relationship is represented using weighted links. In addition, there is a permanent field that represents the no-task option. The model can be mapped to a network as shown in Fig. 4.1. The correspondence is given below:

1. Source nodes (o) are tasks that can be divided between a number of agents.
2. Agent nodes (x) are robots.
3. The attractive fields correspond to stimuli to perform a task, and these are given by the black solid lines.
4. When an agent performs a task, the link is of a different sort, and this is denoted in the figure by a dashed line. Agents linked to a source by a red line are the robots currently doing that task.
5. The field of ignoring the information (w) corresponds to the stimulus to random walk, i.e. the no-task option, and this is denoted by the dotted lines in the graph.
6. Each of the links is weighted. The value of this weight describes the strength of the stimulus that the agent experiences. In a spatial representation of the




Figure 4.1: Attractive Filed Model (AFM)




Figure 4.2: A centralized communication scheme

model, it is easy to see that the strength of the field depends on the physical distance of the agent to the source. In addition, the strength can be increased through sensitisation of the agent via experience (learning). This distance is not depicted in the network, it is represented through the weights of the links. In the figure of the network, the nodes have an arbitrary place. Note that even though the distance is physical in this case, the distance in the model applied to other systems, needs not to be physical, it can represent the accessibility to the information, the time the information takes to reach the receiver, etc.

In summary, looking at the network, we see that each of the agents is connected to each of the fields. This means that even if an agent is currently involved in a task, the probability that it stops doing it in order to pursue a different task, or to random walk, is always non-zero. The weighted links express the probability of an agent to be attracted to each of the fields.

4.2.2 Robotic Interpretation

Now let us interpret this model within the context of our MRS. Let us consider a manufacturing shop floor scenario where N number of mobile robots are required to attend to M number of shop tasks spread over a fixed area A . Let these tasks be represented by a set of small rectangular boxes resembling to manufacturing machines. Let R be the set of robots r_1, r_2, \dots, r_i and J the set of tasks t_1, t_2, \dots, t_j . Each task t_j has an associated task-urgency ϕ_j indicating its relative importance over time. If a robot attends a task t_j in the x^{th} time-step, the value of ϕ_j will

decrease by an amount δ_ϕ in the $(x+1)^{th}$ time-step. On the other hand, if a task has not been served by any robot in the x^{th} time-step, ϕ_j will increase by another amount in $(x+1)^{th}$ time-step. In order to complete a task t_1 , a robot r_i needs to be within a fixed boundary D_{j1} of t_1 . If a robot completes a task t_j it gets sensitised to it and this will increase the robot's likelihood of selecting that task in the future. We call this variable the affinity of a robot r_i to task t_j its *sensitization* k_j^i . If a robot does not do a task t_j for some time, it forgets about t_j and k_j is decreased. According to AFM, all robots will establish attractive fields to all tasks due to the presence of a system-wide continuous flow of information. The strength of these attractive fields will vary according to the distances between robots and tasks, task-urgencies and corresponding sensitizations, $S_{i,j}$ of robots. This is encoded in Eq. 4.1.

$$S_j^i = \tanh\left\{\frac{k_j^i}{d_{ij} + \delta}\phi_j\right\} \quad (4.1)$$

$$P_j^i = \frac{S_j^i}{\sum_j S_j^i} \quad (4.2)$$

Eq. 4.1 states that the stimuli of a robot i to a particular task j , S_j^i depends on i 's spatial distance to j (d_{ij}), level of sensitization to j (k_j^i), and perceived urgency of that task (ϕ_j). We use a very small constant value δ to avoid division by zero when a robot has reached a task. Since S_j^i is a probability function, it is chosen as a *tanh* in order to keep the values between 0 and 1. The probability of selecting each task has been determined by a probabilistic method outlined in Eq. 4.2. AFM suggests that concurrency of a self-regulatory system can be maintained by specifying at least two task options: doing a task and not doing a task. In robots, the latter can be treated as random walking. So in any time-step a robot will choose from $M+1$ tasks. Let T_a be the allocated time to accomplish a task. If R_1 can enter inside the task boundary within T_a time it waits there until T_a elapsed. Otherwise it will select a different task.

4.2.3 A Case Study: Virtual Manufacturing Shop-Floor

In our virtual manufacturing shop-floor (VMS) scenario, each task represents a manufacturing machine. These machines are capable of producing goods from raw materials, but they also require constant maintenance works for stable operations.




Figure 4.3: Virtual Shop-floor production and maintenance cycle

Let W_j be a finite number of material parts that can be loaded into a machine j in the beginning of its production process and in each time-step, ω_j units of material parts can be processed ($\omega_j \ll W_j$). So let Ω_j^p be the initial production workload of j which is simply: W_j/ω_j unit. We assume that all machines are identical. In each time step, each machine always requires a minimum threshold number of robots, called hereafter as *minimum robots per machine* (μ), to meet its constant maintenance work-load, Ω_j^m unit. However, if μ or more robots are present in a machine for production purpose, we assume that, no extra robot is required to do its maintenance work separately. These robots, along with their production jobs, can do necessary maintenance works concurrently. For the sake of simplicity, in this paper we consider $\mu = 1$. Now let us fit the above production and maintenance work-loads and task performance of robots into a unit task-urgency scale. Let us divide our manufacturing operation into two subsequent stages: 1) *production and maintenance mode (PMM)*, and 2) *maintenance only mode (MOM)*. Initially a machine starts working in PMM and does production and maintenance works concurrently. When there is no production work left, it then enters into MOM. Fig. 4.3 illustrates this for a single machine. Under both modes, let α_j be the amount of workload occurs in a unit time-step if no robot serves a task and it corresponds to a fixed task-urgency $\Delta\phi_{INC}$. On the other hand, let us assume that in each time-step, a robot, i , can decrease a constant workload β_i by doing some maintenance work

along with doing any available production work. This corresponds to a negative task urgency: $-\Delta\phi_{DEC}$. So, at the beginning of production process, task-urgency, occurred in a machine due to its production work-loads, can be encoded by Eq. 4.3.

$$\Phi_{j,INIT}^{PMM} = \Omega_j^p \times \Delta\phi_{INC} + \phi_j^{m0} \quad (4.3)$$

where ϕ_j^{m0} represents the task-urgency due to any initial maintenance work-load of j . Now if no robot attends to serve a machine, each time-step a constant maintenance workload of α_j^m will be added to j and that will increase its task-urgency by $\Delta\phi_{INC}$. So, if k time steps passes without any production work being done, task urgency at k^{th} time-step will follow Eq. 4.4.

$$\Phi_{j,k}^{PMM} = \Phi_{j,INIT}^{PMM} + k \times \Delta\phi_{INC} \quad (4.4)$$

