SANDIA REPORT
SAND2001-3685
Unlimited Release
Printed November, 2001

A Critical Review of the State-of-the-Art in Autonomous Land Vehicle Systems and Technology

Hugh Durrant-Whyte

Prepared by
Sandia National Laboratories
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185 and Livermore, California 94550

Sandia is a multiprogram laboratory operated by Sandia Corporation, a Lockheed Martin Company, for the United States Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC04-94AL85000.

Approved for public release; further dissemination unlimited.

Sandia National Laboratories

Issued by Sandia National Laboratories, operated for the United States Department of Energy by Sandia Corporation.

NOTICE: This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government, nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, make any warranty, express or implied, or assume any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represent that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government, any agency thereof, or any of their contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government, any agency thereof, or any of their contractors.

Printed in the United States of America. This report has been reproduced directly from the best available copy.

Available to DOE and DOE contractors from
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Scientific and Technical Information
P.O. Box 62
Oak Ridge, TN 37831

Telephone: (865)576-8401
Facsimile: (865)576-5728
E-Mail: reports@adonis.osti.gov
Online ordering: http://www.doe.gov/bridge

Available to the public from
U.S. Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Rd
Springfield, VA 22161

Telephone: (800)553-6847
Facsimile: (703)605-6900
E-Mail: orders@ntis.fedworld.gov
Online order: http://www.ntis.gov/ordering.htm

SAND2001-3685
Unlimited Release
Printed November 2001

A Critical Review of the State-of-the-Art in Autonomous Land Vehicle Systems and Technology

Hugh Durrant-Whyte
Australian Centre for Field Robotics
The University of Sydney NSW 2006
Australia
hugh@acfr.usyd.edu.au

ABSTRACT

This report describes the current state-of-the-art in Autonomous Land Vehicle (ALV) systems and technology. Five functional technology areas are identified and addressed. For each a brief, subjective, preface is first provided which envisions the necessary technology for the deployment of an operational ALV system. Subsequently, a detailed literature review is provided to support and elaborate these views. It is further established how these five technology areas fit together as a functioning whole. The essential conclusion of this report is that the necessary sensors, algorithms and methods to develop and demonstrate an operationally viable all-terrain ALV already exist and could be readily deployed. A second conclusion is that the successful development of an operational ALV system will rely on an effective approach to systems engineering. In particular, a precise description of mission requirements and a clear definition of component functionality is essential.

Contents

1 Autonomous Land Vehicle Systems **7**
1.1 Structure of the Report . . . 7
1.2 An ALV Functional Map . . . 7
1.3 Definition of ALV Requirements . . . 9
1.4 Summary . . . 10

2 Mobility **10**
2.1 Preface . . . 10
2.2 Mobility: Design . . . 11
2.2.1 Design Choice . . . 12
2.2.2 Design Optimisation . . . 12
2.3 Mobility: Control . . . 14
2.4 Mobility: Vehicles . . . 15

3 Localisation **16**
3.1 Preface . . . 16
3.2 Structure of Localisation Algorithms . . . 17
3.3 Rate Sensing . . . 18
3.3.1 Inertial Sensing . . . 18
3.3.2 Odometric Sensing . . . 20
3.4 GPS and Related Beacon-Navigation Systems . . . 20
3.4.1 GPS Performance . . . 20
3.4.2 GPS Aiding . . . 21
3.4.3 The Use of Pseudolites . . . 22
3.5 Terrain-Navigation Methods . . . 22
3.5.1 Map-based Terrain Navigation . . . 23
3.5.2 Map Construction and SLAM . . . 24

4 Navigation **25**
4.1 Preface . . . 25
4.2 Collision Avoidance and Reactive Control . . . 26
4.2.1 Reactive Methods . . . 26
4.2.2 Local Modelling Methods . . . 27
4.3 The Construction and Use of Local Terrain Models . . . 27
4.3.1 Elevation Grids . . . 28
4.3.2 Tessellated Terrain Models . . . 28
4.3.3 Other Terrain Representation Methods . . . 28
4.4 Terrain Navigation Sensors . . . 29
4.4.1 Passive Sensing . . . 29
4.4.2 Active Sensing . . . 30
4.4.3 Range Imaging . . . 31
4.4.4 Multiple Sensors . . . 31

5 Mission and Task Planning **31**
5.1 Preface 31
5.2 Path Planning Methods 32
5.3 Mission Planning Methods 33

6 Communications **33**

7 Conclusions **35**

Bibliography **37**

1 Autonomous Land Vehicle Systems

This report describes the current state-of-the-art in Autonomous Land Vehicle (ALV) systems and technology. The essential conclusion is that the necessary sensors, algorithms and methods to develop and demonstrate an operationally viable all-terrain ALV already exist and could be readily deployed. A second conclusion is that the successful development of an operational ALV system will rely on an effective approach to systems engineering. In particular, a precise description of mission requirements and a clear definition of component functionality is essential. This is particularly important in the areas of navigation and planning where a finite definition of mission objectives and vehicle functionality is seen as essential.

1.1 Structure of the Report

The Embudito mission [20] is an example of a general class of rough terrain navigation and guidance problems for autonomous land vehicles. The functional requirements call for a ground platform capable of deploying surveillance, reconnaissance, or other payloads in rough, unstructured and vegetated environments. While hypothetical, the Embudito mission captures the essential requirements of a wide range of possible ALV applications. The functional requirements for this class of missions can be broken down into five main areas:

1. Mobility over this terrain class.
2. Position determination in an absolute and target frame.
3. Navigation in the small: negotiation of varied obstacles and local terrain.
4. Navigation in the large: mission and task planning beyond visual range.
5. Communications.

This report addresses these five key areas of ALV technology as elements of a, holistic, overall vehicle system. The factual purpose of this report is to define the state-of-the-art in ALV systems through a literature review in these five technology areas. The subjective purpose of this report is to describe the gap between this state-of-the-art and the deployment of an operational ALV system. A central tenet of this report is that the gap between the current state-of-the-art and the deployment of an operational ALV is largely an issue of appropriate systems engineering. For this reason, the report is centered around a functional map of ALV requirements and operations, rather than being predicated on, or determined by, the choice of specific architecture or methodology.

1.2 An ALV Functional Map

Figure 1 shows a schematic of the relationship between the different *functional* components of an ALV system. The overall function of an ALV in the context of the Embudito mission is to

traverse an unstructured and poorly known terrain and to deploy a payload, generally for the purpose of reconnaissance or surveillance, but potentially for a more active task.



Figure 1: Schematic of the relationship between the different functional components of an ALV system.

Mobility captures the physical mechanics of the vehicle, the interaction of the vehicle with the terrain and the effect of control of the vehicle on the terrain. Mobility is viewed simply as the effector of the overall system; the observable outcome of the system as a whole.

Position determination or **localisation** provides estimates of the location, attitude, velocity and acceleration of the vehicle. Importantly, localisation is an output-only function when viewed by the rest of the system. This means that the development of a localisation ability can often proceed independently from that of other system components.

Navigation in the small, or simply **navigation**, is concerned with the acquisition of, and response to, external sensed information. The navigation function takes input from sensors observing the operational environment. It must use this information to create an internal representation of the environment that can subsequently be used in the execution of a mission.

Navigation in the large, or **mission and task planning**, functionally generates trajectories, behaviours or way points for the system as a whole. It has no direct links with either sensory input or controller output. However, it clearly must use an understanding of these, in conjunction with prior maps and defined mission objectives, to produce appropriate navigation commands.

Communication provides the link between the vehicle and any remaining elements of the global system, including other vehicles and operators. There is no reason to suppose that a truly autonomous ALV should not share the same communication medium with other systems and indeed be interoperable with more conventional platforms.

While the specific payload and mission to be executed must define the overall system requirement, it does not, and should not, impinge on the vehicle functional elements: The need for mobility, localisation, navigation and planning abilities remains regardless of the mission. Indeed, it is to be expected that a common realisation of these four functions would serve a wide variety of payloads and missions. The structure and role of the mission and task planning function is clearly critical in enabling this degree of flexibility. The ideal mission planning system would allow a range of disparate missions to be considered with a range of operational constraints and subjective mission values accounted for. Consideration of specific missions are, however, beyond the scope of this report.

This functional map of ALV capabilities is sufficient to precisely define the technology required to deploy and operational system. Descriptions of specific architectures are considered irrelevant and indeed misleading in understanding the relation between technology areas and operational capability. They are consequently not discussed further.

1.3 Definition of ALV Requirements

One fact that is clear, from the ALV research literature and from previous ALV programmes, is that there needs to be a finite and precise definition of mission requirements for a successful system to be developed.

It is essentially impossible to develop a generic "autonomous machine" for all possible ALV missions. While this may appear obvious, too many ALV programmes have aimed at a very nebulous idea of "intelligent and autonomous" operations, creating an impossible requirement to handle all possible terrains and mission situations in an autonomous manner. In contrast, a well defined end goal, with specific mission types and with specific terrain conditions, immediately makes the problem of developing autonomy tractable.

A precise and quantitative description of mission requirements and system capability is seen as essential. This is no different from a requirements definition in conventional manned civilian or military systems. In particular, for the type of ALV system envisioned in the Embudito Mission, the main requirement is for surveillance and intelligence gathering. This requires deployment of a sensor payload in specific terrain conditions. Mobility terrain conditions can be defined through a reference mobility model (the NATO reference mobility model (NRMM) is described in Section 2.2.2 of this report). This defines precisely the mechanics and control of the platform. Terrain effects on communication and sensing can be defined through geoform and foliage models. Together these define the functionality of communications and sensing options. In terms of mission planning, deployment of surveillance or SIGINT sensors simply requires computation and selection of vehicle trajectories. In robotics, computation of a vehicle path is a well un-

derstood problem. Selection of paths requires some measure of mission effectiveness. This may include traversability of terrain, the ability to maintain a target lock, the best use of navigation information, the need for stealth, and many other criteria. However, it is important to note that once the mission objectives are defined, the quantitative selection of possible trajectories based on these effectiveness measures is a well defined and straight-forward optimisation problem.

The fundamental point of this example is that once a well defined mission set is established, system requirements can be established. In a broad range of potential ALV missions, these requirements are both tractable and can be satisfied by existing ALV systems and technology. This report emphasizes the need for a full and complete mission requirement in defining the capabilities of each functional technology area.

