



**HAL**  
open science

## Toward Human-Aware Robot Task Planning

Rachid Alami, Aurélie Clodic, Vincent Montreuil, Emrah Akin Sisbot, Raja Chatila

► **To cite this version:**

Rachid Alami, Aurélie Clodic, Vincent Montreuil, Emrah Akin Sisbot, Raja Chatila. Toward Human-Aware Robot Task Planning. AAI spring symposium: to boldly go where no human-robot team has gone before, Mar 2006, Palo Alto, CA, United States. hal-01977564

**HAL Id: hal-01977564**

**<https://laas.hal.science/hal-01977564>**

Submitted on 17 Jan 2019

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

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

# Toward Human-Aware Robot Task Planning

Rachid Alami, Aurélie Clodic, Vincent Montreuil, Emrah Akin Sisbot, Raja Chatila

LAAS-CNRS

7, Avenue du Colonel Roche

31077 Toulouse, France

Firstname.Name@laas.fr

## Abstract

Human-robot interaction requires explicit reasoning on human environment and on robot capacities to achieve its tasks in a collaborative way with a human partner.

We have devised a decisional framework for human-robot interactive task achievement that is aimed to allow the robot not only to accomplish its tasks but also to produce behaviors that support its engagement vis-à-vis its human partner and to interpret human behaviors and intentions.

Together and in coherence with this framework, we intend to develop and experiment various task planners and interaction schemes that will allow the robot to select and perform its tasks while taking into account explicitly the human abilities as well as the constraints imposed by the presence of humans, their needs and preferences. We present the first results obtained by our “human-aware” task and motion planners and discuss how they can be extended.

## Introduction

The introduction of robots in our daily life raises a key issue that is “added” to the “standard challenge” of autonomous robots: the presence of humans in its environment and the necessity to interact with them. Clearly, the human should be taken explicitly into account in all steps of the robot design.

We are conducting research on robot decisional abilities taking into account explicit reasoning on the human environment and on the robot capacities to achieve its tasks in such a context. This research is conducted in the framework of Cogniron (Figure 1), an integrated project that aims to make advances (<http://www.cogniron.org/>) towards the cognitive robot companion.

We have devised a decisional framework for human-robot interactive task refinement and execution. This should hopefully allow providing a principled way to deal with human-robot interaction (HRI) for robot task achievement in presence of humans or in synergy with humans.

Together and in coherence with this framework, we aim to develop and experiment various task planners and interaction schemes that will allow the robot to select and perform



Figure 1: Cogniron: the Cognitive Robot Companion.

its tasks while taking into account explicitly human abilities as well as constraints imposed by the presence of humans, their needs and preferences.

The next section discusses briefly related work. Then, we describe the proposed framework. The following sections present specific HRI issues in symbolic action planning as well as in motion planning. The last section discusses various extensions.

## Context

While the field is very active, a good survey is still (Fong, Nourbakhsh, & Dautenhahn 2003). In our context the human is physically present in the vicinity of the robot, is sensed by the robot and may even participate to the task performance.

In relation with this, a number of recent contributions about close interaction deal with the notion of physical and mental safety (Nonaka *et al.* 2004) or the introduction of emotions and/or cognitive models in robotic structures (Breazeal 1998; Nakajima *et al.* 2004). Very often, HRI is merged into the task performance. This tends to reduce HRI to a (sometimes very sophisticated) human interface.

Our aim is to endow the robot with an explicit considera-

tion of humans and with the ability to manage its interactions with them. This must be considered at different levels: at the architecture level as well as at the task/motion planning and execution level.




Figure 2: Reasoning about HRI and anticipation of human activities: sources of information are multi-modal dialogue, and observation of environment and human activity

It is worth noting that there are several architectures that explicitly embed interaction (Tambe 1997; Kawamura, Nillas, & Mugumura 2003; Scerri *et al.* 2003; Fong *et al.* 2005). One key source of inspiration is the Joint Intention theory (Cohen & Levesque 1991; 1990; Kumar *et al.* 2002). It is based on the notion of commitment for team members and defines for a team the concept of Joint Persistent Goal. These definitions constitute a basis for the elaboration of cooperation schemes between heterogeneous agents. We follow a stream similar to (Feil-Seifer & Mataric 2005; Buchsbaum *et al.* 2005; Trafton *et al.* 2005). Indeed, we believe that an effective implementation of this theory can be done, when limited to a clearly defined context in which the robot will deal explicitly with the actions, beliefs or intentions of the human partner.