However, if a robot attends to a machine and does some production works from it, there would be no extra maintenance work as we assumed that $\mu = 1$. Rather, the task-urgency on this machine will decrease by $\Delta\phi_{DEC}$ amount. If ν_k robots work on a machine simultaneously at time-step k , this decrease will be: $\nu_k \times \Delta\phi_{DEC}$. So in such cases, task-urgency in $(k + 1)^{th}$ time-step can be represented by:

$$\Phi_{j,k+1}^{PMM} = \Phi_{j,k}^{PMM} - \nu_k \times \Delta\phi_{DEC} \quad (4.5)$$

At a particular machine j , once $\Phi_{j,k}^{PMM}$ reaches to zero, we can say that there is no more production work left and this time-step k can give us the *production completion time* of j , T_j^{PMM} . Average production time-steps of a shop-floor with M machines can be calculated by the following simple equation.

$$T_{avg}^{PMM} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=0}^M T_j^{PMM} \quad (4.6)$$

T_{avg}^{PMM} can be compared with the minimum number of time-steps necessary to finish production works, T_{min}^{PMM} . This can only happen in an ideal case where all robots work for production without any random walking or failure. We can get T_{min}^{PMM} from the total amount of work load and maximum possible inputs from all robots. If there are M machines and N robots, each machine has Φ_{INIT}^{PMM} task-urgency, and each time-step robots can decrease $N \times \Delta\phi_{DEC}$ task-urgencies, then the theoretical T_{min}^{PMM} can be found from the following Eq. 4.7.

$$T_{min}^{PMM} = \frac{M \times \Phi_{INIT}^{PMM}}{N \times \Delta\phi_{DEC}} \quad (4.7)$$

$$\zeta_{avg}^{PMM} = \frac{T_{avg}^{PMM} - T_{min}^{PMM}}{T_{min}^{PMM}} \quad (4.8)$$

Thus we can define ζ_{avg}^{PMM} , *average production completion delay* (APCD) by following Eq. 4.8: When a machine enters into MOM, only μ robots are required to do its maintenance works in each time step. So, in such cases, if no robot serves a machine, the growth of task-urgency will follow Eq. 4.4. However, if ν_k robots are serving this machine at a particular time-step k^{th} , task-urgency at $(k + 1)^{th}$ time-step can be represented by:

$$\Phi_{j,k+1}^{MOM} = \Phi_{j,k}^{MOM} - (\nu_k - \mu) \times \Delta\phi_{DEC} \quad (4.9)$$

By considering $\mu = 1$ Eq. 4.9 will reduce to Eq. 4.5. Here, $\Phi_{j,k+1}^{MOM}$ will correspond to the *pending maintenance work-load* (PMW) of a particular machine at a given time. This happens due to the random task switching of robots with a no-task option (random-walking). Interestingly PMW will indicate the robustness of this system since higher PMW value will indicate the delay in attending maintenance works by robots. We can find the average PMW (APMW) per time-step per machine, χ_j^{MOM} (Eq. 4.10) and average PMW per machine per time-step, χ_{avg}^{MOM} (Eq. 4.11).

$$\chi_j^{MOM} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \Phi_{j,k}^{MOM} \quad (4.10)$$

$$\chi_{avg}^{MOM} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M \chi_j^{MOM} \quad (4.11)$$

4.3 Implementation

We have developed a system a multi-robot tracking system can track at least 40 E-puck robots ¹ and these robots can operate together according to the generic rules of the AFM. As shown in Fig. 5.1, our software system consists of a multi-robot tracking system, a centralized task server and robot controller clients. Here at first we have presented the design of our communication system. Then we have discussed about our specific implementation.

¹www.e-puck.org




Figure 4.4: Hardware and software setup

4.3.1 Design of our communication system

In order to establish a system-wide continuous flow of information, we need to implement a suitable communication system for our robots. Here we have presented a centralized communication system for our manufacturing shop-floor scenario. As shown in Fig. 4.2, in this model there exists a centralized *TaskServer* that is responsible for disseminating task information to robots. The contents of task information can be physical locations of tasks, their urgencies and so on. *TaskServer* delivers this information by emitting *TaskInfo* signals periodically. The method of signal emission depends on a particular communication technology. For example, in a wireless network it can be a message broadcast. *Task-Server* has another interface for catching feedback signals from robots. The *RobotStatus* signal can be used to inform *TaskServer* about a robot's current task id, its device status and so on. *TaskServer* uses this information to update relevant part of task information such as, task-urgency. This up-to-date information is sent in next *TaskInfo* signal. In Fig. 4.2 an initial configuration of this model has been presented. Upon receiving an initial *TaskInfo* signal robot R_1 has shown strong attraction towards $Task1$ and robot R_3 has shown strong attraction toward $Task2$. This can be inferred from Eq. 4.1 that says if the initial task urgencies and sensitizations for all tasks are same, a robot will strongly be attracted towards a task that is relatively closer to it.

4.3.2 Our current implementation

The major components of our implementation are a multi-robot tracking system, robot controller clients and a centralized task-server. In order to track all robots real-time we have used SwisTrack (?), a state of the art open-source, multi-agent tracking system, with a 16-megapixel overhead GigE camera. This set-up gives us the position, heading and id of each of the robots at a frequency of 1. The interaction of the hardware and software of our system is illustrated in Fig. 5.1.

For inter-process communication (IPC), we have used D-Bus technology ². We have developed an IPC component for SwisTrack (hereafter called as *SwisTrack D-Bus Server*) that can broadcast id and pose of all robots in real-time over our server's D-Bus interface.

Apart from SwisTrack, we have implemented two major software modules: *TaskServer* and *Robot Controller Client (RCC)*. They are developed in Python with its state of the art *Multiprocessing* ³ module. This python module simplifies our need to manage data sharing and synchronization among different sub-processes. As shown in Fig. 5.1, RCC consists of four sub-processes. *SignalListener* and *SignalEmitter*, interface with SwisTrack D-Bus Server and TaskServer respectively. *TaskSelector* implements AFM guidelines for task selection. *DeviceController* moves a robot to a target task. Bluetooth radio link is used as a communication medium between a RCC and a corresponding E-puck robot.

4.4 Experiment Design

In this section, we have described the design of parameters and observables of our experiments within the context of our virtual manufacturing shop-floor scenario. These experiments are designed to validate AFM by testing the presence of division of labour, such task specialization, dynamic task-switching or plasticity etc.