1.4 Summary

In the following, each of the five functional technology areas is addressed separately. For each a brief, subjective, preface is first provided which envisions the necessary technology for the deployment of an operational ALV system. Subsequently, a detailed literature review is provided to support and elaborate these views. Section 1.2 has established an overall map of how these five technology areas fit together as a functioning whole.

Of the five functional technologies identified, the areas of mobility and communication are considered to be mature and to exist in a deployable form. Localisation is also mature in most domains although terrain-aiding methods for land vehicles still require some development. Mission planning methods are also considered to be mature although their application to specific Embudito-type missions still needs to be demonstrated. Navigation, the perception of a local environment and the use of this in motion control, is probably the least well demonstrated area of ALV systems. Here, there are still significant issues in defining a terrain representation and identifying an appropriate methodology for fusing data in this representation to the level of integrity and robustness required by an autonomous system. However, currently demonstrated methods show considerable promise in delivering a deployable system capable of Embudito-type missions.

The intended outcome of this report is to provide a basis for a system definition document, and thence the future development and deployment of an operational ALV.

2 Mobility

2.1 Preface

Mobility is concerned with both the design and motion control of mobile vehicles. Design focuses on determining what kinematic and dynamic arrangement of wheels, tracks, legs or other mechanism best achieves a particular motion. Design must be set against the requirements of

the environment and a task specification. In contrast, motion control is concerned with the analysis of a particular kinematic arrangement, and from this, the determination of an actuator control algorithm to achieve a required motion. The process of design synthesis, analysis and control are closely linked.

The design of all-terrain vehicles is a well understood field in many application areas. Well established techniques exist for describing mobility and for designing vehicles with specific mobility characteristics. The commercial realisation of such vehicles is pervasive: in military systems such as tanks, APCs, and many other vehicles; and for civilian vehicle systems in applications such as agriculture, mining and construction. The last decade has also seen some innovative work in understanding the mobility of robotic vehicles. This has encompassed both fundamental design issues as well as the development of metrics for describing mobility. With a defined ALV requirement, it is certainly the case that a vehicle meeting any realistically achievable mobility requirements can be designed. The arguments for this conclusion are presented in detail in Section 2.2.

Motion control of all-terrain vehicles is generally less well understood than platform design. The reason for this is simply that, until recently, vehicle control was achieved manually in all but a few cases. However, the work undertaken in modelling vehicle-terrain interaction in conventional vehicles, commercial traction and motion control systems used on large manually driven mining and construction equipment, and the progress made in the last decade in autonomous rough-terrain vehicles, has all but solved the motion control problem. With a given ALV platform, motion control at speed can be performed on any realistic and mission enabled terrain. The arguments for this conclusion are presented in detail in Section 2.3.

There are a number of viable approaches to the design of an ALV platform. The obvious approach is simply to automate an existing platform. This leverages the substantial knowledge embodied in existing manned vehicle system design. However, a key constraint, that the vehicle must hold a driver in reasonable comfort, does not exist in an automated system. This opens up a potentially vast range of additional design options from simply having a more compact vehicle to employing a completely different mobility mechanisms. It is *apropos* to review the design of existing experimental ALV platforms. Section 2.4 concludes that there are many existing vehicles appropriate to the mobility requirements of the Embudito mission.

2.2 Mobility: Design

The design of mobile platforms has received considerable attention in both the autonomous vehicle and the broader manned vehicle design community. The mobility design issue has been considered at two levels:

- The design of locomotion methodology, including the choice of wheels, tracks, legs or fins as a propulsion mechanism.
- The optimisation of a specific propulsion method. For example, the choice of size, number,

spacing, and tractive effort of a wheeled platform.

The systematic choice of propulsion method is a considerably harder and more generic problem than simple optimisation of a design.

2.2.1 Design Choice

There have been two notable, and quite different efforts addressing the issue of design choice in autonomous vehicles.

First is the work of Joel Brudick [62] which develops a very general mathematical framework for the design and analysis of mobility mechanisms. The method employs geometric and kinematic methods to study the basic locomotion problem. The properties of connections lead to simplified results for both the dynamics and controllability of locomotion systems in general. Notably the method can deal with undulatory motion generated by coupling internal shape changes to external non-holonomic constraints. This is characteristic of many all-terrain articulated vehicles.

Second, and quite different in flavor, is the work of John Bares at CMU in the development of a software system for the synthesis and analysis of mobility mechanisms called Darwin2K [49]. Darwin2K is an example of a general approach to the design of robotic mechanisms (including land vehicles). It consists of a configuration synthesizer and an analysis tool. The synthesizer, called the Evolutionary Synthesis Engine (ESE), uses the simulation tool to evaluate the performance of each new configuration it creates. The ESE's evolutionary algorithm synthesizes robot configurations by applying genetic operators to one or more existing parent configurations. The performance of each new configuration is evaluated through simulation against a task according to a number of defined metrics. Existing metrics include power consumption, task completion time, robot mass, stability, actuator saturation, and collision measurement.

Practically, the approach taken by Darwin2K is most appropriate to the design choice and synthesis process encountered in land-vehicle systems. The system has the potential to allow systematic study of platform design choices. However the system lacks elements of more rigorous dynamic analysis that are required by land vehicle systems (see Kane [38] for example and possible general approaches to this problem).

2.2.2 Design Optimisation

Once a propulsion method has been chosen, it remains to synthesize, select and optimize the mobility mechanism. There has been a substantially amount of work undertaken on this problem by both in the robotics and manned vehicle domains. Here we focus only on wheel and track mobility design methods (legs, snakes and other more exotic mobility methods or not considered further here).

The optimisation of the geometry of many-wheeled vehicles has been extensively studied in the car industry. The books by Wong [88], Ellis [22], and Dixon [17] are the definitive texts in this area. Ellis and Dixon in particular deal with the optimisation of the number, geometry and layout of wheels for different types of road and off-road conditions. A key element of many of these analysis is the understanding of vehicle-terrain interactions through pneumatic tires and through the effects of the terrain itself. This is particularly addressed in the books by Dixon and Wong. The availability of commercial software packages for the detailed analysis of vehicle kinematic and Dynamics is now common place. The best of these is probably ADAMS[1] from Mechanical Dynamics Inc. This provides modules for modeling of tires, different terrain types, and suspension systems. ADAMS also provides performance analysis in terms of tractive efforts, speed and accelerations, forces and handling.

The book by Wong provides the most comprehensive treatment of off-road mobility. Standard techniques for defining mobility through a "mobility map" and "mobility profile" are described. A mobility map consists of a standardized land area in which terrain surface composition, surface geometry and vegetation are defined. The NATO Reference Mobility Model (NRMM) defines three terrain categories: area patch, linear feature segment (such as a stream, ditch, or embankment), and road or trail segment. The NRMM then defines mobility simulations for determining:

1. Maximum speeds and maximum turning of a given vehicle configuration.
2. Tractive effort available for overcoming resistive forces due to sinkage, slope, obstacles, vegetation, etc.
3. Vehicle maneuverability to avoid obstacles, and to accelerate and decelerate between obstacles.
4. Driver tolerance to ride discomfort (not relevant for ALVs)

These, together with the mobility map provide a precise definition and means of computing mobility for off-road vehicles.

In the robotics community there has also been some important work in characterizing mobility. Notable is the paper by Alexander and Maddox [1] describing a general approach to the mobility characterization of many-wheeled vehicles using generalised coordinates, rolling and rigid-body constraints. Also important was the work undertaken at CMU by Muir [58]. Together these two papers established the ground-work for much subsequent work in the design of indoor mobile robots and also path planning and control for such vehicles. However, neither of these addressed the issues of vehicle dynamics (characteristic of high-speed motion) or motion on rough terrain.

Off-road tracked vehicles have also been the subject of extensive study. Wong [88] again provides the most comprehensive treatment. The main interest has previously been in skid-steered tanks [60]. However, articulated tracked vehicles have also been studied and offer many performance

[1] http://adams.com/solutions/auto/

advantages over skid-steered platforms. In both cases, the main defining parameters are the contact area, mass inertia and centroid of tractive effort. Some relatively simple design rules are available for the design of track systems. The skid properties of such vehicles on a variety of terrain and obstacle types are also well documented. Many of the same mobility models as used for wheeled platforms are equally as applicable to tracked vehicles.

Wong defines some basic rules for the selection of vehicle configurations for off-road operations ([88] page 275, see also [5]). In particular the effects of mission requirements and terrain conditions on optimal vehicle configuration are identified. The process adopted consists of a systems analysis using mobility maps and mobility profiles on which different candidate vehicle configurations are analyzed with respect to an envelope of mission characteristics. When taken together with the current tools available for synthesis (Darwin2K) and analysis (ADAMS), this approach offers a systematic means of defining and optimizing ALV mobility characteristics.

2.3 Mobility: Control

The automatic or autonomous control of vehicles at speed and on rough terrain has been studied in both manned and robotic arenas. As an example in the manned vehicle domain, very large mining trucks are now normally driven "fly-by-wire". Trucks such as the Haulpack 930E[2] are driven by in-hub vector AC drives at speeds approaching 50Km/h on rough ground with loads of over 300 tonnes. The drives are controlled to provide appropriate traction and braking effort over a range of terrain conditions. In cars, ABS braking (now standard) and newer fly-by-wire controls are increasingly being employed. In other heavy vehicle domains, electric over hydraulic and electric over diesel controls are also now standard. Detailed models of skidding, slipping, contour and obstacle negotiation have been developed and a number of books on ground vehicles describe these as part of the standard mobility analysis methods.

In the robotics domain, vehicle mobility control is distinguished from path planning. The normal approach to mobility control is to assume a specified path and then to control the vehicle to follow this path. The path itself is normally specified by a series of way-points linked by straight lines, or alternatively smooth splines joining way points [44]. The plan may be specified fully in advance, or may be changed "in the small" by stretching or movement of way-points, or changed "in the large" by addition, subtraction or re-calculation of way-points. Path planning is further addressed in Section 5. Once the path is determined, control to the path can occur either as a steering-only problem or as a complete location, velocity controller. Pure pursuit controllers [40] in particular are widely used (Demo II for example) and considered to be robust to terrain and environment conditions. Pure pursuit controllers correspond to position error feedback of perpendicular path error. Increased performance can be obtained with the use of some path feed-forward or through the use of full PID loops.