### An illustrative scenario

Let us consider the situation illustrated by Figure 3. There are two persons named Bruce and Clark, and a robot named Robot.

Clark wants to eat something. Robot knows that there is a sandwich in the kitchen. It also has to clean the table. The brush is also in the kitchen. Consequently, there are two goals to achieve : (1) clean the table near Clark with the brush and (2) make Clark have the sandwich.

Let us examine some relevant HRI issues in this context. Robot needs specific decisional capabilities in order to elaborate plans that are “legible” (i.e. “understandable”) and “socially acceptable” by the humans that are involved in the task or simply present in its vicinity. This has consequences on the tasks that the robot will perform but also on its motions. Not only the robot has to elaborate human-friendly




Figure 3: Fetch-an-carry tasks in a human environment.

task and motion plans but it has also to continuously observe human activity. Indeed, it has to ensure, when necessary, that the persons involved in the task are doing their part and that its presence and behaviour are accepted.

### A Decisional framework

Our robot is controlled by a three layer architecture (Alami *et al.* 1998). We present briefly the design of the decisional layer in which we have introduced what we call InterAction Agents (IAAs). They are similar to proxies but are directly implemented on the robot side as a representative of a human agent. To make the interaction more explicit we have defined a complete process of establishing a common goal, achieving it and verifying commitment of all agents involved. Besides, relevant IAA models should be devised and used in the robot planning activities. Such models will range from high-level specifications of the human abilities and preferences to geometric attributes such as position, posture or visibility regions.

We envision HRI in a context where two agents (a human and a robot) share a common space and exchange information through various modalities (Clodic *et al.* 2005; Alami *et al.* 2005).

Interaction happens as a consequence of an explicit request of the human to satisfy a goal or because the robot finds itself in a situation where it is useful if not mandatory.

In both cases, the robot has a goal to satisfy. An important issue is the notion of engagement, a process in which the robot will have to establish, maintain and terminate a connection with a human partner. Besides conversation, such a process will provide a framework for robots performing tasks in a human context.

This covers goal establishment, selection of an incremental refinement of the task that is intended to be achieved, and execution monitoring. This context will be used by the robot in order to follow human task performance, to mon-




Figure 4: Decisional framework for a HRI-enabled robot: the IAA (InterAction Agent) represents the human state, abilities and preferences. Such information is used by the Human-Aware planners and by the Decisional Kernel.

itor his/her commitment to the common goal, and even to influence it.

The proposed decisional framework (Clodic *et al.* 2005) consists of several entities, having each a specific role as illustrated by Figure 4.

The HRI we consider in this context is the common achievement of tasks by two agents - a robot and a human - in order to satisfy a joint goal. The human involvement may range from a direct participation to the task achievement, to a simple “acceptance” of robot activity in his close vicinity.

**The Agenda** Several goals may be sought at a given time, involving possibly several persons. At any moment, there may be several active, inactive and suspended goals. The Agenda manages the current set of robot goals. It ensures the consistency between active goals, and determines their priorities, and their causal links. Based on data provided by the Supervision Kernel, the Agenda determines the relevance of goals and decides to create, suspend, resume or abandon a goal. When a goal is created, it may be associated to the robot alone or to a “team” of agents.

**The IAA Manager** The humans encountered by the robot are represented by entities called “InterAction Agents”

(IAAs). An IAA is created dynamically and maintained by the “IAA Manager”. IAAs are containers for various information associated to a human: not only information provided by perception but also its abilities and preferences. This information will be typically used by the planners described in the next sections.

**The Task Delegates** The set of active goals entails the incremental execution of a set of tasks, some of them involving interaction with humans. Each task corresponding to an active or a suspended goal is represented by an entity called “Task Delegate” that is in charge of monitoring the progress towards the goals of both the robot and the IAA and to assess the level of commitment of the associated person.

