



HAL
open science

From Ability to Capability

Eric Bourreau, Alejandro Garrido, Jean Sallantin, Birgitta Dresp

► **To cite this version:**

Eric Bourreau, Alejandro Garrido, Jean Sallantin, Birgitta Dresp. From Ability to Capability. ECAP'10: 8th Conference on Computing and Philosophy, Oct 2010, München, Germany. pp.149-155. lirmm-00662147v2

HAL Id: lirmm-00662147

<https://hal-lirmm.ccsd.cnrs.fr/lirmm-00662147v2>

Submitted on 14 Feb 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

From Ability to Capability

Eric Bourreau^{1,2}, Birgitta Dresp-Langley³, Alexandro Garrido^{2,4}, Jean Sallantin¹

¹ LIRMM (Laboratoire d'Informatique, de Robotique, de Microélectronique de Montpellier), UMR 5506 - CC477, 161 rue Ada, 34095 Montpellier Cedex 5, France

² Université Montpellier II, Place Eugène Bataillon, 34095 Montpellier, France

³ LMGC (Laboratoire de Mécanique et Génie Civil de Montpellier), UMR 5508, Université MONTPELLIER II, CC 048, Place Eugène Bataillon, 34095 Montpellier cedex 5

⁴ Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Ingeniería Superior de Informática, Ciudad Universitaria , 28040, Madrid, SPain

Abstract

Abilities and Capabilities are different concepts. Classical challenges in robotic arise between theoretical computations and realistic efficient feedbacks. We propose a software platform, trying to split the necessary level of (1) actions (abilities), (2) perceptions of sequences of actions, (3) diagnosis and (4) supervision in order to introduce more reactivity and bring together Artificial Intelligence and Autonomous Robotics. Our first experiments will cope with cognitive mapping representations and necessary adaptations needed when inconsistent landmarks are introduced.

Keywords : Robotic, Cognition, Software platform, realistic experimentations.

From Ability to Capability

Capabilities and abilities are different concepts. All robots have functional and mechanical abilities but most of the time, the necessary algorithms to exploit them have to be specifically built. If you want to achieve a full use of the possible capabilities of a robot, you need to deeply link this algorithm at the physical level. Robotic area is still pushing these limits with humanoid robots for example. If you want to achieve deep cognitions (emotions, expertise, discovery), to perform clever actions (and inter-actions) in a robotic field, you need a high level representation of your capabilities but unfortunately also some well connected feedback from the realistic part of your computation to make them efficient (embodiment).

What we propose is a software platform, trying to split the necessary level of (1) actions (abilities), (2) perceptions of sequences of actions, (3) diagnosis and (4) supervision in order to introduce more reactivity and bring together Artificial Intelligence and Autonomous Robotics.


The proof of the generic use of this platform will be illustrated on four different “devices”: Minstorm robot (from Lego) (Bourreau et al, 2009); four wheels autonomous robot, Peekee; four legged autonomous dog Aibo (from Sony) (Garrido, 2010) and two legged humanoid robot HOAP (from Fujitsu). We perform the same experiments and try to compare and analyze the resulted memories build by the robots.

Working on autonomous robot is a useful strategy to understand the base of human intelligence. (Oudeyer et al., 2007) works on an architecture for a baby robot which is guided in the way it creates its world representation. In Munich, (Bauer et al., 2009) test the ability of the robot to find its way in a town, asking the pedestrians that it meets in the street. (Coeckelgergh, 2009) suppose that robots are quasi human. The good practice of capabilities can be used as an efficient test for the degree of autonomy that can be offered to a robot.

By interpretation, we denote a sequence of actions produced by a specific causal cycle. During this cycle, the system performs actions, perceives previous actions, describes reality, analyses its perception in order to suggest possible actions, and finally decides of potential actions to be executed. Adaptation and Evolution transform the interpretation. Adaptation process translates the diagnostic

From Ability to Capability

into constraints on the “Action” subsystem. Evolution process translates the perception into contextual modifications of the “Supervision” subsystem. A representation of the interpretation is a contextual ontology in adequacy with the interpretation. This model captures the core of the Brooks architecture (Brooks, 1985) and of the behavioral architecture.



Figures 1,2,3: the Robot behaviour (fig1) is based on a causal temporal cycle producing an interpretation given by a sequence of actions. Brook Architecture (fig2) and the behavioral architecture (fig3) are based on more simple causal temporal cycle.

Technically, the diagnostic subsystem, done by (Paulin 2008), is using constraint programming (Mackworth, 1977). The suggested action scheduling is an extension of the STRIPS (Stanford Research Institute Problem Solver) (Fikes et al.,1971) in constraint programming (Lopez, Bacchus, 2003).

To evaluate the actions of the robot, the supervisor uses four modalities (fig 4). These modalities express the supervisor judgments and are used to tell the robot of the nature of the supervisor’s judgment. The series of events are saved in the episodic memory of the robot. It is able to learn and adapt its behavior accordingly.




Figure 4: four modalities which are a) green thumb up indicating agreement b) red thumb down indicating disagreement c) grey Zzzz? indicating misunderstanding d) Orange !!! indicating “interest in the matter”. Meaning of the arrows: for logical reasons $a \Rightarrow d$ and $c \Rightarrow b$ and it is impossible to simultaneously have “a and b” or “c and d”.