4.4.1 Parameters

Table 5.1 lists a set of essential parameters of our experiments. We intend to have a setup that is relatively complex, i.e., with a high number of robots and tasks in a large area. The diameter of the marker of our e-puck robot is 0.08m. So, if we put 4 robots in an area of one square meter, this will give us a robot-occupied-space

²<http://dbus.freedesktop.org/doc/dbus-specification.html>

³<http://docs.python.org/library/multiprocessing.html>

Table 4.1: Experimental parameters

| Parameter | Value |
|---|-----------------|
| Total number of robots (N) | 16 |
| Total number of tasks (M) | 4 |
| Experiment area (A) | 4 m^2 |
| Initial production work-load/machine (Ω_j^p) | 100 unit |
| Task urgency increase rate ($\Delta\phi_{INC}$) | 0.005 |
| Task urgency decrease rate ($\Delta\phi_{DEC}$) | 0.0025 |
| Initial sensitization (K_{INIT}) | 0.1 |
| Sensitization increase rate (Δk_{INC}) | 0.03 |
| Sensitization decrease rate (Δk_{DEC}) | 0.01 |

to free-space ratio of about 1:49 per square meter. This ratio reasonable in order to allow the robots to move at a speed of 5 cm/sec without much interference to each other. We have fixed the number of tasks to 4. Robots also have an additional option for random walking that corresponds to the ignoring task information for ensuring flexibility of our system.

The initial values of task urgencies correspond to 100 units of production work-load without any maintenance work-load as outlined in Eq. 4.3. We choose a limit of 0 and 1, where 0 means no urgency and 1 means maximum urgency. Same applies to sensitisation as well, where 0 means no sensitisation and 1 means maximum sensitisation. This also implies that if sensitization is 0, task has been forgotten completely. On the other hand, if sensitization is 1, the task has been learnt completely. We choose a default sensitization value of 0.1 for all tasks. The following relationships are maintained for selecting task-urgency and sensitization parameters.

$$\Delta\phi_{INC} = \frac{\Delta\phi_{DEC} \times N}{2 \times M} \quad (4.12)$$

$$\Delta k_{DEC} = \frac{\Delta k_{INC}}{M - 1} \quad (4.13)$$

Eq. 4.12 establishes the fact that task urgency will increase at a higher rate than that of its decrease. As we do not like to keep a task left unattended for a long time we choose a higher rate of increase of task urgency. This difference is set on the basis of our assumption that at least half of the expected number of robots (ratio of number of robots to tasks) would be available to work on a task. So they would produce similar types of increase and decrease behaviours in task urgencies. Eq. 4.13 suggests that the learning will happen much faster than the forgetting. The difference in these two rates is based on the fact that faster learning gives a robot more chances to select a task in next time-step and thus it becomes more specialized

on it. Task-Server updates task-info messages in the interval of $\Delta TS_u=5s$ and robots stick on to a particular task for a maximum of $\Delta RT_{to}=10s$.

4.4.2 Observables

We have defined a set of observables to evaluate our implementation. The first two observables, the changes in task-urgencies and the changes in active worker ratios, can give us an overall view of plasticity of division labour. Our third observable is to find changes in robot task specialization which is also an important measure of division of labour. Our last measurement is the communication load which is specific to this particular implementation and corresponds to the continuous flow of information. Within the context of our VMS, we measure the average production completion delay (APCD) and average pending maintenance work (APMW) as the metrics of VMS performance.

4.5 Results and Discussions

In this section we have presented our experimental results. We ran those experiments for about 40 minutes and averaged them over five iterations. Fig. 5.2 shows the dynamic changes in task urgencies. In order to describe our system's dynamic behaviour holistically we analyse the changes in task urgencies over time. Let $\phi_{j,q}$ be the urgency of a task j at q^{th} step and $\phi_{j,q+1}$ be the task urgency of $(q+1)^{th}$ step. We can calculate the sum of changes in urgencies of all tasks at $(q+1)^{th}$ step:

$$\Delta\Phi_{j,q+1} = \sum_{j=1}^M (\phi_{j,q+1} - \phi_{j,q}) \quad (4.14)$$

From Fig. 4.6 we can see that initially the sum of changes of task urgencies are towards negative direction. This implies that tasks are being served by a high number of robots. Fig. 4.8 shows that in production stage, when work-load is high, many robots are active in tasks and this ratio varies according to task urgency changes.

Fig. 5.15 gives us the task specialization of five robots on Task3 in a particular run of our experiment. This shows us how our robots can specialize and de-specialize on tasks over time. The de-specialization or forgetting of tasks is calculated similar to Eq. 5.2. we have calculated the absolute sum of changes in sensitizations by all

robots in the following equation.

$$\Delta K_{j,q+1} = \sum_{j=1}^M | (k_{j,q+1} - k_{j,q}) | \quad (4.15)$$

This values of ΔK are plotted in Fig. 4.10. It shows that the overall rate of learning decreases and forgetting increases over time. It is a consequence of the gradually increased task specialization of robots and reduced task-urgencies over time. Fig. 4.7 presents the frequency of signalling task information by TaskServer. Since the duration of each time step is 50s long and TaskServer emits signal in every 2.5s, there should be an average of 20 signals in each time-step.

Within VMS scenario, we have got average production completion time 165 time-steps (825s) where sample size is $(5 \times 4) = 20$ tasks, $SD = 72$ time-steps (360s). According to Eq. 4.7, our theoretical minimum production completion time is 50 time-steps (250s) assuming the non-stop task performance of all 16 robots with an initial task urgency of 0.5 for all 4 tasks and task urgency decrease rate $\Delta\Phi_{DEC} = 0.0025$ per robot per time-step. Hence, Eq. 4.8 gives us APCD, $\zeta = 2.3$ which means that our system has taken 2.3 times more time (575s) than the minimum estimated time.

Besides, from the average 315 time-steps (1575s) maintenance activity of our robots per experiment run, we have got APMW, $\chi = 0.012756$ which corresponds to the pending work of 3 time-steps (15s) with sample-size = 20 tasks, $SD = 13$ time-steps (65s), $\Delta\Phi_{INC} = 0.005$ per task per time-step. This tells us the robust task performance of our robots which can return to an abandoned task within a minute or so.

4.6 Conclusion and Future works

In this paper we have validated an inter-disciplinary generic model of self-regulated division of labour (DOL) or or multi-robot task allocation (MRTA) by incorporating it in our multi-robot system (MRS) that has emulated a virtual manufacturing shop-floor activities. A centralized communication system has been instantiated to realize this model. We have evaluated various aspects of this model, such as ability to meet dynamic task demands, individual task specializations, communication loads and flexibility in concurrent task completions. A set of metrics has been




Figure 4.5: Task urgencies observed at TaskServer




Figure 4.6: Shop-floor workload change history




Figure 4.7: Task server's frequency of task information signalling




Figure 4.8: Self-organized allocation of workers




Figure 4.9: Task specialization on Task3




Figure 4.10: Changes in sensitizations of all robots

proposed to observe the DOL in this system. From our experimental results, we have found that AFM can meet the requirements of dynamic DOL by the virtue of its self-regulatory behaviours. Our centralised communication system broadcasts information to all the robots from a central server. This has the advantage of minimising the communication load and the disadvantage of a single point of failure. In the future, we will explore local peer-to-peer communication models in a MRS having about 40 E-puck robots.