**The Robot Supervision Kernel** The Robot Supervision Kernel is responsible of all tasks selection, refinement and execution. It maintains an integrated view of all robot activities and ensures a global coherence of robot behavior. It is the only entity that can send execution requests to the functional level.

For each new active goal the Robot Supervision Kernel creates a Task Delegate, selects or elaborates a plan and allocates the roles of each team member.

For all the other active goals, the Robot Supervision Kernel has already a plan and is in charge of the execution of the robot part. Whenever an elementary action is performed, the Robot Supervision Kernel forwards this information to all active Tasks Delegates.

Depending on the context, the planning process can be more or less elaborated. The planning activity associated to a task is a “continuous process”; it provides, incrementally, the next sub-tasks to achieve. It has also to state, depending on the context, on the feasibility or relevance of the task.

The next sections discuss related issues at task level - HATP, a “Human-Aware Task Planner” - and at motion level - HAMP, a “Human-Aware Motion Planner”.

### Human-Aware Task Planning

**Context** The main point here is how high level robot task planning skills should be developed in order to allow it to act as an assistant.

In such a scheme, the robot plans for itself and anticipates the human behavior in order:

- not only, to assess the feasibility of the task (at a certain level) before performing it
- but also, to share the load between itself and the human (negotiation)
- and to explain/illustrate a possible course of actions.

One major point is that the robot must not only perform its tasks but also act in a way judged as “acceptable” and “legible” by humans. Other desired features, that fall in the same category, are “predictability” and “directability” (Klein *et al.* 2004).

**Representing social constraints** We have elaborated a formalization where both the robot and the human are represented in terms of actions they can perform.

It is based on a formalization where both the robot and the human are represented in terms of actions they can perform. A “team” composed of two “agents” (the robot and a human) can be represented as:  $(A_{human}, C_{human}^{ctxt})$  and  $(A_{robot}, C_{robot}^{ctxt})$  where  $A_i$  are sets of actions and  $C_i^{ctxt}$  are their context-dependent associated costs.

The introduction of costs allows to select preferred behaviours. Indeed, at this level, it is possible to deal with social constraints that can be represented as:

- costs/utilities that denote the difficulty and the pleasure an agent has in an action realization
- undesirable states (from the human side)
- desirable or undesirable sequences of actions that may induce a robot behavior that is not understandable (legible) by its human partner
- synchronizations and protocols that may represent social or cultural conventions

Relevant action models and planning algorithms have still to be devised. In a first tentative, we have used an existent planner, in order to assess the pertinence of the approach. A HTN (Hierarchical Task Network) planner SHOP2(Nau *et*

*al.* 2003) has been used mainly because it permits to specify costs for actions and encode procedural knowledge. Examples involved domestic like situations where the robot essentially various actions in interaction and/or in presence of humans.

**An example** We illustrate here below a use of the current version of HATP for the scenario described above. Two agents are directly involved: Clark and Robot. We assume that they can perform the same set of actions:  $A_{Clark} = A_{Robot}$ .

Typical actions are:

- (GOTO ?*dest*): moving to from current place to a specified destination ?*dest*.
- (TAKE ?*obj*): picking a object that is placed near the agent
- (PUT ?*obj*): releasing a grasped object
- (GIVE ?*obj* ?*a*): handing the grasped object directly to another agent ?*a*.
- (USE\_BRUSH ?*furniture*): cleaning a piece of furniture ?*furniture*

In this very simple example, we provide a set of human preferences to the planner. We specify an “undesirable state” corresponding to the situation where Robot holds simultaneously food in one hand and a cleaning object on the other hand. We also specify a (socially) undesirable sequences of actions; for instance, the sequence in which Robot puts an object near a human agent  $A_i$  and immediately after  $A_i$  takes the same object.




Figure 5: Plans synthesized by HATP.

