



Open Motion Planning Library: A Primer

Kavraki Lab
Rice University

ompl.kavrakilab.org

November 23, 2015

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Prerequisites for Using OMPL	1
2	Introduction to Sampling-based Motion Planning	2
2.1	Historical Notes	2
2.2	Sampling-based Motion Planning	3
2.2.1	Problem Statement and Definitions	4
2.2.2	Probabilistic Roadmap	4
2.2.3	Tree-based Planners	6
2.2.4	Primitives of Sampling-based Planning	8
3	Getting Started with OMPL.app	9
3.1	Using OMPL.app	9
3.1.1	Selecting a Robot and an Environment	10
3.1.2	Choosing a Planner	11
3.1.3	Bounding the Environment	12
3.1.4	Saving and Replaying Solution Paths	12
3.2	OMPL.app vs. OMPL	12
4	Planning with OMPL	13
4.1	Design Considerations	13
4.2	OMPL Foundations	14
4.3	Solving a Query	15
4.4	Compiling Code with OMPL	16
4.5	Benchmarking	17
5	Advanced Topics in OMPL	19
5.1	State Space Construction	19
5.2	Planner Customization	19
5.3	Python Bindings	20

Chapter 1

Introduction

This document explains how the Open Motion Planning Library (OMPL) implements the basic primitives of sampling-based motion planning, what planners are already available in OMPL, and how to use the library to build new planners. This primer is segmented into the following sections: An introduction to sampling-based motion planning, a guide to setup OMPL for solving motion planning queries using OMPL.app, a description of the motion planning primitives in OMPL to develop your own planner, and an explanation of some advanced OMPL topics.

At the end of this document, users should be able to use OMPL.app to solve motion planning queries in 2D and 3D workspaces, and utilize the OMPL framework to develop their own algorithms for state sampling, collision checking, nearest neighbor searching, and other components of sampling-based methods to build a new planner.

1.1 Prerequisites for Using OMPL

This primer assumes that users are familiar with C++ programming and compiling code in a Unix environment. Additionally, users should have basic knowledge of sampling-based motion planning. OMPL and OMPL.app should also be installed. For information regarding the installation process, please see `ompl.kavrakilab.org`.

Chapter 2

Introduction to Sampling-based Motion Planning

To put OMPL in context, a short introduction to the principles of sampling-based motion planning is first given. Robotic motion planning seeks to find a solution to the problem of “Go from the start to the goal while respecting all of the robot’s constraints.” From a computational point of view, however, such an inquiry can be very difficult when the robot has a large number of degrees of freedom. For simplicity, consider the classical motion planning problem known as the piano mover’s problem. In this formulation, there exists a rigid object in 3D (the piano), as well as a set of known obstacles. The goal of the piano mover’s problem is to find a collision-free path for the piano that begins at its starting position and ends at a prescribed goal configuration. Computing the exact solution to this problem is very difficult. In this setup, the piano has six degrees of freedom: three for movement in the coordinate planes (x, y, z), and three more to represent rotation along the axes of these coordinate planes (roll, pitch, yaw). To solve the piano mover’s problem we must compute a set of continuous changes in all six of these values in order to navigate the piano from its starting configuration to the goal configuration while avoiding obstacles in the environment. It has been shown that finding a solution for the piano mover’s problem is PSPACE-hard, indicating computational intractability in the degrees of freedom of the robot [1, 2, 3].

2.1 Historical Notes

OMPL specializes in sampling-based motion planning, which is presented in Section 2.2. To put sampling-based methods in context, a very brief historical overview to the methods that have been proposed for motion planning is presented. Most of these methods were developed before sampling-based planning, but are still applicable in many scenarios.

Exact and Approximate Cell Decomposition In some instances, it is possible to partition the workspace into discrete cells corresponding to the obstacle free portion of the environment. This decomposition can then be modeled as a graph (roadmap), where the vertices represent the individual

cells and edges indicate adjacency among the cells. Utilizing this graph, the problem of moving a point robot becomes a classical search from the cell with the starting position to the cell containing the goal position. Such a formulation also works well in “controllable” systems (e.g., omnidirectional base). There are cases though, for example when the robot has complex non-linear dynamics, where it is not clear how to move the system from one cell to an adjacent cell. It should also be noted that the motion of robots are computed in states spaces that are high-dimensional. Partitioning these spaces into free (or approximately free) cells is difficult and impractical in most cases.