Locality-based Decentralized Communication Model

5.1 Biological motivations

5.2 Geometrical analysis

5.3 General characteristics

Our communication model relies on the local P2P communications among robots. Here there is no centralized server to disseminate information but each robot can communicate to its nearby peers within a certain communication radius, r_{comm} . Here by r_{comm} , we assume that within this distance robots can exchange communication signals reliably without any significant loss of information. A robot R_1 is a *peer* of robot R_2 , if spatial distance between R_1 and R_2 is less than its r_{comm} . As shown in Fig. ??, local communication can also give robots similar task information as in centralized communication mode. It shows that it is not necessary for each robot to communicate with every other robot to get information on all tasks. Since robots can random walk and explore the environment we assume that for a reasonably high robot to space density, all task will be known to all robots after an initial exploration period. In order to update the urgency of a task, robots can estimate the number of robots working on a task in many ways: such as, by using their sensory perception (e.g., camera), by doing local P2P communication and so on. In Fig. ?? we have shown that robots exchange both task information and self

status signals to peers.

We characterize our communication model in terms of three fundamental issues: 1) message content (*what to communicate*) 2) communication frequency (*when to communicate*) and 3) target recipients (*with whom to communicate*) (?). In a typical MRS, message content can be categorized into two types: 1) state of each individual robot and 2) target task (goal) information (?). The latter can also be subdivided into two types: 1) an individual robot's target task information and 2) information of all available tasks found in the system. Regarding the first issue, our communication model is open. Robots can communicate with their peers with any kind of message. Our model addresses the last two issues very specifically. Robots communicate only when they meet their peers within a certain communication radius (r_{comm}). Although in case of an environment where robots move relatively faster the peer relationships can also be changed dynamically. But this can be manipulated by setting the signal frequency and robot to space density to somewhat reasonably higher value. In terms of target recipients, our model differs from a traditional publish/subscribe communication (PSC) model by introducing the concept of dynamic subscription. In a traditional PSC model, subscription of messages happens prior to the actual message transmission. In that case prior knowledge about the subjects of a system is necessary. But in our model this is not necessary as long as all robots use a common addressing convention for naming their incoming signal channels. In this way, when a robot meets with another robot it can infer the address of this peer robot's channel name by using a shared rule. A robot is thus always listening to its own channel for receiving messages from its potential peers or message publishers. On the other side, upon recognizing a peer a robot sends a message to this particular peer. So here neither it is necessary to create any custom subject namespace (e.g., (?)) nor we need to hard-code information in each robot controller about the knowledge of their potential peers *a priori*. Subscription is done automatically based on their respective r_{comm} .

5.4 Implementation algorithm

Our local communication model has three major aspects: 1) local sensing of peers (and optionally tasks), 2) listening to peer signals and 3) emitting signals for peers.

Here we present a typical implementation. Let N be the set of robots. At time step q , a robot i that can receive $h_{i,q}$ information by listening to its incoming channel L_i . Let M be the set of tasks. Each task j has an associated information H_j . It encodes the necessary properties of tasks, such as their locations, urgencies etc. Each task j also has a task perception radius r_{task} such that if a robot comes within this radius at time step q it can perceive current value of $H_{j,q}$. Let at time step q , robot i has its own task information $G_{i,q}$ that has been perceived and listened from its peers. Let r_{comm} be the communication radius of each robot. Let at time step q , $P_{p,q}^i$ be a set of peers of i that are within r_{comm}^i . Let $E_{p,q}^i$ be its active signal emission channels. Algorithm 1 implements our proposed dynamic P2P communication.

Algorithm 1: Locality based Dynamic P2P Communication

```

1: Initialization:
2:  $id \leftarrow robotid$ 
3:  $r_{comm} \leftarrow r_1$ 
4:  $r_{task} \leftarrow r_2$ 
5:  $pose[id] \leftarrow (0, 0, 0)$ 
6:  $G[id], P[id], L[id], E[] \leftarrow 0$ 
7: Loop:
8:  $pose[id] \leftarrow (x, y, \theta)$ 
9: if  $pose[id] \in U(pose[k], r_{task}^k), (k = 0, 1, \dots, M - 1)$  then
10:    $G[id] \leftarrow G[id] \cup H_k$ 
11: end if
12: if  $pose[id] \in V(pose[k], r_{comm}^k), (k = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1, k \neq id)$  then
13:    $P[id] \leftarrow P[id] \cup k$ 
14:    $h_k \leftarrow W(E[k], L[id])$ 
15:    $G[id] \leftarrow G[id] \cup h_k$ 
16: end if
17: for all  $k \in P[id], (k = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1, k \neq id)$  do
18:    $W(E[id], L[k]) \leftarrow G[id]$ 
19: end for
20:  $P[id] \leftarrow 0$ 

```




Figure 5.1: Hardware and software setup

21: Loop again

From Algorithm 1, we see that a robot controller is initialized with its specific robot-id and default values of r_{comm} and r_{task} . We assumed that these values are same for all robots and for all tasks respectively. Initially a robot has no information about tasks. It has neither listened nor transmitted any information yet. Upon initialization, robot determines its current pose and evaluates a function $U(pose, r_{task})$ that helps it to perceive information of a nearby task. This is not strictly necessary as this information can be available from alternate sources. In second step, robot senses its nearby peers by evaluating $V(pose, r_{comm})$ and start filling the list of peers P by their id. The signal exchange with a peer is denoted by a communication function $W(emitter, listener)$. So by listening to a peer signal, it receives task information h and aggregates this h with its own task info G . In last step, robot emits its task information to its peers stored in P . Finally it erases all values of P and repeat this loop.

5.5 Implementation

We have developed a system where up to 40 E-puck robots (?) can operate together according to the generic rules of the AFM. As shown in Fig. 5.1 (right), our software system consists of a multi-robot tracking system, a task perception assistant (TPA) and robot controller clients (RCC). Here at first we have presented the

design of our communication system. Then we have discussed about our specific MRS implementation.

5.5.1 Our communication system

As shown in Fig. 5.1, RCCs disseminate task information to each other by *TaskInfo* D-Bus signal. The contents of task information are physical locations of tasks and their urgencies. However as our robots are incapable of sensing task directly. So it relies on TPA for actual task location and urgency. When a robot i comes within r_{task} of a task j , SwisTrack reports it to TPA (by *TaskNeighbors* signal) and TPA then gives it current task information H_j to i (by *TaskInfo* signal). TPA has another interface for catching feedback signals from robots. The *RobotStatus* signal can be used to inform TPA about a robot's current task id, its device status and so on. TPA uses this information to update relevant part of task information such as, task-urgency. This up-to-date information is encoded in next *TaskInfo* signal.

5.5.2 Our current implementation

In order to track all robots real-time we have used SwisTrack (?), a state of the art open-source, multi-agent tracking system, with a 16-megapixel overhead GigE camera. This set-up gives us the position, heading and id of each of the robots at a frequency of 1. The interaction of the hardware and software of our system is illustrated in Fig. 5.1.