Figure 5 illustrates two plans elaborated by HATP under different conditions related to the “level tiredness” of Clark. In Plan (1) is a plan, the robot takes into account that Clark is tired and prefers not to move. However, Clark prefers to clean himself the table for efficient reasons. Plan (2) corresponds to the case where Clark is really tired so he does not want to do anything except getting his sandwich.

Note that in both cases, the planner has avoided to produce a plan where Robot gets the brush and the sandwich at the same time even though it is far more efficient in terms of number of actions or energy.

## Human-aware motion planning

The presence of humans in the environment raises also new issues to the classic motion/manipulation task planning (Chatila *et al.* 2002; Pacchierotti, Christensen, & Jensfelt 2005; Sisbot *et al.* 2005). Classic motion planners that consider only obstacles and free space are clearly insufficient.

For instance, Figure 6 illustrates two paths generated by a standard motion planner. Both paths are uncomfortable: (1) the robot “springs out” close and then move too close to the seated person, (2) the robot moves in the back of the person.




Figure 6: A path produced by a conventional planner: an efficient trajectory, that does not into account the “human parameter”, makes the robot move too close to people and sometimes behind them.

We claim that a human-aware motion planner must not only elaborate safe robot paths (Kulic & Croft 2004), but also plan “good”, socially acceptable and “legible” paths. Our aim is to build a motion planner that takes explicitly into account the human partner by reasoning about his accessibility, his vision field and potential shared motions.

While several contributions take into account the robot’s and humans safety, very few papers, in our knowledge, deal with comfort and legibility issues and often in an ad hoc manner. We believe that our approach can be more generic. We introduce two criteria to the motion planning stage to ensure safety and comfort. The first criterion, called Safety Criterion, mainly focuses on ensuring the humans’ safety by controlling the distance between robot and humans present in the environment. The robot, unless necessary, must avoid to approach too much humans. In some cases a given perimeter around humans must not be allowed to pass through.

The second criterion, called Visibility Criterion, takes into account the humans field of view and robot’s relative position to it. Humans tend to feel safer and more comfortable when the robot is in their sight. It is preferable that the robot chooses a path as visible as possible to ensure this property. The visible and invisible zones (to the humans’ field of view) in the environment can be ranked proportionally to the min-

imum angular deviation from the humans gaze. Indeed, one can consider this Visibility Criterion as a proportion to the “humans effort to keep the robot in his sight by turning the head or the body”. Another aspect concerns zones that are hidden (in the human perspective) by a walls or obstacles of a given height. The sudden appearance of the robot can cause fear and surprise especially if the obstacle is close to the human.

Note that other aspects should be taken into account like speed (time to contact) and acceleration of the robot (or of a part of its structure) particularly when it is in the close vicinity of humans.

We are investigating various minimization criteria based on a weighted combination of distance, visibility and comfort for computing a satisfactory path and velocity profile. The two criteria mentioned above are represented by numerical potentials stored in 2D grids combining various costs. These costs are highly related to the humans’ state, capabilities and preferences. Figure 7 shows safety criterion costs and Figure 8 presents computed costs related to hidden zones from the human perspective.

A first navigation planner (Sisbot *et al.* 2005) has been built in order to study motion in the vicinity of humans as well approach motions to human. The chosen criteria are based on user trials that have been conducted by (Walters *et al.* 2005).




Figure 7: Human relative “Safety grids” when human is sitting and standing are different.

**Back to the example:** To illustrate the results obtained by our motion planner, we show how the actions selected by HATP are refined and executed at geometric level.

As an input, the motion planner receives the action (GOTO KITCHEN) together with a set of complementary information: the next possible action (TAKE BRUSH), the current state of the world  $S^v$  which contains the positions and states of the robot, the humans and the objects.

These information are used to adapt HAMP’s criteria. For example, there is no human in the kitchen. When planning motion for (GOTO KITCHEN), visibility loses its importance because the robot is already seen and there is nobody at the destination point. This will not be the case when the robot will plan a trajectory from the kitchen to the room where Clark and Bruce are present.