Control-based Methods Control-based methods attempt to model the equations of motion of the system and apply ideas from control theory in order to navigate a system along a specified trajectory. These approaches operate in the continuous space, and typically employ a feedback loop in order to effectively maneuver the system with minimal error. Using a control-based approach to navigate a robot is very fast and can be done in an online manner, which is necessary in many applications. Computing a desirable and feasible trajectory can be very difficult, however, in systems with complex dynamics and/or cluttered environments, which heavily restrict the valid motions.

Potential Fields Conceptually, potential fields are a simple and intuitive idea. The classical potential field involves computing a vector at each point in the workspace by calculating the sum of an attractive force emanating from the goal, and a repulsive force from all of the obstacles. The point robot can then navigate using gradient descent to follow the potentials to the goal. Potential fields have been generalized to systems with a rigid body by considering multiple points on the robot, and can operate in real-time. Navigating a system using a potential field, however, can fail due to local minima in the field itself, which stem from the heuristic combination of the forces in the workspace. Ideally the field would be constructed in the state space of the system, but this is equivalent to solving the original problem. Some approaches consider a *navigation function* where the potential field is guaranteed to have a single minimum, but computing such a function is possible only in low-dimensional spaces and is non-trivial.

Randomized Planning Randomization in otherwise deterministic planners has shown to be very effective. In potential fields, for example, Brownian motions in which a random action is applied for a specific amount of time have been shown to be highly effective in guiding a system out of a local minima. Randomized methods have also been applied to non-holonomic systems, particularly in the field of sampling-based planning. Sampling-based methods were inspired by randomization, and the use of samples, random or deterministic, when planning are particularly effective for high degree of freedom systems or those with complex dynamics.

2.2 Sampling-based Motion Planning

Sampling-based motion planning is a powerful concept that employs sampling of the state space of the robot in order to quickly and effectively answer planning queries, especially for systems with

differential constraints or those with many degrees of freedom. Traditional approaches to solving these particular problems may take a very long time due to motion constraints or the size of the state space. Sampling arises out of the need to quickly cover a potentially large and complex state space to connect a start and goal configuration along a feasible and valid path.

The need to reason over the entire continuous state space causes traditional approaches to breakdown in high-dimensional spaces. In contrast, sampling-based motion planning reasons over a finite set of configurations in the state space. The sampling process itself computes in the simplest case a generally uniform set of random robot configurations, and connects these samples via collision free paths that respect the motion constraints of the robot to answer the query. Most sampling-based methods provide *probabilistic completeness*. This means that if a solution exists, the probability of finding a solution converges to one as the number of samples reasoned over increases to infinity. Sampling-based approaches cannot recognize a problem with no solution.

2.2.1 Problem Statement and Definitions

This section will present the problem to be solved by the motion query using a sampling-based method, and define some useful terminology that will be used throughout the remainder of the primer.

Workspace: The physical space that the robot operates in. It is assumed that the boundary of the workspace represents an obstacle for the robot.

State space: The parameter space for the robot. This space represents all possible configurations of the robot in the workspace. A single point in the state space is a *state*.

Free state space: A subset of the state space in which each state corresponds to an obstacle free configuration of the robot embedded in the workspace.

Path: A continuous mapping of states in the state space. A path is collision free if each element of the path is an element of the free state space.

From these definitions, the goal of a sampling-based motion planning query can be formalized as the task of finding a collision path in the state space of the robot from a distinct start state to a specific goal state, utilizing a path composed of configurations connected by collision free paths.

The remainder of this section will discuss two types of sampling-based planners, from which many of the state-of-the-art techniques can be derived from. It should be noted that many sampling strategies exists, but their presentation is beyond the scope of this Primer.

2.2.2 Probabilistic Roadmap

The probabilistic roadmap (PRM) is among the first sampling-based motion planners [4]. This approach utilizes random sampling of the state space to build a roadmap of the free state space. This roadmap is analogous to a street map of a city. To illustrate the fundamentals of the PRM, a simple example of a 2D workspace and freely moving point robot will be used.




Figure 2.1: The 2D workspace and a single state for the point robot.