For IPC, we have used D-Bus technology. We have developed an IPC component for SwisTrack (hereafter called as *SwisTrack D-Bus Server*) that can broadcast id and pose of all robots in real-time over our server's D-Bus interface.

Apart from SwisTrack, we have implemented two major software modules: *Task Perception Assistant (TPA)* and *Robot Controller Client (RCC)*. They are developed in Python with its state of the art *Multiprocessing*¹ module. This python module simplifies our need to manage data sharing and synchronization among different sub-processes. As shown in Fig. 5.1, RCC consists of four sub-processes. *SignalListener* and *SignalEmitter*, interface with SwisTrack D-Bus Server and TPA. *TaskSelector* implements AFM guidelines for task selection. *DeviceController*

¹<http://docs.python.org/library/multiprocessing.html>

Table 5.1: Experimental parameters

| Parameter | Value |
|--|----------------|
| Total number of robots (N) | 16 |
| Total number of tasks (M) | 4 |
| Experiment area (A) | 4 m^2 |
| Initial task urgency (Φ_{INIT}) | 0.5 |
| Task urgency increase rate ($\Delta\phi_{INC}$) | 0.005 |
| Task urgency decrease rate ($\Delta\phi_{DEC}$) | 0.0025 |
| Initial sensitization (K_{INIT}) | 0.1 |
| Sensitization increase rate (Δk_{INC}) | 0.03 |
| Sensitization decrease rate (Δk_{DEC}) | 0.01 |
| A very small distance (δ) | 0.000001 |
| Task info update interval (ΔTS_u) | 5s |
| Task info signal emission interval (ΔTS_e) | 2.5s |
| Robot's task time-out interval (ΔRT_{to}) | 10s |

moves a robot to a target task. Bluetooth radio link is used as a communication medium between a RCC and a corresponding E-puck robot.

5.6 Experiment Design

In this section, we have described the design of parameters and observables of our experiments. These experiments are designed to validate AFM by testing the occurrence of convergent MRTA. Table 5.1 lists a set of essential parameters of our experiments.

5.6.1 Parameters

We intend to have a setup that is relatively complex, i.e., a high number of robots and tasks in a large area, but with a high probability of convergence. The following criteria shows our rationale behind our selected parameters.

- Robots should be capable of moving at a reasonably high speed (e.g., $\geq 4\text{ cm/s}$) without interfering to each other very much.
- Tasks density should be as least one task per square meter.

- Host PC to robot communication should be as dedicated and stable as possible.
- No task should be left unattended completely for a long time (e.g., $\geq 300s$).

When many Bluetooth devices talk to a single Bluetooth adapter, communication delays become very frequent due to the fact that each device gets a guaranteed turn to communicate (?). After some initial testing, we found a stable server configuration with 8 Bluetooth adapters, i.e., one Bluetooth adapter is used to communicate with two robots. This limits us to set the total number of robots to 16. Also we found that after about 35-40 minutes from the start of our experiments some of robots fail to get the access to their designated Bluetooth adapters. So we limit the length of our experiments to 40 minutes. We expect that this limitation would be removed by distributing Bluetooth adapters among multiple server PCs.

The diameter of the marker of our E-puck robot is 8cm. So, if we put 4 robots in an area of one square meter, this will give us a robot-occupied-space to free-space ratio of about 1:49 per square meter. We have found that this ratio is reasonable to allow the robots to move at a speed of 7.5 cm/sec without much interference to each other. We randomly placed four 18.5 cm x 11.5 cm rectangular boxes as a shop task in our experiment arena. They were about one meter apart from each other.

The initial values of task urgencies can be set to any value as long as they are same for all tasks. We choose a limit of 0 and 1, where 0 means no urgency and 1 means maximum urgency. Same applies to sensitisation as well, where 0 means no sensitisation and 1 means maximum sensitisation. We choose a default sensitization value of 0.1 for all tasks. Our rationale behind selecting task urgency and sensitisation change rates can be found in (?).

5.6.2 Observables

We have defined a set of observables to benchmark our implementation. They are briefly explained here.

Changes in task-urgencies ($\Delta\Phi$): In our experiments, urgency of each task in each step has been logged. From the above design of task urgency, we can see that if a task is not served by any robot for 100 consecutive steps (500s), urgency of

that task will reach from 0.5 to its maximum value 1.0. On the other hand, if a task is served by only one robot for 200 consecutive steps (1000s) urgency of that task will be 0. But in real experiment, it is more likely that more than one robot will serve a task. So urgency of a task will decrease $\Delta\phi_{DEC}$ times number of working robots on that task (based on AFM guidelines (?)). The overall changes in task urgencies will show the convergence behaviour of our system.

Changes in robot sensitizations (ΔK): According AFM, as robots will do tasks they will specialize on each task by increasing or decreasing sensitizations (learning and forgetting). From our above design, we can see that if a robot starts doing a task with an initial sensitization of 0.1 and it repeatedly does it for 30 consecutive steps, sensitization will reach to 1. Thus by logging the sensitization data of each robots we will be able to comment on task specializations of robots.

Changes in robot motions (ΔU): As we might guess that initially the task urgencies will be relatively higher for all tasks so robots will need to do a lot of movements by switching from one task to another. But as the system approaches to converge overall robot motions will be decreased. In order to observe this phenomena we log the pose of robots in every time step.

D-Bus Signals emitted by Task server (S_f): In order to measure the communication load on our communication system we are also interested to log P2P TaskInfo D-Bus signals. Since the emission of signals happens asynchronously it is more likely that the overall communication load on the system will vary over time. This is contrary to the centralized communication where communication load is almost constant over time.

5.7 Results and Discussions

In this section we have presented our experimental results. We ran those experiments for about 40 minutes and averaged them from three iterations. For comparison purposes, here we present some of the results of our baseline experiments in centralized communication mode. Details can be found in (?).

Fig. 5.2 shows the dynamic changes in task urgencies. In order to describe our system's dynamic behaviour holistically we analyse the changes in task urgencies over time. Let $\phi_{j,q}$ be the urgency of a task j at q^{th} step. In $(q + 1)^{th}$ step, we can




Figure 5.2: Task urgencies observed at TaskServer in local mode $r_{comm}=0.5m$

find the change of urgency of task j :

$$\delta\phi_{j,q+1} = (\phi_{j,q+1} - \phi_{j,q}) \quad (5.1)$$

So we can calculate the sum of changes in urgencies of all tasks at $(q+1)^{th}$ step:

$$\Delta\Phi_{j,q+1} = \sum_{j=1}^M \delta\phi_{j,q+1} \quad (5.2)$$

Fig. 5.3 plots this sum of changes of task urgencies by a dashed line. If we consider the absolute change over a window of time w in the following equation, we can describe the overall changes of our systems in both positive and negative directions.