At higher speeds and on rougher ground however, it is essential to incorporate some understanding of the dynamics of the vehicle and knowledge of the interaction between the terrain

[2] http://www.komatsumining.com/

and the wheels or tracks of the vehicle [25, 67]. This issue has been considered in [37] where dynamic models of increasing complexity were evaluated on a high-speed wheeled vehicle, in [48] where on-line slip models for tracked vehicles were developed, and [70] in which slip models for high-speed articulated vehicles were employed in path control. It is important to note that the types of models used in guidance and control problems must be predictive, in contrast to the simulation-based models used in the synthesis and analysis of vehicle designs.

Robust path control of vehicles on outdoor rough terrains is thus a well studied subject. Appropriate techniques exist for the control of both wheeled and tracked ALVs, at high speed and over variable terrain.

2.4 Mobility: Vehicles

By far the most common approach to ALV design is to simply automate an existing manual vehicle which has already been optimized for the required task or mission. All early ALV systems followed this route, notably Demo II [33] and Demo III, and the current Ulysses project (an M113 APC). These cover both wheeled and tracked vehicles in conventional arrangement. Commercial programs in automated mining, construction or agricultural vehicles have also taken this route. The normal mode of automation is to provide straight electric-over-hydraulic, or electric-over-diesel control through proprietary hardware and controllers. A significant number of manufacturers now provide an "automation option" on manual vehicles: Notably, Kalmar Industries (of Finland) who manufacture container straddle carriers and forestry logging equipment, Komatsu-Haulpack who manufacture large mining trucks and excavators, and Vost-alpine who manufacture underground mining equipment. Fly-by-wire "automation options" are also widely available in many manned military vehicles. A number of specialist companies now exist which provide "off-the-shelf" retro-fit automation options to any conceivable manually operated vehicle.

The next step up is the development of ALV platforms based on conventional vehicle design philosophies. Notable is the "Modulaire" platform developed in the EEC "Panorama" project in the early 1990s. This consisted of an all-terrain tracked vehicle approximately 3m in length, 1.5m in width, 0.5m high, capable of speeds of 6m/s. The vehicle was demonstrated in a number of applications including agricultural spraying and soil tilling, land mine disposal, and military reconnaissance. More recently, the Mobile Detection, Assessment and Response System (MDARS) vehicle designed by RST offers a wheeled base similar to a conventional all-terrain vehicle[3].

The final level is to purpose-design a robotic mechanism directly from mission requirements. There is some excellent basic research going on in this area, notably [71] and [24]. This work addresses many practical issues in traversability of surfaces including rocks and other geoforms, speed and steering on different terrain types, and in mobility on different gradients. The Lunar and Mars rover communities have also developed many innovative vehicle systems, the most

[3] http://www.rst.com/products4.html

widely used being the Russian designed "Marsokhod" vehicle.

The Nomad vehicle developed at CMU stands out as one of the most innovative of all recent vehicle designs. Nomad was developed as a Lunar rover and has been evaluated in trials both in the Atacama Desert and in Antarctica. Nomad's innovative locomotion design features four-wheel/all-wheel drive locomotion, a reconfigurable chassis, electronically coordinated steering, pivot-arm suspension, and body motion averaging [69]. Nomad also employs a unique steering system design enabling both skid and explicit steering [72]. Notable in the development of the Nomad vehicle has been the systematic use of mobility metrics and configuration analysis in design and testing of the locomotion system.

There is clearly a broad range of possible mobility systems for an operational ALV. Techniques for understanding, developing and testing mobility metrics are established, if not yet widely used in robotics. Once requirements for a class of ALV mission objectives are defined, the design and optimisation of an appropriate platform should not be considered a technical risk.

3 Localisation

3.1 Preface

Localisation is the problem of determining the position and attitude of a vehicle with respect to some fixed coordinate system. Localisation is a very well-studied problem in a range of air, land and sub-sea applications[4]. Autonomous localisation methods, such as those envisioned in the Embudito mission, offer additional challenges in dealing with high-degrees of sensor uncertainty, in interpretation of terrain and environment observations, and in the need to make robust autonomous decisions on the basis of ambiguous sensor data.

While slow in coming, the use of inertial navigation systems (INS) in ALV applications is now well established and should serve as a basis for any localisation system design. The state of the art in inertial and odometric sensing is described in Section 3.3.

The use of GPS is also now well developed for land vehicles. However, it is essential to recognize and understand that GPS has many failure modes that make it inappropriate for stand-alone use in *autonomous* systems: In particular GPS may fail due to loss of line-of-site, from multi-path of local terrain, and from active RF jamming. GPS can be augmented through the use of pseudolites and alternative precision timing (pps) signals, however these will have similar failure modes to conventional GPS. The state-of-the-art in GPS and GPS aiding for land vehicles is described in Section 3.4.

Practically therefore, additional terrain-aided navigation methods are required to localize a platform, both globally and with respect to the local environment. Terrain-aided localisation methods are well established in robotics. Of particular importance in environments that are

[4]Notably, [57] pp 289–367 and subsequent citations is a particularly good development of the "standard navigation" algorithms developed for aerospace applications during the 1960s and 1970s.

generally not know *a priori*, is the advent of Simultaneous Localisation and Mapping (SLAM) methods. These provide an autonomous platform with the ability to build a map of the environment while simultaneously using this map to localise. SLAM methods in some form will be essential for autonomous localisation in operations such as those envisioned in the Embudito mission. The state-of-the-art in terrain navigation and SLAM is described in Section 3.5. Finally, the range of sensors that can be used in ALV terrain aiding includes both passive EO and FLIR, as well as active devices such as radar or laser.

The structure and operation of autonomous localisation systems are generally well understood. Given requirements for localisation performance, accuracy and integrity, a composite ALV navigation system based on inertial, odometric, GPS and terrain-aiding can be assembled in a form appropriate to operations characterised by the Embudito mission.

3.2 Structure of Localisation Algorithms

The generally accepted structure of most localisation algorithms is shown in Figure 2. It consists of three parts arranged in a feedback configuration. The **rate sensors** feedforward integrated estimates of vehicle position, attitude and velocity. These estimates are also fed to an **estimation algorithm** which also takes information from a set of **external sensing devices**. The estimation algorithm produces a set of corrections which are fed-back to the rate sensors. The output of the rate sensors is then corrected to reflect external sensor information and yielding a fused localisation estimate. This structure embodies a number of important principles:



Figure 2: Feedback structure of localisation algorithms.

Frequency Interpretation: The estimation algorithm (often a Kalman filter) has a low-pass characteristic. Thus, external sensor measurements appear in low-passed form at the output of the structure. Conversely, the location of the rate sensors in the loop ensure that rate sensor

measurements have a "one minus filter" or high-pass characteristic. Thus, the output of the localisation system is high-frequency information from rate sensors together with low-frequency information from external sensors. This accords with common experience; accelerometers and other rate sensors provide measurements of rapid motion, whereas GPS or other external sensors provide measurements of slowly varying or fixed location. Both types of sensors are essential for successful operation of a localisation system.

Fault Tolerance: The structure is such that loss of external sensors or loss of corrections from the estimation algorithm result in the system running on rate sensing only. This is a robust configuration. In general, rate sensors (such as inertial devices) are internal and not prone to failure, whereas external sensors and algorithms may fail in any number of unpredictable ways. The structure is also naturally amenable to the inclusion of varied and sporadic external correction information; from beacon observations, from terrain observations, etc. As and when external information arrives, a correction to the rate sensors is performed.

Error-Corrector Structure: In this feedback structure, the estimation algorithm operates on the *error* between integrated rate information and externally obtained position and attitude, feeding back corrections, rather than absolute quantities, to the rate sensors. The use of error rather than absolute value in the estimation algorithms allows more generic and accurate estimator structures to be employed.

It should be clear from the structure of the localisation process and from a frequency-domain understanding of the sensor noise characteristics that both rate sensors and absolute sensors are required to construct a complete localisation system.

The algorithm employed in estimation is very often a Kalman filter. However, increasingly full Bayesian algorithms are also being used either in the form of particle filters, or as a density function estimators.

3.3 Rate Sensing

3.3.1 Inertial Sensing

Inertial sensing, the use of inertial measurement units (IMUs), the development of inertial navigation systems (INS) is a mature discipline. There are a number of excellent books on inertial navigation [7, 9, 47, 66], although these are mainly concerned with the navigation of aircraft and missiles. Inertial sensors have a major advantage in being non-radiating, non-jammable sensors which do not rely on any external information to provide estimates of position, attitude and body rates. The main disadvantage of inertial sensors is the need to provide periodic resetting information to bound error growth. The required frequency of resetting (the rate of error growth in the IMU) is the primary measure of performance in land vehicle applications.

The use of IMUs on robotic land vehicles has been slow in coming. The main reason for this has been cost. Until the advent of low-cost solid state IMU systems (approximately 6-8 years ago), most inertial systems, of sufficient accuracy to be useful, were far too expensive to be used in mobile robot systems. The exceptions to this employed expensive aircraft grade IMUs in a relatively blind application to provide basic dead-reckoning information (early DARPA ALV programs including Demo II are examples of this).

In the last decade however, there have been huge cost and performance improvements in solid state inertial systems. Now, IMUs and associated navigation algorithms have been specifically developed for robotic vehicles. This section focuses on these units.

At the time of writing, Inertial Sciences Inc[5] make some of the best and most appropriate inertial measurement units for autonomous land-vehicle applications. Two example models are:

- ISIS-IMU: This is a six-axis solid-state IMU weighing only 250grams and measuring only 70 mm square. The unit is capable of containing attitude drift to approximately 3° in 15 minutes and can maintain a less than one-meter position error for up to 3 minutes without external aiding. The unit costs approximately $10,000.
- DMARS-I[6]: This is a six-axis IMU incorporating dynamically tuned gyroscopes and pendulous linear accelerometers. It weighs 1.7 Kg and has a diameter of 120mm. The unit is capable of maintaining attitude drift to 0.5^o in 15 minutes and can maintain a less than one-meter position error for up to 15 minutes without external aiding. The unit costs approximately $30,000.

Units such as the ISIS-IMU are now of sufficient precision to allow vehicles to run without any external navigation updates for several minutes. This is often enough to overcome intermittent jamming of GPS or slow acquisition of other landmark data (for example). The ISIS-IMU is currently being used in a number of commercial autonomous vehicle applications. Units such as DMARS-I are an order of magnitude better even than this, and could allow high-speed all-terrain vehicle motion without external navigation updates for periods of up to 15 minutes. The DMARS-I unit is being used in some non-US autonomous military vehicle programs.

