Towards Model-Based Reinforcement Learning on Real Robots

_{by} Georg Martius





Vision

Dexterous and versatile robots as assistance to humans



[bergkvistanna karin@tuvie.com]

[NCCR Digital Fabrication]

- learning
- > adaptivity
- safety

Reinforcement learning achievements

Robotics, Games: Go, Dota, Starcraft



[OpenAl 2019]



[Deepmind 2019]

Problems

need probitive amount of data simulations need very long time



[DARPA rescue] challenge]

Current Situation

Learned robot control in recent **research**

- using simulations of robot and environment
- trained to cope with anticipated variations
- works already for difficult tasks
 needs a high-fidelity simulation
 learning is inefficient (needs domain randomization)
 resulting controller is fixed
 new task: start from scratch



[OpenAl 2019]



[Hutter lab. ETH, 2020]

How to achieve efficient learning and online adaptation?

Model-based Reinforcement Learning

Two instantiations

Bellman operator to optimize a value function and the policy

- ➤ use model to collect data nearby real observation
- ➤ learn to solve a specific task
- ► global optimimization

Planning to search for a policy on the fly

- ➤ use model for planning
- ➤ perform new task on the fly
- ➤ optimize finite horizon problem



Model-based RL with Planning

Challenges:

- ➤ Real time planning
 - previous general purpose planner are
 - 1-2 orders of magnitudes too slow
- ➤ Good models + uncertainty aware
- ➤ Safety



(KIT H²T)











Cristina Pinneri

Sebastian Blaes

Marin Vlastelica Shambhuraj Sawant

Georg Martius

Cross Entropy Method (CEM)

➤ Sampling based optimization

 $a_1, \ldots, a_h \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$



$$a_1, \ldots, a_h = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{a_1, \ldots, a_h} J(a_1, \ldots, a_h)$$

J cost of rollout

Random Walk Model and Colored Noise



Power spectral density of action sequences



Georg

8

Random Walk Model and Colored Noise



Power spectral density of action sequences



9

Cross Entropy Method (CEM)

➤ Sampling based optimization

$a_{t,\dots,t+H} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$



improved Cross Entropy Method

- ♣ Memory
- + Colored noise: temporal correlation power-law spectrum: $PSD \propto \frac{1}{f^{\beta}}$
- ➡ small improvements

Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

Pinneri, Sawant, Blaes, Achterhold, Stückler, GM. CORL 2020





(environment from DAPG project)

Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

11

Pinneri, Sawant, Blaes, Achterhold, Stückler, GM. CORL 2020



Georg Martius < georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

Pinneri, Sawant, Blaes, Achterhold, Stückler, GM. CORL 2020

12

Action



Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

13



Learn Policy from Plans

We can create solutions for complicated control problems within seconds, but:

- ➤ need a lot of run-time compute
- ➤ mostly with Ground Truth models (simulations)

Goal of our method:

- ➤ train policy from planner data
- ➤ make policy and planner mutually improve themselves
- ➤ solve tasks that standard RL struggles with

Let's do simple behavioral cloning:

- ➤ does not work!
- ➤ multimodality + combounding errors



Okay, use guidance (*guided policy search*)

$$a_1, \dots, a_h = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{a_1, \dots, a_h} f(a_1, \dots, a_h) + \lambda \sum_i ||a_i - \pi(s_i)||$$

better, but not ideal!



Okay, use guidance (guided policy search)

$$a_1, \dots, a_h = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{a_1, \dots, a_h} f(a_1, \dots, a_h) + \lambda \sum_i \|a_i - \pi(s_i)\|$$

better, but not ideal!

► planner premature convergence Agent

➤ combounding errors





Pinneri*, Sawant*, Blaes, GM. ICLR 2021

Okay, use guidance (guided policy search)

$$a_1, \dots, a_h = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{a_1, \dots, a_h} f(a_1, \dots, a_h) + \lambda \sum_i ||a_i - \pi(s_i)||$$

+ relabeling (*DAgger*):



Okay, use guidance (guided policy search)

$$a_1, \dots, a_h = \underset{a_1, \dots, a_h}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} J(a_1, \dots, a_h) + \lambda C^{\operatorname{aux}}(a_1, \dots, a_h)$$

+ relabeling (*Dagger*) + adaptive λ

don't use guidance if no progress on actual task



$$\lambda = c \frac{\mathcal{R}(J)}{\mathcal{R}(C^{\mathrm{aux}}) + \epsilon}$$

c relative importance

$$\mathcal{R}(C) = \max_{\text{elite-set}} C - \min_{\text{elite-set}} C$$

APEX (Adaptive Policy Extraction)

SAC

ICEM BC

Pinneri*, Sawant*, Blaes, GM. ICLR 2021

APEX results



Discussion:

- + strong policies for hard tasks
- behavior not perfect
- high computational costs

Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

Pinneri*, Sawant*, Blaes, GM. ICLR 2021



Real-time Risk-Averse Model-based Planning

Towards real-robots:

- ➤ learned models: adapt to real system
- ➤ safety: do not destroy the robot / environment
- ➤ real-time: run at > 25Hz

Challenges:

- ➤ explore effective but careful
- ➤ need powerful dynamics models
- ➤ awareness of **uncertainties** required

➤ separation of *aleatoric* and *epistemic* uncertainty

Why?

