



Near-Optimal Multi-Agent Learning for Safe Coverage Control



Manish Prajapat



Matteo Turchetta



Melanie N. Zeilinger[†]



Andreas Krause[†]









- Density
 - Spatially distributed events





- Density
 - Spatially distributed events
- Multiple agents
 - A set of agents coordinate in the process





- Density
 - Spatially distributed events
- Multiple agents
 - A set of agents coordinate in the process







- Density
 - Spatially distributed events
- Multiple agents
 - A set of agents coordinate in the process
- Coverage Control
 - Agents navigate to cover the space "as best as they can"





- Density
 - Spatially distributed events
- Multiple agents
 - A set of agents coordinate in the process
- Coverage Control
 - Agents navigate to cover the space "as best as they can"
- Safe
 - Constraints by the environment





- Density
 - Spatially distributed events
- Multiple agents
 - A set of agents coordinate in the process
- Coverage Control
 - Agents navigate to cover the space "as best as they can"
- Safe
 - Constraints by the environment
 - Safe execution





- Density
 - Spatially distributed events
- Multiple agents
 - A set of agents coordinate in the process
- Coverage Control
 - Agents navigate to cover the space "as best as they can"
- Safe
 - Constraints by the environment
 - Safe execution

Real-world applications: Bio-diversity monitoring, Swarm robots, 3D scene reconstruction, etc.





Coverage function:







Coverage function:







Coverage function:



Coverage function:



Coverage function:



- A-priori unknown density
- A-priori unknown constraints

Coverage function:



- A-priori unknown density
- A-priori unknown constraints
- Even with known functions \rightarrow NP Hard problem $\textcircled{\mbox{$\odot$}}$

Coverage function:



- A-priori unknown density
- A-priori unknown constraints
- Even with known functions \rightarrow NP Hard problem $\textcircled{\odot}$ Submodular function

Coverage function:



Challenges

- A-priori unknown density
- A-priori unknown constraints
- Even with known functions \rightarrow NP Hard problem $\textcircled{\mbox{$\odot$}}$

Submodular function \rightarrow Greedy is Near-Optimal,

Coverage function:



Challenges

- A-priori unknown density
- A-priori unknown constraints

Even with known functions → NP Hard problem ☺
 Submodular function → Greedy is Near-Optimal,

$$\underbrace{F(X_t;\rho)}_{\text{Our goal}} \geq (1 - \frac{1}{e}) \underbrace{F(X_\star;\rho)}_{\text{optimal clairvoyant}} - \epsilon_{\rho}$$

Coverage function:



Challenges

- A-priori unknown density
- A-priori unknown constraints

Even with known functions → NP Hard problem ☺
 Submodular function → Greedy is Near-Optimal,

$$\frac{F(X_t;\rho)}{Our \ \text{goal}} \ge (1 - \frac{1}{e}) \underbrace{F(X_\star;\rho)}_{\text{optimal clairvoyant}} - \epsilon_{\rho}$$

Algorithmic questions

Coverage function:



Challenges

- A-priori unknown density
- A-priori unknown constraints

Even with known functions → NP Hard problem ☺
 Submodular function → Greedy is Near-Optimal.

$$\frac{F(X_t;\rho)}{Our \, goal} \geq (1 - \frac{1}{e}) \underbrace{F(X_\star;\rho)}_{optimal \, clairvoyant} - \epsilon_{\rho}$$

Algorithmic questions

• Can we always satisfy safety constraints?

Coverage function:



Challenges

- A-priori unknown density
- A-priori unknown constraints
- Even with known functions → NP Hard problem ☺
 Submodular function → Greedy is Near-Optimal.

$$\frac{F(X_t;\rho)}{Our \, \text{goal}} \geq (1 - \frac{1}{e}) \underbrace{F(X_\star;\rho)}_{\text{optimal clairvoyant}} - \epsilon_{\rho}$$

Algorithmic questions

- Can we always satisfy safety constraints?
- Do we converge? How quickly?

Coverage function:



Challenges

- A-priori unknown density
- A-priori unknown constraints
- Even with known functions → NP Hard problem ☺
 Submodular function → Greedy is Near-Optimal.

$$\frac{F(X_t;\rho)}{Our \, goal} \geq (1 - \frac{1}{e}) \underbrace{F(X_\star;\rho)}_{optimal \, clairvoyant} - \epsilon_{\rho}$$

Algorithmic questions

- Can we always satisfy safety constraints?
- Do we converge? How quickly?
- How far are we from the optimal solution?





MACOPT steps: 1) GREEDY UCB





MACOPT steps: 1) GREEDY UCB





MACOPT steps: 1) GREEDY UCB





MACOPT steps: 1) GREEDY UCB 2) Uncertainty sampling





MACOPT steps: 1) GREEDY UCB 2) Uncertainty sampling





MACOPT steps: 1) GREEDY UCB 2) Uncertainty sampling



Theoretical result: Cumulative regret grows sublinear with time

































Multi-Agent extension of Goal-oriented Safe Exploration (GoOSE) (Turchetta et al., 2019)



Theoretical Results:

- Guarantees that SAFEMAC is safe with high probability
- Achieves near-optimal coverage in finite time



Experiments on biodiversity monitoring and obstacle avoidance environments



Experiments on biodiversity monitoring and obstacle avoidance environments

- MACOPT up to 40% more coverage as compared to UCB
- SAFEMAC up to 50% more sample efficient as compared to two-stage algorithm



Experiments on biodiversity monitoring and obstacle avoidance environments

- MACOPT up to 40% more coverage as compared to UCB
- SAFEMAC up to 50% more sample efficient as compared to two-stage algorithm

If you are interested in:

- Multi-agent learning
- Submodular optimization
- Safety
- Bayesian optimization

See you at our poster @NeurIPS 2022 !!!



Scan for paper !!!



Experiments on biodiversity monitoring and obstacle avoidance environments

- MACOPT up to 40% more coverage as compared to UCB
- SAFEMAC up to 50% more sample efficient as compared to two-stage algorithm

If you are interested in:

- Multi-agent learning
- Submodular optimization
- Safety
- Bayesian optimization

See you at our poster @NeurIPS 2022 !!!

Thank you for your attention !!!



Scan for paper !!!