Early use of inertial systems in mobile robotics focused on the use of gyroscopes. The use of low-cost solid-state gyroscopes for outdoor vehicle guidance is described in [4]. Subsequently fiber-optic gyroscopes have become widely used; notably units from Andrew and from Hitachi have been employed in various off-road and mining applications (see [23] Chapter 13 for an excellent summary of gyroscope technology for robotics). As cost and performance has improved, low-cost gyro-compass units (north-seeking gyroscopes) have also been employed in mobile robots (notably [3]). Now full six-axis solid-state units (providing both heading and location) have been developed for mobile robots and are being used in commercial autonomous vehicle systems for cargo handling and mining [80]. Further developments include redundant (more than six axis) units for high reliability and high accuracy ALV and UAV applications [79]. A particularly

[5] http://www.inertialscience.com

[6] The DMARS unit was jointly designed by Inertial Sciences and Sandia National Laboratories

interesting development has been the use of vehicle geometric constraints to bound vehicle motion and thus improve INS algorithm performance [16]. This is one instance of a trend to tightly integrate IMU systems with both other vehicle sensors and with knowledge of vehicle motion characteristics. This tight coupling can substantially increase the performance of a standard inertial navigation unit.

The use of INS in ALV applications is now standard practice. Low-cost INS units now provide performance levels which can define the overall system performance for both localisation and navigation functions.

3.3.2 Odometric Sensing

Odometric sensing includes the use of wheel velocity sensors, ground (radar or laser) Doppler, and steering or articulation angle sensors.

The use of wheel and steer encoders is ubiquitous in robotics, both for low-level closed loop control and for "dead-reckoning" navigation. Simple kinematic motion models can be used to integrate velocity and heading measurements from wheel and steer encoders to provide an estimate of the location and orientation of a platform. Estimates are usually subject to substantial error due to misalignment, offsets and slippage of wheels or tracks. This is particularly true in rough-terrain applications. It is possible to augment basic kinematic models to estimate and correct offset and slippage errors on-line [70] leading to substantially improved performance. When used in conjunction with inertial navigation units, wheel and steer encoders have a second role in making traction, slip and other terrain characteristics observable. This is essential in guidance functions.

The use of odometric Doppler sensors is not common in robotics, but is widely used in racing cars and in some mining and military vehicles (see [30] for example). The advantage of such sensors is that they are not subject to slip in the same way as wheel and steer encoders. Doppler velocity sensors may be either RF or laser based. They may also be configured as a group to provide vector velocity measurements.

3.4 GPS and Related Beacon-Navigation Systems

The use of GPS has revolutionized outdoor localisation in many different domains. GPS is widely used in the robotics community. The basic theory and methods of GPS based navigation are well known and so will not be discussed here (see [65, 50]).

3.4.1 GPS Performance

Normal GPS is now capable of accuracies of the order of 10m. Differential GPS is capable of accuracies of better than 0.5m, and real-time kinematic GPS is capable of accuracies of around

2cm. All of these systems can be purchased off-the-shelf with update rates of 10Hz or better for use in vehicles traveling at speed in open environments.

When more than one GPS receiver is used on a vehicle accurate estimates of vehicle attitude (to fractions of a degree) can be obtained using a phase comparison. Although this not yet widely used, it is employed in some air and ground robot applications.

GPS systems can fail in a number of different ways. Most common failure modes involve obstruction of line-of-site to satellites, multipath from foliage or terrain geometry, and active jamming from other RF sources. Even in relatively benign conditions, GPS will routinely fail for periods of time. In hostile environments, complete loss of GPS is likely.

There are a number of methods for improving GPS integrity. These include tight-coupling with an aiding sensor such as an INS, the use of "pseudolites", and the use of improved, narrower band, receiver designs. However, the essential physics of the GPS system means that other additional navigation sensors and methods will always be required to obtain the level of integrity necessary for deployment of an autonomous vehicle.

3.4.2 GPS Aiding

GPS was never originally envisaged as a stand-alone sensor but rather as a source of external aiding for inertial or Doppler based navigation systems. GPS aided INS systems are widely used in military systems (see in particular the systems described in [36, 54]). Aiding is normally implemented in a "loose-coupled" form in which position and velocity outputs from GPS are fused directly with IMU measurements (in the form of Figure 2). Many "off-the-shelf" loose-couple GPS/INS packages are now available[7].

Integrated GPS/INS units are seeing growing use in ALV systems as a means of increasing navigation systems integrity [68, 80]. An outstanding challenge is to perform "tight coupling" of GPS and IMU in the context of land vehicles. Tight coupling means that the raw pseudoranges from the GPS are employed directly in the navigation filter and IMU information can, in principle, be used to drive the GPS correlators. This has the advantage of much higher integrity for the navigation loop and the ability to use a narrower band (and thus less jammable) GPS correlator. In land vehicle applications the goal is to also integrate other vehicle-specific information at this level to further improve navigation system performance and integrity. A number of groups are pursuing this goal for land vehicle applications[8].

GPS can also be aided by other types of rate sensors including, Doppler laser or radar, visual or radar odometry, or wheel and steer encoders. Generally the same principles of fusion apply[9].

[7] See http://www.cas.honeywell.com/ats/products/nav.html as an example of current systems for aircraft.

[8] Only this year, the US Air Force awarded of a contract to undertake the same work for air-vehicles.

[9] [57] chapter 6 still provides one of the best design guides to aiding systems including such issues as error budgeting and integrity.

3.4.3 The Use of Pseudolites

Pseudolites are artificial "GPS satellites" transmitting the same timing and location information as the conventional GPS constellation but more often being ground-based or occasionally air-based. The purpose of pseudolites is to provide additional pseudorange information in cases where the normal constellation is either obscured or otherwise unavailable. Pseudolites are being developed primarily for use in high-integrity applications such as aircraft landing. However, they have also seen use in mining and other land vehicle applications where constellation obscuration is a problem. Stanford Telecom is one of the leading developers and suppliers of pseudolite technology[10].

The general principle of pseudolites is also encapsulated in the precision timing signals (pps) employed by military (Link 16 or JTIDS) and occasionally civilian communication systems. Here, the communication standard defines a pps signal to be transmitted in every communication package. This provides a "pseudorange" between transmitter and receiver. In Link 16, for example, the protocol also requires the communication of transmitter location (effectively an ephemeris) which allows registration of targets across platforms. Together, each transmission site therefore define a pseudolite as an integral part of the communications standard. In terms of ALV navigation, this provides a flexible and robust method of providing augmented positioning information. It is possible to envisage "communication marbles", periodically dropped by an ALV, serving also as location beacons, or in a multi-vehicle configuration, many vehicles each providing location information for each other, and in a mixed force operation, information also coming from air vehicles or indeed individual human field operatives.

General principles and use of pseudolites is well understood, even if not commonly recognised in the robotics area. It can and should be exploited in ALV localisation schemes.

3.5 Terrain-Navigation Methods

For long-duration GPS outages (and indeed as an essential adjunct to a GPS navigation loop), terrain-aided navigation methods are appropriate. Terrain-aided navigation methods use an external sensor capable of observing terrain features in the vicinity of the vehicle. By comparing observed terrain features with terrain features held in a global prior or constructed map, the navigation algorithm constructs an estimated position and attitude error which is used to correct the inertially indicated values in the form of Figure 2.

Terrain navigation techniques are necessarily more complex than inertial only or GPS based navigation methods. Some of the key issues are; the type of sensor employed, the type of terrain feature used as a landmark, the construction of the global map, the algorithms used for feature extraction, and the complexity of feature to map matching. These issues are briefly discussed below.

[10] See http://www.stel.com.

3.5.1 Map-based Terrain Navigation

Map-based terrain navigation systems assume the existence of an *a priori* terrain map in some form. The best known example of map-based terrain navigation are TERCOM and TERPROM. These employ a digital terrain elevation data (DTED) map sensed by a radar altimeter to provide corrections to an inertial navigation system [34]. TERCOM is used in Cruise missile navigation, and TERPROM is used in low-altitude aircraft navigation and collision avoidance. DTED maps are now normally constructed from high-altitude SAR radar surveys. Resolution is normally 10-25m but maybe as high as one meter.

The direct use of DTED maps in ALV navigation is difficult as salient features or landmarks at ground level are quite different to those viewed from the air. There has been some efforts to use DTED information in land vehicle navigation, notably in the TRACER (UK MOD) and Ulysess (Singapore) programs. While DTED can provide global location information at a coarse scale, local navigation is dominated by much smaller features. Fusion of local navigation landmarks with DTED data is still an open issue.

Map-based localisation algorithms using local features and landmarks are commonly used in robotics. However, most algorithms have only been demonstrated in indoor environments. The Kalman Filter is the most widely used map-based localisation algorithm [51]. It has also been used in some demanding outdoor localisation problems [18]. More recently full Bayesian navigation methods have been demonstrated [85]. Bayesian methods potentially offer a number of advantages over Kalman filter based methods in dealing with near-field landmarks and complex sensor modeling problems. Bayesian methods are often implemented using particle filters or likelihood function estimators. Similar techniques are also now being applied in complex target tracking problems [77] (see also [39]). Other probabilistic landmark methods have also been developed (see [61] for a recent example).

Other more qualitative approaches to navigation have also been investigated [53]. These include the use of nodal, topological, maps that potentially avoid the need for metric localisation information. However, even topological maps require some local knowledge of "distinctive place" landmarks.

The essential problem with outdoor map-based terrain navigation methods is the requirement to obtain an *a priori* map with which to compare observations. The best practical solutions to the outdoor map-based navigation problem have been approaches that employ "global features" and in particular the use of visual or panoramic horizons [14, 75]. Although not widely used, these methods are quite innovative and appropriate to ALV applications. Further, because of the far-field nature of observations, they offer an opportunity for fusion and registration with independently acquired DTED information.

3.5.2 Map Construction and SLAM

The use of trees, rocks, terrain contours or other small-scale, near-field features as landmarks for navigation is an obvious step in terrain navigation. The use of small-scale features for localisation and navigation is common in indoor environments. However, navigation outdoors is substantially more complex because of the lack of well-defined structure or features in natural environments. It is not realistic to envisage the construction of an *a priori* map describing the location and geometry of rocks and vegetation. Not only does the complexity of a model at this scale seem prohibitive in anything other than small-scale demonstrations, but at this scale the environment itself is often subject to change due to variations in weather and season. Consequently, terrain navigation in outdoor natural environments invariably demands an on-line autonomous map building capability.