24

- ➤ aleatoric: avoid
- ➤ epistemic: seek to reduce



Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

➤ separation of *aleatoric* and *epistemic* uncertainty

Why?

- ➤ aleatoric: avoid
- ➤ epistemic: seek to reduce



Ensemble of probabilistic Deep Nets

➤ good estimates of separation both types of uncertainty

Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

What about n-step preditions?

- ➤ PETS: [Chua et al 2018] Probabilistic Ensemble models with Trajectory Sampling
- ➤ sampling at every timestep **mixes** uncertainties



Vlastelica*, Blaes*, Pinneri, GM. CORL 2021

What about n-step preditions?

- ➤ PETS: [Chua et al 2018] Probabilistic Ensemble models with Trajectory Sampling
- ➤ PETSUS [ours] disentangle uncertainties



Vlastelica*, Blaes*, Pinneri, GM. CORL 2021

What about n-step preditions?

28

- ➤ PETS: [Chua et al 2018] Probabilistic Ensemble models with Trajectory Sampling
- ➤ PETSUS [ours] disentangles uncertainties also for n-step predictions



Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

Efficient Exploration

Seek to reduce epistemic uncertaint:

 \mathbf{a}

$$\mathbf{a} = \arg\min J(\mathbf{a}) - w^{\mathcal{E}} \operatorname{Epistemic}(\mathbf{a})$$

► Exploration bonus

toy world: Bridge Maze



no bonus
$$\,w^{\mathcal{E}}=0\,$$







Risk-averse Behavior

Seek to reduce epistemic uncertaint:

$$\mathbf{a} = \underset{\mathbf{a}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} J(\mathbf{a}) - w^{\mathcal{E}} \operatorname{Epistemic}(\mathbf{a})$$

Risk-averse planning

$$\mathbf{a} = \underset{\mathbf{a}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} J(\mathbf{a}) + w^{\mathcal{A}} \operatorname{Aleatoric}(\mathbf{a})$$

 avoid unpredictable areas: uncertainty penalty toy world: Bridge Maze





Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

Risk-averse Behavior

Seek to reduce epistemic uncertaint:

$$\mathbf{a} = \underset{\mathbf{a}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} J(\mathbf{a}) + w^{\mathcal{E}} \underset{\mathbf{a}}{\operatorname{Epistemic}}(\mathbf{a})$$

Risk-averse planning

31

$$\mathbf{a} = \underset{\mathbf{a}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} J(\mathbf{a}) + w^{\mathcal{A}} \operatorname{Aleatoric}(\mathbf{a})$$

avoid unpredictable areas: uncertainty penalty
 Noisy Fetch Pick & Place
 RAZER PETS
 O¹/₀
 <

Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

Safety-aware Behavior

Probabilistic safety constraints as cost penalty

- \succ compute probability of entering unsafe set $\mathbb C$
- \succ add high penalty cost if larger δ
- ➤ here: simple box constraints: analytic solution for probability

$$\mathbf{a} = \underset{\mathbf{a}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} J(\mathbf{a}) + w^{\mathcal{S}} \sum_{\Delta t=1}^{H} \left[p(\hat{x}_{t+\Delta t} \in \mathbb{C}) > \delta \right]$$

Safety-aware Behavior

Probabilistic safety constraints as cost penalty

- \succ compute probability of entering unsafe set $\mathbb C$
- \succ add high penalty cost if larger δ
- ➤ here: simple box constraints: analytic solution for probability



33

Safety-aware Behavior

Probabilistic safety constraints as cost penalty

- \succ compute probability of entering unsafe set $\mathbb C$
- \succ add high penalty cost if larger δ
- ➤ here: simple box constraints: analytic solution for probability



Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

Summary

Fast universal planning – iCEM

- ➤ works with arbtrary models and cost functions
- ➤ 1-2 orders of magnitude faster than previous SotA

Extracting policies is hard – APEX is one solution

- ➤ adaptive guided policy search + Dagger
- ➤ offline RL might be a better choice

Planning with learned models – RAZER

- ➤ uncertainty estimation
- ➤ efficient exploration, risk and safety-aware behavior
- ➤ GPU implementation at 30 Hz







Near future applications to real robots:



real-robot-challenge.com @ MPI-IS











Volkswagen Stiftung

Thank you!

Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

imprs-is CyberValley

















Huanbo Sun

Georg Martius

Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

39

Coming out soon: ML-driven haptic sensor



Huanbo Sun (Ph.D. Student) Autonomous Learning Group



Katherine J. Kuchenbecker Haptic Intelligence Department



Georg Martius Autonomous Learning Group







Sun, Kuchenbecker, Martius, Nature Machine Intelligence, 2022

iCEM Sensitivity



20

40

planning horizon

60

80

Georg Martius <georg.martius@tue.mpg.de>

0.8

1.0

0.4

0.6

 σ_{init}

0.2

iCEM Ablation

best -