$$\Delta\Phi_{jw,q+1} = \sum_{j=0}^{w-1} | \Delta\Phi_{q+j} | \quad (5.3)$$

In order to find convergence in MRTA we have calculated the sum of absolute changes in task urgencies over a window of 2 consecutive steps (100s). This is plotted in solid line in Fig. 5.3. Note that we scale down the time steps of this plot by aggregating the values of 10 consecutive steps (50s) of Fig. 5.2 into a single step value. From Fig. 5.3 we can see that initially the sum of changes of task urgencies are towards negative direction. This implies that tasks are being served by a high number of robots. When the task urgencies stabilize near zero the fluctuations in urgencies become minimum. Since robots chose tasks stochastically, there will always be a small changes in task urgencies. A potential convergence point is located by considering the persistence existence of the value of $\Delta\Phi_{jw,q+1}$ below a threshold 0.1. In Fig. 5.3 this convergence happens near step 23 or after 1150s




Figure 5.3: Convergence of task urgencies in centralized mode






Figure 5.4: Sum of translations of all robots in centralized mode

Figure 5.5: Convergence of task urgencies in local mode $r_{comm}=0.5m$ Figure 5.6: Sum of translations of all robots in local mode $r_{comm}=0.5m$

from the beginning of our experiments. This implies that from this point of time and onwards, changes of our system's behaviour remain under a small threshold value.

Using this same criteria, we can find that in local communication experiment convergence happens after step 14 in case of $r_{comm}=0.5m$ (Fig. 5.5) and after step 29 in case of $r_{comm}=1m$ (Fig. 5.7).

We have aggregated the changes in translation motion of all robots over time. Let $u_{i,q}$ and $u_{i,q+1}$ be the translations of a robot i in two consecutive steps. If the difference between these two translations be δu_i , we can find the sum of changes of translations of all robots in $(q+1)^{th}$ step using the following equation.

$$\Delta U_{q+1} = \sum_{i=1}^N \delta u_{i,q+1} \quad (5.4)$$



Figure 5.7: Convergence of task urgencies in local mode $r_{comm}=1m$




Figure 5.8: Sum of translations of all robots in local mode $r_{comm}=1m$




Figure 5.9: Changes in sensitizations in local mode $r_{comm}=0.5m$




Figure 5.10: Changes in sensitizations in local mode $r_{comm}=1m$




Figure 5.11: Peer signals caught by Robot12 in local mode $r_{comm}=0.5m$ Figure 5.12: Peer signals caught by Robot12 in local mode $r_{comm}=1m$

The result from centralized communication experiment is plotted in Fig. 5.4. In this plot we can see that robot translations also vary over varying task requirements of tasks. But it fails to show a consistence behaviour like previous plots. The robot translation results from local mode experiments are plotted in Fig. 5.6 and Fig. 5.8. The reduction of robot translation is significant in both local communication experiments.

Similar to Eq. 5.2, we can calculate the absolute sum of changes in sensitizations by all robots in the following equation.

$$\Delta K_{j,q+1} = \sum_{j=1}^M | \Delta k_{j,q+1} | \quad (5.5)$$

This values of ΔK from local experiments are plotted in Fig. 5.9 and Fig. 5.10. They show that the overall rate of learning and forgetting decrease over time. It is a consequence of the gradually increased task specializations of robots.

As an example of P2P signal reception of a robot, Fig. 5.11 and Fig. 5.12 show the number of received signals by Robot12 in two local experiments. It states the relative difference of peers over time in two local cases. The overall P2P task information signals of both of these local modes are plotted in Fig. 5.13 and Fig. 5.14. Note that in centralized communication mode the task info signal frequency was kept 20 signals per time step (?).

As an example of task specialization of a robot we plotted sensitization of Robot12 in Fig. 5.15. It shows that this robot has specialized in Task1. The continuous learning of Task1 happens from step 23 to step 59 where it has learned this task




Figure 5.13: Frequency of P2P signalling in local mode $r_{comm}=0.5m$




Figure 5.14: Frequency of P2P signalling in local mode $r_{comm}=1m$




Figure 5.15: Task specialization of Robot12 in local mode $r_{comm}=0.5m$

Figure 5.16: Changes in translation of Robot12 in local mode $r_{comm}=0.5m$

completely. This behaviour was found common in all robots with varying level of sensitizations. Hence we get the linear decrease of ΔK in sensitization plots. However, the changes in motion of this robot plotted in Fig. 5.16 was not stable due to the fact that robots frequently avoid dynamic obstacles and select random-walking.

5.8 Related Works

Krieger and Billeter presented MRTA in a team of 12 robots in ants' foraging scenario where a central server sent broadcast message containing energy level of the colony to all robots (?). They also applied a form of indirect communication in order to share information about discovered food sources among robots. Although this P2P communication did not happen in real time, it improved the robustness of peer recruitment when compared with centralized communication only. Agassounon and Martinoli compared three task-allocation algorithms using simulations and reported that algorithm that used information sharing among local peers became robust in worker allocation (?). However, environment condition should be known *a priori* to optimize some parameters. By modulating the transmission power of local on-board wireless device of E-puck robots, Cianci *et al.* enabled them to communicate in different local radii (?). In a self-organized decision making experiment, decision of 15 robots converged faster when local communication radius was relatively higher. Since the number of tasks was only two (left or right wall following), robots got global view of the system with increased communication radius. Thus they agreed quickly in one task.

5.9 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

We presented a locality based dynamic P2P communication model that achieves similar or better self-regulated multi-robot task allocation (MRTA) than its centralized counterpart. Particularly the reduction in robot movement states that local model is preferable when we need to minimize robot energy usage. Our model assumes no prior knowledge of the environment and it also does not depend on the number of the robots. We presented an abstract algorithm that can be used with various P2P communication technologies. We reported our implementation

of this algorithm by using D-Bus technology in Linux. Comparative results from local mode experiments shows us that robots relatively perform better when the radius of communication is such small that most of the robots only communicate with their closest peers. This is contrary to the findings from (?, ?) where increased amount of information help to get desired task-allocation quickly. In our case, more information exchange with larger communication radius or with centralized communication increased task switching among robots. In case of local information exchange, robots have more chances to select local tasks by the virtue of self-regulating principles. Thus in local communication mode our system converged better and significantly reduced robot motions.