The past few years have seen considerable progress in the construction of local terrain maps for use in navigation and localisation. Notably is the work at CMU and JPL in stereo terrain reconstruction on grids [42, 56], and more recently on triangular-tessellated terrain models [35, 31]. These methods have the potential to provide quite general terrain models for both navigation and motion planning tasks. Currently however, such methods require independent knowledge of platform location and so have limited application in localisation. These methods are discussed further in Section 4.3.

The Simultaneous Localisation and Map building (SLAM) problem has recently received a great deal of attention. SLAM is the process of building a map of the environment while simultaneously using this map to provide localisation information. The algorithm works by generating estimates of the relative location between landmarks. It can be shown that the precision of these estimates increases monotonically and that the vehicle location estimate becomes bounded [15]. This means that a vehicle can start at an unknown location in an unknown environment and incrementally build a convergent map while maintaining bounds on platform error. The implications of this for outdoor autonomous navigation tasks such as those envisaged in the Embudito mission are particularly significant.

Practical demonstrations of the SLAM algorithm in ALV applications over traverse distances of 20Km at speeds of 30Km/h have been described [27, 28]. In particular, the work described in [27] use trees and other vegetation as landmark information for a time-of-flight laser scanner. As the vehicle drives through the environment, landmarks are extracted from laser scans and placed in correspondence with a map. Subsequent observation of these landmarks are fused with measurements from an inertial navigation system and used to provide updates to vehicle and map estimates.

The complexity of the SLAM estimation problem is potentially huge (of dimension the number of landmarks). Further, the structure of the SLAM problem is characterised by monotonically increasing correlations between landmark estimates. Thus the state space can not be trivially decoupled. For these reasons, there has been a significant drive to find computationally effective SLAM algorithms. This has been achieved through the development and use of the Kalman and extended Kalman filter as the estimation algorithms of choice in SLAM algorithms. In these

developments, simplification in the time update step and locality in the observation update step have resulted in algorithms that can process thousands of land-marks in real time on PC level architectures [28, 52]. However, the Kalman filter approach comes with a number of limitations. Most notably, the inability to represent complex environment or feature models, the difficulty of faithfully describing highly skewed or multi-modal vehicle error models, and the inherent complexity of the resulting data association problem. A parallel approach to vehicle navigation, which overcomes many of these limitations, is to consider navigation as a Bayesian estimation problem [83]. In this method, vehicle motion and feature observation are described directly in terms of the underlying probability density functions and Bayes theorem is used to fuse observation and motion information. Practically, these methods are implemented using a combination of grid-based environment modeling and particle filtering techniques. These Bayesian methods have demonstrated considerable success in some challenging environments [84].

Other applications in both air-borne and sub-sea environments have also been demonstrated [19, 87, 78]. One of the most relevant applications to the Embudito mission is in navigation of an autonomous surveillance vehicle for use in jungle warfare, being developed by Gintic and DSTA in Singapore. In this case, there is no possibility of using GPS because of foliage cover, nor is it reasonable to expect any kind of local terrain map to be available as the terrain is dominated by seasonal vegetation. Consequently, SLAM algorithms are essentially the only means of providing localisation information. The sensors used in this case include mm-wave radar and infra-red imaging [81].

Functionally, SLAM methods are most appropriate to the Embudito mission. Thus, while still a challenge, the position determination problem in this domain is eminently solvable, and indeed can draw substantially on navigation and technology

4 Navigation

4.1 Preface

"Navigation in the small", or simply navigation, is taken to mean the guidance and control of a vehicle in response to information from sensors concerning the state of the environment in the local neighbourhood of the vehicle. This involves both reactive response to immediate situations such as collisions, as well as local path planning to avoid or negotiate objects. Higher-level "mission planning" is discussed in Section 5, lower level motion control is discussed in Section 2.3.

Essentially there are two main approaches to the navigation problem. The first is to consider navigation as purely reactive; "avoid holes", "don't hit anything", for example. This approach has been particularly popular over the last decade for the "behavioral" control of indoor vehicles [2]. The approach seems less applicable in outdoor environments where some forward view of terrain type or possible maneuvers is often essential. The second approach to navigation has

been to build up a local model of the environment in the neighborhood of the vehicle and then undertake a degree of path planning with this local model. This approach has been most successful in current outdoor vehicle projects.

The navigation of an ALV requires a suite of sensors that can look forward and build up a picture of the environment in front of the platform. Such sensors must minimally be able to determine the geometry of the environment and to distinguish obstacles, ditches or other obstructions from traversable terrain. The ability to classify different terrain types is also likely to be advantageous. Sensors must also be capable of operating at speed in a range of environment conditions. A number of different passive and active sensors have been employed for ALV and vehicle navigation. More than enough choice exists to satisfy the most demanding mission applications. These sensors are discussed in detail in Section 4.4.

While navigation sensors are generally well advanced, methods for fusing information from these sensors to build up an environment picture are generally less well developed. The use of active ranging information in reactive collision avoidance has been developed in a number of ways for indoor vehicle applications. Outdoor applications are less widely known, but are used in areas such as automotive cruise control and for autonomous mining trucks. The use of passive collision detection sensors in outdoor applications is possible but generally less robust than the use of active systems. Reactive navigation and collision detection is discussed in detail in Section 4.2.

The construction of terrain pictures for local path planning and navigation is probably the most complex problem remaining in enabling operational ALV systems. While many good sensors exist, fusing and processing information to provide an accurate and reliable description of terrain geometry and type is a complex operation. Making this information available in real-time and being able to undertake local planning and reason about possible trajectories while a vehicle is on the move is a significant challenge. However, a number of techniques are emerging for constructing local navigation maps in a form that allows robust fusion of relevant sensor information. Such maps can also incorporate statistical terrain information in a form enabling local trajectory planning. Terrain picture compilation is discussed in detail in Section 4.3.

As a general problem in perception, navigation is not yet entirely solved. However, currently available sensor technology together with new methods in terrain reconstruction offer a viable development path for the majority of envisioned ALV missions.

4.2 Collision Avoidance and Reactive Control

4.2.1 Reactive Methods

The classic reactive approach to collision avoidance is the use of potential fields [41]. These have been successfully employed in a number of different outdoor navigation systems (see [43] for example). The system described in [29] is particularly valuable and relevant to the Embudito mission. It describes a reactive potential field method for navigation in lightly cluttered cross-country environments. The system uses stereo vision in conjunction with a probabilistic cell-

based model of the local terrain to generate platform motion corrections. The work particularly addresses the issue of the fusion of successive visual frames without recourse to a complete terrain model. The use of potential field models as immediate collision avoidance methods will almost certainly be a component of any ALV navigation system.

A second approach to collision avoidance is the use of certainty grids [21]. Certainty grids offer the ability to build local probabilistic models of the surrounding environment and then to use these in local path planning for collision avoidance. The idea of local, probabilistic certainty grids has been extended to use evidential reasoning methods [63]. These have the advantage of additionally encoding "ignorance" about areas of the environment and consequently are far more robust in path planning. The vector histogram approach described in [6] has also been widely used in obstacle avoidance.

4.2.2 Local Modelling Methods

Both potential field and certainty grid methods are commonly applied to 2D navigation problems (locally flat worlds). The extension to undulatory 2.5D outdoor environments, with gradients and dips, requires some additional understanding of the world. The most successful approach to reactive control, hazard and obstacle avoidance, in outdoor environments has been to couple either potential field or certainty grid methods with a simple "freeway" model of traversable regions. Here, the intended or possible paths for the vehicle are used to define "regions of interest" and used to clip (restrict the view) of the collision sensor data (see [26] for example). Within the clipped window, the local geometric structure is computed, generally consisting of a piece-wise planar model of the near field area. This model is qualified with a statistical measure of the quality of the model and with additional derived measures of terrain quality including a measure of texture (rock/partical size), and vegetation type. The information about gradient and terrain is then combined into a traversability index in the form of a local grid. Minimization or optimisation of the path on this grid then provides the local vehicle trajectory. Some of the best work in this area has been undertaken at CNRS/LAAS [10, 11]. This work explores a number of key ideas; multi-level planning, the use of distinct terrain representations, the classification of terrain areas into classes, (unknown, uneven, flat, or obstacle), and the use of these in generating a traversability index. The work described in [33] also addresses a number of these issues. In particular, [32] provides traversability measures based on uncertainty, slopes and perceived obstacles (and also describes an interesting "virtual sensor scrolling" idea), and [40] considers the issue of hazard arbitration.

4.3 The Construction and Use of Local Terrain Models

The use of reactive navigation methods is not always enough. For longer term planning, it is necessary to build a representation of the local environment which can be used for both local and more global planning. This is evidenced by the work at both LAAS [11] and CMU [33]. The terrain representation must allow information from different sensors to be fused over many

time frames and from different locations along the vehicle trajectory. It should also be possible to use the representation to reason about local structure; to measure traversability, to identify obstacles such as rocks or vegetation, and to locate traps or ditches.

4.3.1 Elevation Grids

Initial work in terrain modeling made substantial use of elevation grids [82, 42]. The work of Matthies [56] is of particular interest for its use of stereo, IR and laser imaging for building off-road terrain models. There are a number of disadvantages with grid-based terrain modeling methods. In particular, they do not provide any direct (statistical) means of managing uncertainty or errors in sensor observation, they do not provide an obvious means of combining or fusing terrain models and they do not scale well in large environments. Nevertheless, grid-based models form the basis for a number of local navigation methods [82, 40]. Grid-based methods are also a feature of the work at LAAS [10], although these are supplemented with other techniques for fusion and registration of data.

4.3.2 Tessellated Terrain Models

More recently, triangular-tessellated terrain models (or triangular irregular networks–TINs) have come into use [35, 31]. These resemble the finite-element grids common in engineering computing. TIN terrain models naturally lend themselves to being updated with variable resolution sensor data. On arrival of new data, the TIN can be re-tessellated as a local operation using a Delauny triangulation. As a consequence of this, TINs also allow a variable resolution representation of the terrain. This can either be used to model near and distant terrain at different levels of detail, or indeed to describe the same terrain at different sensor resolutions. Finally, new particle filtering ideas can be used to coherently represent uncertainty on TINs through the use of sample densities and information measures. In [35], TIN models are used to fuse vision and range data. A mechanism is described which allows a particle-based measure of uncertainty to be incorporated into the terrain measure. The application of TIN methods to the reconstruction and recognition of a ditch (for the Demo III program) is described in [55]. The last three years have seen the use of TINs established as the primary means of representing natural terrains.

4.3.3 Other Terrain Representation Methods

A slightly different approach to terrain reconstruction using wavelet models is described in [64]. The use of wavelets and related functionals provides a natural means of describing geometric texture at different scales. The use of a multi-scale functional description of the terrain also allows direct planning of vehicle motions.