Our platform gives us the experimental environment to test the efficiency and the limit of our architecture. As first experiment, we will deal with Cognitive Mapping and adaptation to Inconsistent

From Ability to Capability

Landmarks. The concept of Cognitive Mapping refers to a process that is essential to the survival of all intelligent species and involves cognitive strategies which lead to mental representations of routes, itineraries, and critical landmarks. Such representations are necessary for successful navigation in a physical environment. We suggest that cognitive mapping can be exploited to investigate the adaptive behaviour of “intelligent robots”.

Psychological theory (Tolman, 1948; Denis, 1997) claims that skeletal representations of routes are constructed through the iterative learning of physical and/or symbolic landmarks along routes on the basis of intrinsic or relative or intrinsic spatial reference frames (Levinson, 1996). A relative reference frame gives the robots’ position in space (left, right, back, or front) with regard to a reference object or symbol, a so-called landmark, and a target object or symbol. An intrinsic reference frame gives the position of a landmark with regard to the target.

Spatial reference frames and iterative route learning based on landmarks is exploited here to investigate the adaptive (“intelligent”) behavior from the episodic memory of the robot trained with teacher-robot interactions. This supervised learning is used to make the robot learn to choose an “ideal route” through a maze towards a hidden target object by responding to specific physical or symbolic landmarks along that route. Learning is accomplished once the robot is capable of responding successfully to the landmarks given and finds the ideal route with a satisfactory success rate (>90%). A learning curve is computed as a reference measure.

After learning, the robot’s capacity of adaptive behaviour is tested by introducing either physical or symbolic inconsistencies in the learnt landmarks. Psychological experiments with human observers in virtual maze environments, for example, have shown that removing learnt landmarks from a learnt itinerary does not noticeably affect navigation performances. Changes in the topographical organization of landmarks, however, may considerably affect navigation from destination to target and individuals then have to use other strategies to cope with the problem. Also, as can be predicted on the basis of clinical observations with patients presenting psychological disorders, the repeated perturbation of a learnt landmark code could be experienced as extremely

From Ability to Capability

stressful and therefore produce unsuccessful (non-adapted) coping behaviours, as in post-traumatic stress disorders or schizoid, obsessive-compulsory, hysterical and paranoid behaviour disorders, for example (Ishii, 2009).

Will we observe non-adapted stereotypic coping behaviours in the robot that match the stereotypic behaviours of clinical patients when the landmark code, which has previously allowed the robot to produce a highly successful behaviour, is repeatedly perturbed after learning?

How and how long it takes the robot to “unlearn” the learnt itinerary, can be assessed by comparing “post-traumatic” performances with the >90% successful trials at the end of learning.

References

- Bauer A., Klasing K., Lidoris G., Mühlbauer Q., Rohrmüller F., Sosnowski S., ...Buss M. (2009), The Autonomous City Explorer : Towards Natural Human-Robot Interaction in Urban Environments.
- Bourreau E., Peralta E., Sallantin J. (2009), Scientific Discovery of itself by a robot assisted by an human, *ECAP*, J. Vallverdu.
- Brooks R. A. (1985), A Robust Layered Control System For a Mobile Robot, *Technical Report*, Cambridge, MA, USA.
- Coeckelgergh M. (2009), Robot anthropology : Robots as hermeneutic devices for defining human, *ECAP*, J. Vallverdu.
- Denis M. (1997), The description of routes: a cognitive approach to the production of spatial discourse. *Current Psychology of Cognition*, 16, 409-458
- Fikes R., Nilsson N. J. (1971), STRIPS : A New Approach to the Application of Theorem Proving to Problem Solving, *IJCAI*, 608-620.
- Garrido A. (2010), Implémentation de comportements intelligents sur AIBO : Plateforme COGITOIDE, *Master Thesis*.
- Ishii K. (2009), Emerging conciousness and shizophrenic by products in Humanoid Robots, *ECAP*, J. Vallverdu.
- Levinson S. (1996), Frames of reference and Molyneux's question: cross-linguistic evidence. In Bloom, P, Peterson, MA, Nadel, L and Garrett, M (eds.). *Space and Language*. MIT Press, Cambridge (MA), 109-169
- Lopez A., Bacchus F. (2003), Generalizing GraphPlan by Formulating Planning as a CSP, *IJCAI*, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, 954-960.
- Mackworth A. (1977), Consistency in Networks of Relations, *Artificial Intelligence*, 8, vol 1, 99-118. Reprinted in *Readings in Artificial Intelligence*, B. L. Webber and N. J. Nilsson (eds.), Tioga Publ. Col., Palo Alto, CA, 69-78, (1981). [This paper was honoured in Artificial

From Ability to Capability

Intelligence 59, 1-2 (1993) as one of the fifty most cited papers in the history of Artificial Intelligence].

Oudeyer P.-Y., Kaplan F., Hafner V. (2007), Intrinsic Motivation Systems for Autonomous Mental Development, *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*.

Paulin M. (2008), Contributions à l'apprentissage automatique de réseau de contraintes et à la constitution automatique de comportements sensorimoteurs en robotique, *PhD thesis*, Université Montpellier II.

Tolman E.C. (1948), Cognitive maps in rats and men. *Psychological Review*, 55, 189-208.