Our future work include performing more experiments with increased number of robots (up to 40) and tasks. Since our existing Bluetooth communication setup with one server fail to scale we are looking forward to distribute communication loads over a network cluster of tens of servers.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusions

6.1 Summary of contributions

6.2 Future work

Bibliography

- Agassounon W, Martinoli A & Easton K 2004 *Autonomous Robots* **17**(2), 163–192.
- Ali M S 1995 *Scientific Indications in the Holy Quran* Islamic Foundation Bangladesh.
- Andriani P & Passiante G 2004 *Complexity theory and the management of networks : proceedings of the Workshop on Organisational Networks as Distributed Systems of Knowledge, University of Lecce, Italy 2001* Imperial College Press London.
- Arai T, Ogata H & Suzuki T 1989 *Intelligent Robots and Systems' 89.(IROS'89)'The Autonomous Mobile Robots and Its Applications', Proceedings. IEEE/RSJ International Workshop on* pp. 479–485.
- Arcaute E, Christensen K, Sendova-Franks A, Dahl T, Espinosa A & Jensen H J 2008 in 'Ecol. Complex'.
- Arkin R C 1990 *ROBOT. AUTONOMOUS SYST.* **6**, 105–122.
- Arkin R C 1998 *Behavior-based robotics* Cambridge, Mass. : MIT Press, c1998. Includes bibliographical references (p. [445]-476) and indexes.
- Arkin R & Diaz J 2002 *Advanced Motion Control, 2002. 7th International Workshop on* pp. 455–461.
- Asada M, Kitano H, Noda I & Veloso M 1999 *Artificial Intelligence* **110**, 193–214.

- Asama H, Matsumoto A & Ishida Y 1989 *Intelligent Robots and Systems' 89.(IROS'89)'The Autonomous Mobile Robots and Its Applications', Proceedings. IEEE/RSJ International Workshop on* pp. 283–290.
- Balch T 2005 in E Sahin & W Spears, eds, 'Swarm Robotics Workshop: State-of-the-art Survey' number 3342 in 'Lecture Notes in Computer Science' Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg pp. 21–30.
- Balch T & Arkin R C 1998 *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON ROBOTICS AND AUTOMATION* **14**, 1.
- Baumeister R F & Vohs K D 2007 *Handbook of Self-Regulation: Research, Theory, and Applications* The Guilford Press.
- Beckers R, Holland O E & Deneubourg J L 1994 *Artificial Life IV* **181**, 189.
- Beer S 1981 *Brain of the firm* J. Wiley New York.
- Beni G 1988 *Intelligent Control, 1988. Proceedings., IEEE International Symposium on* pp. 57–62.
- Beni G 2005 *Swarm Robotics: SAB 2004 International Workshop, Santa Monica, CA, USA, July 17, 2004: Revised Selected Papers* .
- Beni G & Liang P 1996 *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation* **12**, 485 – 490.
- Bonabeau E, Dorigo M & Theraulaz G 1999 *Swarm intelligence: from natural to artificial systems* Oxford University Press.
- Botelho S, Alami R & LAAS-CNRS T 1999 *Robotics and Automation, 1999. Proceedings. 1999 IEEE International Conference on* **2**.
- Braitenberg V 1984 *Vehicles, Experiments in Synthetic Psychology* Bradford Book.
- Brooks R 1986 *IEEE J. ROBOTICS AUTOM.* **2**, 14–23.
- Burgard W, Moors M, Fox D, Simmons R & Thrun S 2000 *Robotics and Automation, 2000. Proceedings. ICRA'00. IEEE International Conference on* **1**.

- Bussmann S, Jennings N & Wooldridge M 2004 *Multiagent Systems for Manufacturing Control: A Design Methodology* Springer.
- Camazine S, Franks N, Sneyd J, Bonabeau E, Deneubourg J & Theraula G 2001 *Self-organization in biological systems* Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, c2001. What is self-organization? – How self-organization works – Characteristics of self-organizing systems – Alternatives to self-organization –.
- Cao Y, Fukunaga A & Kahng A 1997 *Autonomous Robots* **4**(1), 7–27.
- Chaimowicz L, Campos M F M & Kumar V 2002 *Robotics and Automation, 2002. Proceedings. ICRA'02. IEEE International Conference on* **1**.
- Cianci C M, Raemy X, Pugh J & Martinoli A 2007 *Swarm Robotics: Second Sab 2006 International Workshop, Rome, Italy, September 30-October 1, 2006 Revised Selected Papers* .
- Davis R & Smith R 1988 *Distributed Artificial Intelligence* pp. 333–356.
- Dias M B, Zlot R M, Kalra N & Stentz A 2006 *Proceedings of the IEEE* **94**, 1257–1270.
- Doty K & Van Aken R 1993 in 'Robotics and Automation, 1993. Proceedings., 1993 IEEE International Conference on' pp. 778–782.
- Dudek G, Jenkin M, Milios E & Wilkes D 1996 *Autonomous Robots* **3**, 375–397.
- Dunbar W & Klein B 2002 *CIM Bulletin* **95**(1057).
- Feldman D 1997 *Department of Physics, University of California, July* .
- Franklin D, Kahng A & Lewis M 1995 *Proceedings of SPIE* **2496**, 698.
- Fukuda T & Nakagawa S 1987 in 'Proceedings of IECON' p. pages 588595.
- Garnier S, Gautrais J & Theraulaz G 2007 *Swarm Intelligence* **1**(1), 3–31.
- Gat E, Bonnasso R, Murphy R & Press A 1997 *Artificial intelligence and mobile robots* .

- Gazi V & Fidan B 2006 **4433**, 71–102.
- Gerkey B & Mataric M 2003 *Robotics and Automation, 2003. Proceedings. ICRA'03. IEEE International Conference on* **3**.
- Gerkey B P & Mataric M J 2002 *IEEE TRANSACTIONS ON ROBOTICS AND AUTOMATION* **18**.
- Gerkey B P & Mataric M J 2004 *The International Journal of Robotics Research* **23**, 939.
- Hamann H & Worn H 2006 in E Sahin, W. M Spears & A. F. T Winfield, eds, 'Second International Workshop on Swarm Robotics at SAB 2006' Vol. 4433 Springer Verlag Berlin, Germany pp. 43–55.
- Holldobler B & Wilson E 1990 *The ants* Belknap Press.
- Huntsberger T L, Trebi-Ollennu A, Aghazarian H, Schenker P S, Pirjanian P & Nayar H D 2004 *Autonomous Robots* **17**, 79–92.
- Kogut B 2000 *Strategic Management Journal* **21**(3), 405–425.
- Konolige K, Fox D, Limketkai B, Ko J & Stewart B 2003 *Intelligent Robots and Systems, 2003.(IROS 2003). Proceedings. 2003 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on* **1**.
- Kppers G, Kppers G, Krohn W & Nowotny H 1990 *Selforganization: portrait of a scientific revolution* Dordrecht ; Kluwer Academic Publishers, c1990. Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
- Krieger M & Billeter J 2000 *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* **30**(1-2), 65–84.
- Kube C R & Zhang H 1993 *Adaptive Behavior* **2**, 189.
- Kuniyoshi Y, Kita N, Rougeaux S, Sakane S, Ishii M & Kakikua M 1994 *Robotics and Automation, 1994. Proceedings., 1994 IEEE International Conference on* pp. 767–774.
- Labella T 2007 Division of labour in groups of robots PhD thesis Universite Libre de Bruxelles.

