Computation and Control

Jason Hickey Richard Murray

Eric Klavins

Caltech



Adam Granicz Cristian Tapus Justin Smith Xin Yu Nathan Gray

Computation and reaction

- A <u>reactive</u> system is a system that describes how to react to events
 - "moving left" → "steer right"
 - "slowing down" → "increase thrust"
- <u>Algorithms</u> are a set of rules to apply repeatedly
 - while(i != 0) { k *= i; i-- }



Rewriting systems

- A *rewriting* system us a language \mathcal{L} , together with a set of rules $s_i \rightarrow t_i$ for some $s_i, t_i \in \mathcal{L}$.
- s_i is called a *redex* (a pattern or set of terms)
- t_i is called a *contractum*
- A *computation* is a sequence of rewrite applications $e_1 \rightarrow e_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow e_n$



Lambda calculus (canonical example)

Language \mathcal{L} :

Rewrites:

$$(\lambda v.e_1) e_2 \rightarrow_{\beta} e_1[e_2/v]$$

$$(\lambda x.\lambda y.x + y) 1 2$$

$$\rightarrow (\lambda y.1 + y) 2$$

$$\rightarrow 1 + 2$$

$$\rightarrow 3$$



Computing/Control http://mojave.cs.caltech.edu

Example: vehicle formation/assembly

Assemble a set of vehicle/parts into a formation





Formation rules





Computing/Control http://mojave.cs.caltech.edu

Rewriting rules

- Rule classes
 - <u>Progress</u>: getting closer to a goal
 - <u>Dynamics</u>
 - <u>Adversaries</u>: destructive actions
- Technical questions
 - Determinism (Church-Rosser)
 - Progress (liveness)
 - Termination
 - Locality



Determinism (Church-Rosser)

- Does the order of evaluation matter?
- Often the answer is no
 - There may be reasons to have more than one result
- Proofs are quite difficult





Deadlock/progress

- Is it possible to build a partial, final, formation?
 - Show that: if a formation is not final, at least one rule is always enabled
- Easy to prevent
 - Add more rules to make progress from partial formations
 - Add "undo" to reverse bogus computations





Termination

- Does every reduction sequence terminate?
- Termination proofs require the formation of a metric
 - Often infeasible, if not it can be extremely hard
 - In many cases it doesn't matter







- Is it possible to make decisions locally?
 - Locality is determined by the scope of the rewrite
- Methods
 - Optimize the program to limit the scope
 - Introduce communication







- Rewriting languages
 - Determinism(*)
 - Termination(*)
 - Progress
 - Locality

UNITY-like languages:

G_1	\rightarrow	P_1	decisions and actions
G_2	\rightarrow	P_2	
	÷		
G_n	\rightarrow	P_n	
G_{c}	\rightarrow	$P_{\mathcal{C}}$	physics, control
G_a	\rightarrow	P_a	adversaries

 - (*) hard to prove, not always useful



Logical Programming Environments



• The LPE is a framework for supporting formal design

- Type theory is a common language for specification and synthesis
- Enables collaborative development of verified control libraries and design automation tools
- The compiler is an assistant, and the link to executable code



Logical Programming Environments



14

Phobos

- Phobos is a front-end for domain-specific languages
 - Programs are translated to one of a set of "standard" languages
 - or to a theorem prover





Language definitions

Each language has a lexicon

```
Tokens -longest {
      NUM = "[0-9]+"
                           { __token__[p:s]{'pos} -> num[p:s]{'pos} }
      * SPACF = " "
                           { }
  }
And a grammar
 %]eft PLUS MINUS
 %]eft TIMES DIV
 %]eft LPAREN RPAREN
 Grammar -start exp {
                         { num[p:s]{'pos} -> exp{num[p:s]; 'pos}}
    exp ::= NUM
         ID
                         \{ \dots \}
                         { 'e1 PLUS 'e2 -> exp{sum{'e1; 'e2};
        exp PLUS exp
                                                union_exp_pos{'e1; 'e2} }
```



•

Logical Programming Environments



Parts

- Phobos language support complete
- DRL language design and control primitives
- <u>Code</u> compiler complete