Another potential method of describing terrain information is through the use of probability density functions. In indoor environments, this approach has been pioneered by Thrun [84].

Here, particle models of density functions are used to represent walls and other objects in typical indoor environments. Sum of Gaussian and other density models are also possible. The information represented in this way can be used for both navigation and localisation.

Terrain representation methods have matured greatly in the past five years. The TIN representation together with some measure of uncertainty would seem to be the preferred approach. It provides a multi-resolution basis on which to fuse data, a mechanism for describing uncertainty, and the richness to encapsulate most natural terrain information.

4.4 Terrain Navigation Sensors

A wide range of appropriate sensor technologies have been applied to the terrain-aided navigation problem. These different sensor technologies can be placed in three broad categories: Passive imaging devices, active point ranging sensors, and range imaging systems. These are briefly discussed below. There are many good books on different types of sensing technology[11], and far more information than can be reviewed here. As a broad rule, the use of sensors in the robotics community tends to follow and benefit from the huge military and civilian sensors industry. However, of specific interest to robotics is the book by Everett [23]. which describes a great many relevant sensor technology areas, albeit at a rather low technical level. In addition the review paper by Herbert [31] provides a good recent survey in the area of passive and active imaging.

4.4.1 Passive Sensing

Passive sensing includes conventional computer vision, stereo vision, other EO sensors, IR and FLIR imaging. Passive sensing is almost always image focused; a two-dimensional array of receptor devices measures ambient energy amplitude reflected from objects in the environment. Vision, stereo and other EO sensors are ubiquitous in robotics. The great advantage of visual sensing is low cost, high data rate. The great illusion in visual sensing is the anthropomorphic appeal: In reality processing of visual data is extremely complex and visual image interpretation is prone to high levels of uncertainty, ambiguity, and error. The use of visual sensing in outdoor unstructured environments is the most demanding of all applications. The only real way of ensuring that a stand-alone vision system will work with sufficient integrity is to limit the domain of operation to either a specific environment, specific feature types, or specific illumination constraints.

IR and FLIR sensors have similar operating characteristics to vision expect that, of course, they operate in different wave-bands. FLIR systems have seen a huge decrease in price and increase in accuracy and sensitivity in the past few years (see [86] for example). Many commercial systems are now available. FLIR/EO systems are now used in a number of AUV projects including, for example the RST MDARS vehicle. A notable application of IR to a AUV operating in complex

[11] The Artech House series is notable.

jungle environments is described in [81]. The main advantage of FLIR over conventional vision is the use of thermal wave-bands. Together with conventional EO wave-bands, this potentially provides reduced ambiguity in image interpretation. Extending this principle, multi-spectral vehicle-based imagers are also now making an appearance.

4.4.2 Active Sensing

Active sensing includes the use of time-of-flight or phase delay lasers, the use of radars at different frequencies, and the use of sonar. Active sensors transmit energy and irradiate the environment with specific types of energy. The key advantage of active sensors is that knowledge of the transmitted energy pattern usually allows accurate and unambiguous interpretation of return signals in a broad range of environment conditions. The clear disadvantages of active sensors are that they require energy, are not stealthy, and generally cost more than passive sensors.

In the past decade, low-cost time-of-flight lasers have become commercially available and are now widely used in robotics. Notable are the LM series of lasers manufactured by Erwin Sick[12]: For only $4,000, these lasers provide 10cm accurate 2D range scans to a distance of 50m. They are now ubiquitous on indoor robots and have also been used in a number of challenging outdoor robot applications in surface and underground mining, bulk cargo handling and agriculture. Longer range lasers, to 400m, are produced by Riegel[13]. The Sick Lasers can run up to 20Hz, producing 200 samples per scan. Some Riegel units run at sample rates of 20,000Hz. Riegel also produce a novel "last return" laser. This provides a range measurement from the *last object* detected, allowing the laser to "see through" rain and dust. Riegel lasers coupled with 2D and 3D scanners are used in a number of ALV projects. Also of note in laser scanning is the work being undertaken on "urban" robots by JPL and CMU[14].

Over a similar time period, millimeter-wave radar (MMWR) for outdoor vehicles and robots has also become affordable. MMWR (typically 77Ghz or 94Ghz) provides an all-weather all-environment performance often lacking in laser and EO sensor systems, while providing the directivity, accuracy and compactness lacking in lower frequency radars. A great deal of development has been undertaken in MMW collision detection or cruise-control radars and these are now appearing on automobiles. Such radars are usually of limited bandwidth and with range accuracy of around 1m. Beam widths and shapes vary, but can be as wide as 15° (although this is often quite suitable for the application). The technology employed uses surface-printed (MIC) antennae and beams are often electronically scanned. A number of higher-performance MMWR have also been produced for field robotic applications (see [12] for example). These have relatively high bandwidth (12cm accuracy) and narrow beams (l-2°). These radars are normally mechanically scanned. However, unlike lasers, full coherent amplitude signals are normally obtained which provide an "image" of the terrain seen in the beam of a single sample. These radars can also be used over far longer ranges (2Km) than lasers.

[12] See http://www.sick.de/english/products/products.htm
[13] See http://www.riegl.com
[14] See in particular http://telerobotics.jpl.nasa.gov/tasks/tmr/homepage.html.

4.4.3 Range Imaging

Range image sensors employ a complex imaging intensity array to sample time-of-flight or phase information from an actively illuminated scene [23]. Illumination is normally from a laser, in which case the sensors are referred to as LIDAR. Such sensors are capable of providing an "image" of range points in real time [86]. LIDAR are commonly deployed in military helicopters in a number of different roles.

Clearly range image sensors can be of considerable advantage in ALV applications, and indeed a number of LIDAR-type systems have been used in recent ALV designs (notably the German DVLR system, and in Demo III [13]). However, a major limitation is that typical LIDAR systems are very expensive. This has restricted their development and effective use in ALV systems.

4.4.4 Multiple Sensors

Combining active and passive sensor data makes considerable sense in ALV applications. Passive image-based sensing provides a detailed forward picture of the environment. However, this picture carries little direct depth or 3D information, and the picture alone can often be difficult to interpret in terms of the geometry and structure of the local terrain. Spatially sparse range information can substantially aid the process of interpretation and make construction of terrain pictures much more robust [59].

While the fusion of passive and active sensor data is largely an algorithmic issue (and is discussed in Section 4.3), there are a number of efforts to construct so-called "common mode" sensors which physically integrate both passive and active devices in to a single unit. This approach is commonly accepted in military aerospace applications (integrated targeting pods for example), but has yet to be seen in ALV or field robotics applications. Of note however would be the fusion of a passive FLIR imager with a beam-imaging MMWR as a common-mode ALV sensor. This would offer unprecedented all-environment capability to an ALV navigation system.

5 Mission and Task Planning

5.1 Preface

Mission and Task Planning is concerned with the construction of trajectories and other vehicle actions, typically over a long time horizon and beyond sensing range. Functionally, planning resides above the process of navigation and mobility. In the scenarios envisioned by the Embudito mission, planning is focused on the deployment of a payload along a trajectory or at a specified location. While there may be many constraints that need to be accounted for in the planning process, the essential output of planning is a series of way-points or trajectories through which the vehicle must pass. Trajectory generation methods are described in Section 5.2.

Mission planning must also incorporate additional tactical information including, for example, the ability to communicate, the need for stealth, or cooperation with other vehicles. Within this, a broad scope of "intelligent" control ideas can be considered. While such issues are important in the context of a real mission and of robotics intelligence in general, they are beyond the scope intended by this report. Section 5.3 briefly examines the problem of mission specification and optimisation.

This section provides only a very brief overview of path and mission planning issues for ALV systems (this is not an area of expertise for the author).

5.2 Path Planning Methods

There are a great many path planning systems described in the literature. Most of these are concerned with the construction of trajectories optimized for a specific purpose. Trajectory generation can be through the use of straight lines between way-points, spline curves, clothoids, or other appropriately smooth geometric structure. The book by Latombe [44] is generally regarded as the definitive text on classical path planning issues. Classical path planning generally assumes complete knowledge of the world and in return provides useful properties of correctness and completeness.

In contrast, most outdoor vehicle missions do not have complete knowledge of the world. Rather, sensor information is acquired during mission execution and path planning proceeds incrementally. Heuristic planners, such as the subsumption architecture, track arbitration schemes [33], or way-point type algorithms are more appropriate to outdoor environments. They are better able to accommodate new sensor data than classical planners. However, such path planning algorithms do not provide any guarantee of completeness [46].

Generally, sensor-based motion planners are incremental. The robot senses its immediate environment, and determines the "best" local path segment based upon these measurements. After moving along the local path, the robot begins the cycle again. There are two main approaches to the sensor-based path planning problem; the use of "freeways" and the use of cell or grid methods. Freeway methods include the TangentBug algorithm in which a visibility polygon is generated and a path constructed, like an elastic band, around obstacles and other traversability constraints [46, 45]. Grid-based methods are best represented by the D* algorithm [76]. The D* algorithm uses an approximate cell decomposition, filling in a grid-based world model incrementally with sensor information. The algorithm has the advantage of being well-developed and of being particularly suited to rough terrain navigation.

Once a process for incorporating new sensor information is established, and once a representation (either freeways or grids is defined), then way points or trajectories can be computed. Most often, trajectories are computed using splines or other smooth curves. The use of "energy minimisation" or the "elastic band" principle is both common and intuitively appealing. In essence, a path is laid out which minimises some potential function, constructed from the initial grid or freeway and incorporating any other relevant optimisation criteria [3, 74, 73]. The

advantage of such a representation is that it can be easily stretched or modified by new incoming sensor information.

In general, current path-planning methods and algorithms provide the scope and ability to deal with the deployment scenarios envisaged in the Embudito mission.

5.3 Mission Planning Methods

Mission planning is little studied in robotics although a number of methods available in other domains could be applied to this problem. At one extreme, rule-based methods implementing conventional doctrine could be employed. The disadvantage with such methods is the need to respond to unforeseen circumstances in an autonomous manner. At the other extreme would be to employ unsupervised learning methods (reinforcement learning for example) to develop strategies in the face of different situations. Practically, these methods are beyond what is required for the Embudito mission.