- Lazinica A & Katalinic B 2007 *International Journal of Automation and Control* **1**(1), 16–27.
- Lerman K, Jones C, Galstyan A & Mataric M J 2006 *The International Journal of Robotics Research* **25**, 225.
- Lerman K, Martinoli A & Galstyan A 2005 (3342), 143–152.
- Liu W, Winfield A F T, Sa J, Chen J & Dou L 2007 *Adaptive Behavior* **15**(3), 289–305.
- Lochmatter T, Roduit P, Cianci C, Correll N, Jacot J & Martinoli A 2008 in ‘IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, 2008. IROS 2008’ pp. 4004–4010.
- Love R 2005 *Linux Journal* **2005**(130), 3.
- Martinoli A, Lausanne S & Mondada F 1996 *Experimental Robotics IV: The 4th International Symposium, Stanford, California, June 30-July 2, 1995* .
- Mataric M 2007 *The Robotics Primer* Mit Press.
- Mataric M J 1994 Interaction and Intelligent Behavior PhD thesis Massachusetts institute of Technology.
- Mataric M J 1995 *Robotics and autonomous systems* **16**, 321–331.
- Mataric M J 1998 *Journal of Experimental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence* **10**, 357–369.
- Mataric M J 2001 *Cognitive Systems Research* **2**, 81–93.
- Mataric M J, Nilsson M & Simsarian K T 1995 in ‘IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Robotics and Intelligent Systems’ Pittsburgh, PA.
- McFarland D 1994 *From Animals to Animats* **3**, 440–444.
- McGregor P & Peake T 2000 *Acta Ethologica* **2**(2), 71–81.
- Melhuish C, Holland O & Hoddell S 1998 *From Animals to Animats 5: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Simulation of Adaptive Behavior* pp. 465–470.

- Murphy R 2000 *Introduction to AI Robotics* MIT Press.
- Ortiz C, Vincent R & Morisset B 2005 *Proceedings of the fourth international joint conference on Autonomous agents and multiagent systems* pp. 860–867.
- Parker L 1994 *Proceedings of the ASCE Specialty Conference on Robotics for Challenging Environments, Albuquerque, NM, February* .
- Parker L 1995 L-alliance: a mechanism for adaptive action selection in heterogeneous multi-robot teams Technical report ORNL/TM–13000, Oak Ridge National Lab., TN (United States).
- Parker L E 1998 *Robotics and Automation, IEEE Transactions on* **14**, 220–240.
- Parker L E 2008 *Journal of Physical Agents, special issue on multi-robot systems* **vol. 2**(no. 2), 5–14.
- Parker L E & Tang F 2006 *Proceedings of the IEEE* **94**, 1289–1305.
- Payton D, Estkowski R & Howard M 2005 in E Sahin & W Spears, eds, ‘Swarm Robotics Workshop: State-of-the-art Survey’ number 3342 Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg pp. 45–57.
- Pennington H, Carlsson A & Larsson A 2010 ‘D-bus specification’.
- Premvuti S & Yuta S 1990 *Intelligent Robots and Systems’ 90: Towards a New Frontier of Applications’, Proceedings. IROS’90. IEEE International Workshop on* pp. 59–63.
- Reynolds C W 1987 *Computer Graphics* **21**.
- Rothermich J, Ecemis I & Gaudiano P 2005 in E Sahin & W Spears, eds, ‘From Swarm Intelligence to Swarm Robotics’ number 3342 in ‘Lecture Notes in Computer Science’ Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg pp. 58–69.
- Rutishauser S, Correll N & Martinoli A 2009 *Robotics and Autonomous Systems* **57**(5), 517–525.
- Sahin E & Spears W 2005 *Swarm Robotics: SAB 2004 International Workshop Santa Monica, CS, July 2004 Revised Selected Papers* Berlin, Germany: Springer.

- Sahin E, William M S & Winfield A F T 2007 *Swarm Robotics, Second International Workshop, SAB 2006, Rome, Italy, September 30-October 1, 2006, Revised Selected Papers*. International Conference on Simulation of Adaptive Behavior rome, italy edn Springer Berlin.
- Sarker M 2008 'Emergent self-regulation in social robotic systems' PhD Transfer Report, University of Wales, Newport, 2008.
- Sarker M & Dahl T n.d.
- Sayer A & Walker R 1992 *The new social economy : reworking the division of labor* Blackwell Oxford. 19920311.
- Schild K & Bussmann S 2007.
- Schmickl T, Moslinger C & Crailsheim K 2006 in E Sahin, W. M Spears & A. F. T Winfield, eds, 'Second International Workshop on Swarm Robotics at SAB 2006' Vol. 4433 Springer Verlag Berlin, Germany pp. 144–157.
- Sendova-Franks A B & Franks N R 1999 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B* **354**, 1395–1405.
- Shen W, Hao Q, Yoon H & Norrie D 2006 *Advanced Engineering Informatics* **20**(4), 415–431.
- Shen W, Norrie D H & Barthes J P 2001 *Multi-agent systems for concurrent intelligent design and manufacturing* Taylor & Francis London.
- Simmons R, Smith T, Dias M B, Goldberg D, Hershberger D, Stentz A & Zlot R M 2002 *Multi-Robot Systems: From Swarms to Intelligent Automata, Proceedings from the 2002 NRL Workshop on Multi-Robot Systems* .
- Slater P J B 1986 *Animal behaviour* Leisure Circle Wembley.
- Spears W & Gordon D 1999 *IEEE International Conference on Information, Intelligence, and Systems* pp. 281–288.
- Spears W M, Hamann J C, Maxim P M, Kunkel T, Heil R, Zarzhitsky D, Spears D F & Karlsson C 2006 in E Sahin, W. M Spears & A. F. T Winfield, eds,

- 'Second International Workshop on Swarm Robotics at SAB 2006' Vol. 4433
Springer Verlag Berlin, Germany pp. 129–143.
- Stone P & Veloso M 1999 *Artificial Intelligence* **110**, 241–273.
- Thurn S, Burgard W & Fox D 2000 *Proc. of the IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation* .
- Torbjrn S, Dahl M J M & Sukhatme G S 2003 in 'IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA'03)Taipei, Taiwan, September 14 - 19, 2003' pp. pp2293–2298.
- Ueda K 2006 *DET, Setubal, Portugal* .
- Wang P K C 1989 *Intelligent Robots and Systems' 89.(IROS'89)'The Autonomous Mobile Robots and Its Applications'.*, *Proceedings. IEEE/RSJ International Workshop on* pp. 486–493.
- Werger B B & Mataric M J 2001 *Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems* **4**, 347356.
- West, Richard T L H 2003 *Introducing communication theory : analysis and application* McGraw-Hill.
- Wittenburg G 2005 'Desktop ipc'.
- Yang E & Gu D 2004 *University of Essex Technical Report CSM-404, Department of Computer Science* .
- Zlot R, Stentz A, Dias M & Thayer S 2002 *Robotics and Automation, 2002. Proceedings. ICRA'02. IEEE International Conference on* **3**.