In Figure 9-a, one can see the path generated by HAMP for (GOTO KITCHEN). Although the choice of the final point of the path is not made automatically in the current




Figure 9: Paths generated by the Human-Aware Motion Planner. Note that (1) the robot avoids to “burst” in the close vicinity of humans, (2) that it tries to stay in their field of sight and (3) that it avoids to approach humans from behind.

implementation, the path produced by HAMP takes into account human safety and comfort by staying in the visibility of both persons.

When performing (GOTO LIVING\_ROOM), we can see in Figure 9-b that HAMP finds a path that avoids springing out from the kitchen wall too close to the seated person. The robot chooses a path that keeps a certain distance to this wall.

In Figure 9-c, we can see that Bruce came to talk to Clark; so the robot calculates a different trajectory which stays in Clark’s visibility and avoids to pass close to Bruce back.

In the last Figure, the original path is blocked and the robot computes an alternative trajectory (Figure 9-d).

### Discussion and future work

The design choices and the results presented here is still preliminary. While the general scheme we propose might be difficult to implement in a general sense, we believe that it is a reasonable challenge to implement it in the case of a personal robot assistant essentially devoted to fetch-and-carry, as well interactive manipulation tasks and associated activ-

ities. The robot would operate in a known in-door environment (acquired in a preliminary phase).

Fetch-and-carry and object manipulation task need 3D geometric planning. One challenging problem would be to extend the approach discussed above to the situation where a robot has to hand an object to human. Indeed, there is a need to take into account visibility and reach, in terms of kinematic constraints, of the human partner (Figure 10).

Besides, the robot should produce motion that is acceptable and easily “legible”. The human partner should easily understand by observing the robot motion that it is intending to hand an object (Figure 11).

One additional difficulty when considering such issues is the construction of a coherent formalization that allows to take into account various constraints of different nature. For instance, some of them can be best expressed geometrically while others may be expressed in terms of temporal or causal links between actions.

This is why we intend to apply and extend models and algorithms similar to those developed, in aSyMov, a planner that is able to deal with intricate symbolic and geometric




Figure 8: Hidden zones from the human perspective

constraints (Gravot, Cambon, & Alami 2003).

### Conclusion

In this paper we have presented a decisional framework designed for robots operating in a human environment. Our objective is to provide a management of human interaction that is an integral part of a general robot control architecture. This was done in order to provide a principled way to deal with HRI.

The framework is also suitable for the development and experiment of task planners and interaction schemes that explicitly consider human abilities and preferences.

Examples of such planners are presented that integrate various models of human abilities and preferences.

### Acknowledgments

The work described in this paper was conducted within the EU Integrated Project COGNIRON ("The Cognitive Companion") and was funded by the European Commission Division FP6-IST Future and Emerging Technologies under Contract FP6-002020 and by the French National Program ROBEA.

### References

- Alami, R.; Chatila, R.; Fleury, S.; Ghallab, M.; and Ingrand, F. 1998. An architecture for autonomy. *International Journal of Robotics Research, Special Issue on Integrated Architectures for Robot Control and Programming* 17(4).
- Alami, R.; Clodic, A.; Montreuil, V.; Sisbot, E.; and Chatila, R. 2005. Task planning for human-robot interaction. *Proceedings Soc-EUSAI'2005 conference*. Grenoble, France,.
- Breazeal, C. 1998. A motivational system for regulating human-robot interaction. *National Conference of American Association for Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*.




Figure 10: Handing an object to a person requires to take into account the person's reach and field of sight

Buchsbaum, D.; Blumberg, B.; Breazeal, C.; and Meltzoff, A. N. 2005. A simulation-theory inspired social learning system for interactive characters. *IEEE International Workshop on Robots and Human Interactive Communication*.

Chatila, R.; Alami, R.; Simeon, T.; Pettre, J.; and Jaillet, L. 2002. Safe, reliable and friendly interaction between humans and humanoids. *Rapport LAAS No02530, 3rd IARP International Workshop on Humanoid and Human Friendly Robotics* 83–87.

Clodic, A.; Montreuil, V.; Alami, R.; and Chatila, R. 2005. A decisional framework for autonomous robots interacting with humans. *IEEE International Workshop on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN)*.

Cohen, P. R., and Levesque, H. J. 1990. Intention is choice with commitment. *Artificial Intelligence* 42(2-3):213–361.