Most valuable are mission planning algorithms solely focused on trajectory and way-point generation. The mission planning problem described in [10] is a good example of a possible approach to this problem. This consists of the optimisation of a spline-based trajectory. As terrain information is acquired in front of the vehicle, the spline is extended and modified based on measures of traversability for the perceived terrain (see Section 4.3). Modification is undertaken as a constrained optimisation problem. The cost of various paths are evaluated in terms of the perceived nature of the terrain, modification from the initial trajectory, distance from goal and consumed energy. It is not hard to imagine other constraints being incorporated including, maintenance of communication line-of-site, availability of localisation information, or stealth. In effect, these enter in to the problem simply as cost functions in a multi-objective optimisation task.

A final point to consider in mission planning is the generation of system-level control objectives. This problem is characterised by the need to fuse or sequence single controller actions into complete system missions. This is currently an active area of research in robotics. The "meta-control" modeling methods developed by Koditschek (see [8] for example), provides one of the few general methods for tackling this issue. In this work, a "funnel model" of control action is developed, describing the effect of a controller in transferring the system from one state to another. Compositions of funnels feeding funnels allow behaviours to be combined with *predictable* outcomes.

6 Communications

ALV operations such as those considered in the Embudito mission, require communication between vehicle and base station, and potentially between vehicles and field operatives. Radio communication technology for this type of system has made huge advances in the past decade and many options for communication exist. A detailed exposition of communication technology

in this context is beyond the scope of this report (and beyond the capability of the author), however a number of key points can be made.

Radio ethernet is commonly used in indoor robotics projects. It has the advantage of high bandwidth and low cost, but the disadvantage of requiring line-of-sight and having very low range capabilities. Radio ethernet is not likely to be appropriate for ALV applications by itself. However, the implementation of TCP/IP protocols on other, tactical radio, systems may well have a significant impact on operations[15].

Off-the-shelf spread spectrum (1-2GHz) radio systems with band-width of over 1Mbit and a range of up to 20Km are readily available[16]. A number of current ALV research and development projects use spread spectrum systems. The advantage of these systems is relatively high bandwidth, long range, and immunity to jamming and interference. The disadvantages include the need for line-of-sight operation.

Live video feed is also possible, but generally undesirable, in ALV missions. Video can be fed, with appropriate compression, over TCP/IP or spread-spectrum networks. Over short ranges, a number of commercial off-the-shelf broad-band video systems are also available. Over longer ranges, directional antennae are normally used (common for UAVs). This is generally considered undesirable for ALV missions. Autonomous missions are generally taken to exclude live video feed.

A range of military tactical radio systems exist in the UHF and VHF bands[17]. The lower frequency provides far greater range than the systems described above and does not generally require line-of-sight, although lower frequencies generally means lower data rates. Tactical radio systems have substantial built-in immunity to jamming, interference and interception. Details of such systems are, for obvious reasons, not widely available.

At the tactical level, the Link 11, Link 16 and future Link 22 communication standards are of relevance to ALV applications. These standards define a communication layer between the physical communication system and a tracking or data fusion function. Together they are elements of the developing Joint data network (JDN). Link 16 and future Link 22 embody a number of features which are of considerable importance to autonomous systems[18]. These include:

- A standard global coordinate system (WGS-84) for fusion of data,
- a standard timing signal to allow communication of real-time data between platforms,
- a precision timing signal which can be used as a pseudorange to provide self-localisation

[15] Of relevance also are the Bluetooth protocol http://www.bluetooth.com and Wireless Application Protocol http//www.wapforum.org.

[16] See http://www.freewave.com for example. Some units also include transmission of a GPS timing signal which can be used in localisation.

[17] The Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) is the current embodiment.

[18] See http://prodevweb.prodev.usna.edu/Seanav/NS40x/NS401/Introduction/html/indexintro.html for a detailed technical description of the Link 16 protocol.

between a number of receivers,

- the incorporation of receiver location information as an integral part of message packets, and
- a measure of uncertainty (a single measure in Link 16, a covariance proposed in Link 22) in track data that can be used in the fusion process.

Whatever communication system is developed for ALV applications, it would seem essential that it too would include all these elements.

At the tactical level, the use of "communication marbles" is appealing in allowing networking between vehicles, operators and other systems. The principle is that low cost communication modules could be dropped by an ALV, from a UAV or by a field operative and used to relay information otherwise restricted by line-of-sight, jamming or stealth considerations. A high-frequency, high gain, point-to-point communication network is the most likely physical implementation for such systems. Incorporating parts of the Link 16 protocol as part of a communication marble would substantially increase their value. The use of timing signals would allow marbles to self-register in a global coordinate frame and to double as pseudolites to provide precision location information.

In addition to tactical systems, there are a number of strategic communication options. These may include the use of a satellite up-link. Commercially available up-links such as Iridium are used in a number of projects. Military up-links provide sufficient band-width for live video feed. In tactical situations, up-links to a UAV could provide direct and high-band-width communication relays at modest cost.

Unsurprisingly, there are a range of different remote communications options appropriate to ALV operations. A possible approach is to use two or more different options in combination; spread-spectrum plus an up-link, or point-to-point marbles plus a tactical radio, for example. This provides a degree of robustness to variations in operational circumstance. Whatever physical communication mechanism is chosen, a protocol that provides similar functionality to Link 16 is desirable.

7 Conclusions

This report has reviewed the current state-of-the-art in ALV systems and technology. The key conclusion is that the technology currently exists to develop and deploy an operational ALV system. Of the functional elements identified, mobility, localisation, and communication are well understood and well developed areas that can offer immediate solutions to ALV technology needs. The remaining two areas, navigation and planning, are less mature but are, regardless, deployable in a broad range of mission scenarios.

A second conclusion is that the successful development of an operational ALV system will rely on an effective approach to systems engineering. A precise description of mission requirements

and a clear definition of component functionality seems essential. This is particularly important in the areas of navigation and planning where a finite definition of mission objectives and vehicle functionality will makes the whole problem tractable. Too many ALV programmes have ended up chasing an elusive "intelligent and autonomous" target. It is appropriate to quote Patrick Winston's (a former director of the MIT AI Lab) definition of AI in the context of ALVs: "AI is whatever we can not currently do. When we know how to do it, it is called an algorithm".

References

[1] J.C. Alexander amd J.H. Maddocks. On the kinematics of wheeled mobile robots. *Int. Journal Robotics Research*, 8(5):15–27, 1989.

[2] R. Arkin. Motor schema-based mobile robot navigation. *Int. Journal Robotics Research*, 8(4):92–112, 1989.

[3] D. Bapna, E. Rollins, J. Murphy, M. Maimone, and W. Whittaker. The Atacama desert trek: Outcomes. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 597–602, Leuven, Belgium, 1998.

[4] B. Barshan and H. Durrant-Whyte. Inertial navigaton systems for mobile robots. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 11(3):328–342, 1995.

[5] M.G. Bekker. *Introduction to Terrain-Vehicle Systems*. The University of Michigan Press, 1969.

[6] J. Borenstein. The vector histogram–Fast obstacle avoidance for mobile robots. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 7(3):278–288, 1991.

[7] K.R. Britting. *Inertial Navigation System Analysis*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc, 1971.

[8] R.R. Burridge, A.A. Rizzi, and D.E. Koditschek. Toward a systems theory for the composition of dexterous robot behaviours. In G. Giralt and G. Hirzinger, editors, *Robotics Research, The Seventh International Symposium (ISRR'95)*, pages 149–161. Springer-Verlag, 1996.

[9] A.B. Chatfield. *Fundamentals of High Accuracy Inertial Guidance*. American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Inc, 1997.

[10] R. Chatila and S. Lacroix. Adaptive navigation for autonomous mobile robots. In G. Giralt and G. Hirzinger, editors, *Robotics Research, The Seventh International Symposium (ISRR'95)*, pages 450–458. Springer-Verlag, 1996.

[11] R. Chatila and S. Lacroix. A case study in machine intelligence: Adaptive autonomous space rovers. In A. Zelinsky, editor, *Field and Service Robotics (FSR'97)*. Springer-Verlag, 1998.

[12] S. Clark and H. Durrant-Whyte. Autonomous land vehicle navigation using millimeter wave radar. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 3697–3702, Leuven, Belgium, 1998.

[13] D. Coombs, K. Murphy, A. Lacaze, and S. Legowik. Driving autonomously offroad up tp 35km/h. In *Proc. Intelligent Vehicles Conf.*, Dearborn, MI, 2000.

[14] F. Cozman and E. Krotkov. Automatic mountain detection and pose estimation for teleoperation of lunar rovers. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 2452–2457, Albuquerque, NM, 1997.

[15] G. Dissanayake, P. Newman, S. Clark, H.F. Durrant-Whyte, and M. Csorba. A solution to the simultaneous localization and map building (SLAM) problem. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 17(3):229–241, 2001.

[16] G. Dissanayake, S. Sukkarieh, E. Nebot, and H. Durrant-Whyte. A new algorithm for the alignment of inertial measurement units without external observation for land vehicle applications. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 2274–2279, Detroit, MI, 1999.

[17] J.C. Dixon. *Tyres, Suspension and Handling*. Cambridge University Press, 1991.

[18] H. Durrant-Whyte. An autonomous guided vehicle for cargo handling applications. *Int. Journal Robotics Research*, 15(5):1–24, 1996.

[19] H.F. Durrant-Whyte, G. Dissanayake, , and P.W. Gibbens. Toward deployment of large-scale simultaneous localisation and map building (SLAM) systems. In J. Hollerbach and D. Koditscheck, editors, *Robotics Research, The Ninth International Symposium (ISRR'99)*, pages 161–168. Springer-Verlag, 2000.

[20] P. Eicker. The Embudito Mission: A case study of the systematics of autonomous ground mobile robots. Technical Report SAND2001-0193, Sandia National Laboratories, 2001.

[21] A. Elfes. Sonar-based real-world mapping and navigation. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 3(3):249–265, 1987.

[22] J.R. Ellis. *Vehicle Handling Dynamics*. Mechanical Engineering Publications, 1994.

[23] H. Everett. *Sensors for Mobile Robots*. A.K. Peters Ltd., 1995.

[24] P. Fiorini. Ground mobility systems for planetary exploration. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 908–913, San Francisco, CA, 2000.

[25] R. Godbole, R. Alcock, and D. Hettiaratchi. The prediction of tractive performance on soil surfaces. *Journal of Terramechanics*, 30(6):443–459, 1993.

[26] J. Gowdy. SAUSAGES: Between planning and action. In M. Herebert, C. Thorpe, and A. Stentz, editors, *Intelligent Unmanned Ground Vehicles*, pages 33–52. Kluwer Academic Press, 1997.