Cohen, P. R., and Levesque, H. J. 1991. Teamwork. *Nous* 25(4):487–512.

Feil-Seifer, D., and Mataric, M. J. 2005. A multi-modal approach to selective interaction in assistive domains. *IEEE International Workshop on Robots and Human Interactive Communication* 416–421.

Fong, T. W.; Nourbakhsh, I.; Kunz, C.; Flockiger, L.; Schreiner, J.; Ambrose, R.; Burrige, R.; Simmons, R.; Hiatt, L. M.; Schultz, A.; Trafton, J. G.; Bugajska, M.; and Scholtz, J. 2005. The peer-to-peer human-robot interaction project. *AIAA Space 2005*.

Fong, T.; Nourbakhsh, I.; and Dautenhahn, K. 2003. A survey of socially interactive robots. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems, Special Issue on Socially Interactive Robots* (42 (3-4)):146–163.

Gravot, F.; Cambon, S.; and Alami, R. 2003. asmov: a planner that deals with intricate symbolic and geometric






Figure 11: Four ways of handing an object to a person. Only one seems acceptable.

problem. *International Symposium of Robotics Research (ISRR)*.

Kawamura, K.; Nilas, P.; and Mugumura, K. 2003. An agent-based architecture for an adaptive human-robot interface. *Proceedings of the 36th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS)*.

Klein, G.; Woods, D. D.; Bradshaw, J. M.; Hoffman, R. R.; and Feltoovich, P. J. 2004. Ten challenges for making automation a "team player" in joint human-agent activity. *IEEE Intelligent Systems* 19(6):91–95.

Kulic, D., and Croft, E. 2004. Safe planning for human-robot interaction. *Proc. in IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics & Automation, New Orleans, USA*.

Kumar, S.; Huber, M. J.; Cohen, P. R.; and McGee, D. R. 2002. Toward a formalism for conversation protocols using joint intention theory. *Computational Intelligence* 18(2).

Nakajima, H.; Morishima, Y.; Brave, S.; Yamada, R.; Maldonado, H.; Nass, C.; Arao, M.; and Kawaji, S. 2004. Toward an actualization of social intelligence in human and robot collaborative systems. *International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*.

Nau, D.; Au, T.-C.; Ilghami, O.; Kuter, U.; Murdock, J. W.; Wu, D.; and Yaman, F. 2003. Shop2: An htn planning system. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* (20):379–404.

Nonaka, S.; Inoue, K.; Arai, T.; and Mae, Y. 2004. Evaluation of human sense of security for coexisting robots using virtual reality. *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*.

Pacchierotti, E.; Christensen, H. I.; and Jensfelt, P. 2005. Human-robot embodied interaction in hallway settings: a pilot user study. *14th IEEE International Workshop on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (Ro-Man), Nashville, USA*.

Scerri, P.; Pynadath, D. V.; Johnson, L.; Paul, R.; Schurr,

N.; Si, M.; and Tambe, M. 2003. A prototype infrastructure for distributed robot-agent-person teams. *The Second International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS)*.

Sisbot, E. A.; Alami, R.; Simeon, T.; Dautenhahn, K.; Walters, M.; Woods, S.; Koay, K. L.; and Nehaniv, C. 2005. Navigation in presence of humans. *IEEE-RAS International Conference on Humanoid Robots, Humanoids2005, Tsukuba, Japan*.

Tambe, M. 1997. Agent architectures for flexible, practical teamwork. *Proceedings of the National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*.

Trafton, J. G.; Schultz, A. C.; Bugajska, M.; and Mintz, F. 2005. Perspective-taking with robots: Experiments and models. *IEEE International Workshop on Robots and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN)*.

Walters, M.; Dautenhahn, K.; Boekhorst, R.; Koay, K. L.; Kaouri, C.; Woods, S.; Nehaniv, C.; Lee, D.; and Werry, I. 2005. The influence of subjects personality traits on personal spatial zones in a human-robot interaction experiment. *14th IEEE International Workshop on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (Ro-Man), Nashville, USA*.