[27] J. Guivant, E. Nebot, and S. Baiker. High accuracy navigation using laser range sensors in outdoor applications. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 3817–3822, San Francisco, CA, 2000.

[28] J.E. Guivant and E.M. Nebot. Optimization of the simultaneous localization and map-building algorithm for real-time implementation. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 17(3):242–257, 2001.

[29] H. Haddad, M. Khatib, S. Lacroix, and R. Chatila. Reactive navigation in outdoor environments using potential fields. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 597–602, Leuven, Belgium, 1998.

[30] S.Y. Harmon. USMC ground surveillance robot (GSR): Lessons learned. In *SPIE Vol. 727*, pages 336–343, Boston MA, 1986.

[31] M. Hebert. Active and passive range sensing for robotics. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 102–110, San Francisco, CA, 2000.

[32] M. Herebert. SMARTY: Point-based range processing for autonomous driving. In M. Herebert, C. Thorpe, and A. Stentz, editors, *Intelligent Unmanned Ground Vehicles*, pages 87–103. Kluwer Academic Press, 1997.

[33] M. Herebert, C. Thorpe, and A. Stentz. *Intelligent Unmanned Ground Vehicles*. Kluwer Academic Press, 1997.

[34] L.D. Hostetler and R.D. Andreas. Nonlinear Kalman filter techniques for terrain-aided navigation. *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, 28(3):315–322, 1983.

[35] D. Huber, O. Carmichael, and M. Hebert. 3D map reconstruction from range data. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 891–897, San Francisco, CA, 2000.

[36] G. Hyslop, D. Gerth, and J. Kraemer. GPS/INS integration on the standoff land attack missile (SLAM). In *IEEE Position, Location and Navigation Symposium*, pages 407–412, 1990.

[37] S. Julier and H. Durrant-Whyte. Navigation and parameter estimation of high-speed road vehicles. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 101–105, Nagoya, Japan, 1995.

[38] T.R. Kane and D.A. Levinson. *Dynamics: Theory and Applications*. McGraw-Hill Inc., 1985.

[39] K. Kastella and S. Musick. Challenge problem in nonlinear filtering for predetection tracking. Technical report, AFRL, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, 2001.

[40] A. Kelly. RANGER: Feedforward control approach to autonomous navigation. In M. Herebert, C. Thorpe, and A. Stentz, editors, *Intelligent Unmanned Ground Vehicles*. Kluwer Academic Press, 1997.

[41] O. Khatib. Real-time obstacle avoidance for manipulators and mobile robots. *Int. Journal Robotics Research*, 5(1):490–496, 1986.

[42] E. Krotkov and R. Hoffman. Terrain mapping for a walking planetary rover. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 10(6):728–739, 1994.

[43] D. Langer, J. Rosenblatt, and M. Herbert. A behaviour-based system for off-road navigation. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 10(6):776–783, 1994.

[44] J.C. Latombe. *Robot Motion Planning*. Kluwer Academic Press, 1991.

[45] S.L. Laubach and J.W. Burdick. An autonomous sensor-based path-planner for planetary microrovers. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 891–897, Detroit, MI, 1999.

[46] S.L. Laubach, J.W. Burdick, and L. Matthies. An autonomous path planner implemented on the Rocky7 prototype microrover. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 292–297, Leuven, Belgium, 1998.

[47] A. Lawrence. *Modern Inertial Technology*. Springer Verlag, 1993.

[48] A.T. Le, D.C. Rye, and H.F. Durrant-Whyte. Estimation of track-soil interactions for autonomous tracked vehicles. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 1388–1393, Albuquerque, NM, 1997.

[49] C. Leger and J. Bares. Automated task-based synthesis and optimisation of field robotics. In *Proc. Int. Conf. Field and Service Robotics*, pages 370–375, Pittsburgh, PA, 1999.

[50] A. Leick. *GPS Satellite Surveying*. John Wiley and Sons, 1995.

[51] J.J. Leonard and H.F. Durrant-Whyte. Mobile robot localization by tracking geometric beacons. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 7(3):376–381, 1991.

[52] J.J. Leonard and H.J.S. Feder. A computational efficient method for large-scale concurrent mapping and localisation. In J. Hollerbach and D. Koditscheck, editors, *Robotics Research, The Ninth International Symposium (ISRR'99)*, pages 169–176. Springer-Verlag, 2000.

[53] T. Levitt and D. Lawton. Qualitative navigation. *Artificial Intelligence*, 44(3):305–360, 1990.

[54] A.H. Lewantowicz. Architectures and GPS/INS integration: Impact on mission accomplishment. In *IEEE Position, Location and Navigation Symposium*, pages 284–289, 1992.

[55] R. Mandelbaum, G. Salgian, H. Sawhney, and M. Hansen. Terrain reconstruction for ground and underwater robots. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 879–884, San Francisco, CA, 2000.

[56] L. Matthies, A. Kelly, and G. Tharp. Obstacle detection for unmanned ground vehicles: A progress report. In G. Giralt and G. Hirzinger, editors, *Robotics Research, The Seventh International Symposium (ISRR'95)*, pages 475–486. Springer-Verlag, 1996.

[57] P.S. Maybeck. *Stochastic Models Estimation and Control*. Academic Press, 1979.

[58] P.F. Muir and C.P. Neuman. Kinematic modelling of wheeled mobile robots. *Journal of Robotic Systems*, 4(2):281–333, 1987.

[59] J. Neira, J.D. Tardos, J. Horn, and G. Schmidt. Fusing range and intensity images for mobile robot localisation. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 15(1):76–84, 1999.

[60] R.M. Ogorkiewicz. *Technology of Tanks*. Jane's Information Group, 1991.

[61] C.F. Olson. Probabilistic self-localisation. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 16(1):55–66, 2000.

[62] J. Ostrowski and J. Burdick. Geometric perspectives on the mechanics and control of robotic locomotion. In G. Giralt and G. Hirzinger, editors, *Robotics Research, The Seventh International Symposium (ISRR'95)*, pages 536–547. Springer-Verlag, 1996.

[63] D. Pagac, E. Nebot, and H. Durrant-Whyte. An evidential approach to map-building for autonomous vehicles. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 14(4):623–629, 1998.

[64] D.K. Pai and L.M. Reissell. Multiresolution rough terrain motion planning. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 14(1):19–33, 1998.

[65] B.W. Parkinson and J.J. Spiker. *Global Positioning System: Theory and Applications*. American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 1996.

[66] G.R. Pittman. *Inertial Guidance*. John Wiley and Sons, 1962.

[67] L.R. Ray. Nonlinear state and tire force estimation for advanced vehicle control. *IEEE Trans. Control Systems and Technology*, 3(1):117–124, 1995.

[68] R.M. Rogers. Integrated INU/DGPS for autonomous vehicle navigation. In *IEEE Position, Location and Navigation Symposium*, pages 471–476, 1996.

[69] E. Rollins, J. Luntz, A. Foessel, B. Shamah, and W. Whittaker. Nomad: A demonstration of the transforming chassis. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 611–606, Leuven, Belgium, 1998.

[70] S. Scheding, G. Dissanayake, E. Nebot, and H. Durrant-Whyte. An experiment in autonmous navigation of an underground mining vehicle. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 15(1):85–95, 1999.

[71] H. Schempf. Less is more: AUROA-an example of minimalist design for tracked locomotion. 2000.

[72] B. Shamah, D. Apostolopoulos, M Wagner, and W. Whittaker. Effect of tire design and steering mode on robotic mobility in barren terrain. In *Proc. Int. Conf. Field and Service Robotics*, pages 287–292, Pittsburgh, PA, 1999.

[73] Z. Shiller. Obstacle traversal for space exploration. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 989–994, San Francisco, CA, 2000.

[74] S. Singh, R. Simmons, T. Smith, A. Stentz, V. Verma, A. Yahja, and K. Schwehr. Recent progress in local and global traversability for planetary rovers. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 1194–1200, San Francisco, CA, 2000.

[75] F. Stein and G. Medioni. Map-based localisation using the panoramic horizon. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 11(4):892–896, 1995.

[76] A. Stentz. Optimal and efficient path planning for partially known environments. In M. Herebert, C. Thorpe, and A. Stentz, editors, *Intelligent Unmanned Ground Vehicles*, pages 203–220. Kluwer Academic Press, 1997.

[77] L.D. Stone, C.A. Barlow, and T.L. Corwin. *Bayesian Multiple Target Tracking*. Artech House, 1999.

[78] S. Sukkarieh and H. Durrant-Whyte. Towards the development of simultaneous localisation and map building for an unmanned air vehicle. In *Proc. 3rd International Conference on Field and Service Robotics*, pages 193–200, Helsinki, Finland, 2001.

[79] S. Sukkarieh, P. Gibbens, B. Grocholsky, K. Willis, and H. Durrant-Whyte. A low cost redundant inertial measurement unit for unmanned flight vehicles. *Int. Journal Robotics Research*, 19(11):1089–1104, 2000.

[80] S. Sukkarieh, E.M. Nebot, and H. Durrant-Whyte. A high integrity IMU/GPS navigation loop for autonomous land vehicle applications. *IEEE Trans. Robotics and Automation*, 15(6):572–578, 1999.

[81] E. Sung, J. Ibanez-Guzman, and P. Chaturvedi. Passive IR images for night driving in semi-structured tropical environment. In *Proc. Asian Conference on Robotics on Robotics and its Applications*, pages 27–32, 2001.

[82] C. Thorpe. *Vision and Navigation: The Carnegie-Mellon Navlab*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1990.

[83] S. Thrun. Probabilistic algorithms and the interactive museum tour-guide robot Minerva. *International Journal of Robotics Research*, 19(11):972–999, November 2000.

[84] S. Thrun. Probabilistic algorithms in robotics. *AI Magazine*, 21(4), 2000.

[85] S. Thrun, W. Burgard, and D. Fox. A probabilistic approach to concurrent mapping and localisation for mobile robots. *Machine Learning*, 31(1):29–53, 1998.

[86] S.A. Weiss. Laser-radar imaging without scanners. *Photonics Spectra*, pages 28–29, 1994.

[87] S.B. Williams, P. Newman, G.Dissanayake, and H.F. Durrant-Whyte. Autonomous underwater simultaneous localisation and map building. In *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, pages 1793–1798, San Francisco, CA, 2000.

[88] J.Y. Wong. *Theory of Ground Vehicles (Second Edition)*. John Wiley, 1993.