Consider the workspace in Figure 2.1. This image shows a bounded workspace for the point robot in which the shaded regions are obstacles. One particular state for the robot is highlighted. The PRM works by uniformly sampling the free state space and making connections between the samples to form a roadmap of the free state space. The roadmap can be stored efficiently as a graph data structure where the random samples compose the vertices, as in Figure 2.2. It should be noted that the free state space is almost never explicitly known in sampling-based methods. Each sample that is generated is checked for collision, and only collision free samples are retained. Additionally, there are many different ways to sample the free state space, and changing the sampling strategy is beneficial in many planning instances.




Figure 2.2: One possible set of uniform random samples of the free state space

Once the desired number of free samples have been found, the roadmap itself can be constructed by connecting the random samples to form edges. The canonical PRM attempts to connect each sample to the k samples nearest to it by using a local planner that is tasked with finding short collision free paths. The local planner finds this path by interpolating the motion of the robot between the two samples, checking for collisions at some prescribed resolution. If no configuration of the robot between the samples collides with an obstacle, then an edge is inserted to the roadmap. Figure 2.3 shows a complete probabilistic roadmap in the 2D workspace example.

Once the roadmap is complete, it can be used to answer motion planning queries by connecting the start and goal states to the roadmap using the local planner, and performing a graph search to




Figure 2.3: Using a local planner, the PRM is formed by connecting samples that are close to one another using a straight path in the free state space.

find the shortest path in the roadmap. This is seen in Figure 2.4.




Figure 2.4: An example of a motion planning query on a PRM. The start and the goal are connected to the roadmap, and the shortest path in the graph is found.

2.2.3 Tree-based Planners

There exist many types of sampling-based planners that create tree structures of the free state space. The trees generated by these methods are analogous to the probabilistic roadmap, except that the structure contains no cycles. Due to the wide variety of tree-based planners (e.g., RRT[5], EST[6], SBL[7], KP I ECE[8]), one specific type will not be discussed in detail here. However, a general framework will be described. These methods begin by rooting a tree at the starting configuration of the robot. With the first node of the tree intact, random sampling of the free space then occurs. The planner employs an expansion heuristic, which typically gives the method its name, from which the sample is connected to the tree along a collision free path. Figure 2.5 shows an example in the 2D workspace scenario where the first few valid samples are connected to the tree.

Since it is highly improbable that the sampling process will ever sample the goal state exactly, the methods often bias the expansion of the tree toward the goal state. If it is possible to connect the




Figure 2.5: The sampling observed after the first few samples have been connected. Random samples are connected to the tree using an expansion heuristic.

goal to the existing tree, then the search is complete; a path through the free state space has been found from the start to the goal. Figure 2.6 shows a case where the goal cannot be connected to the tree, and Figure 2.7 shows the case where the goal is connected, terminating the search.




Figure 2.6: Scenario where the goal is selected during the sampling process, but cannot be connected to the tree. The closest node in the tree is obscured by an obstacle.

It is important to highlight the difference between the roadmap-based planners and the tree-based planners. The tree-based techniques are most suitable for single-query planning. These trees do not normally cover the free space in the same manner that a roadmap would. However, when planning with differential constraints, it is not easy to encode control information into an undirected edge. Controls are usually directed commands, and require a specific pre-condition in order for a particular control to be valid. Tree-based methods, on the other hand, excel at planning with complex dynamics because of the directed, acyclic nature of the underlying data structure. Control information can be encoded for each edge of the tree, with the vertices of the tree satisfying the prerequisites for the valid controls.

Finally, it should be noted that many sampling-based approaches require a smaller memory footprint than other motion planners. The compactness of these planners stems from the sampling process itself, as well as the fact that no explicit representation of the state space is needed in order to solve the problem. Storage and search of the underlying data structure (e.g., graph, tree) should




Figure 2.7: Scenario where the goal is selected during the sampling process, and is connected to the tree, ending the search.

be efficient to fully maximize the quality of these methods. However, as tree planners are used for increasingly difficult problems, memory requirements may increase in order to keep information that guides the expansion of the search.

2.2.4 Primitives of Sampling-based Planning

Sampling-based planning is a very powerful tool for planning in high-dimensional spaces or for system with complex dynamics. There exists many kinds of sampling-based motion planners, with many commonalities, but the method in which one samples the state space is key to computing a solution.

Collision checking is a very important part of sampling-based planning. It is used not only in the local planner when attempting to find collision free paths between samples, but also during the sampling process itself. In a complex or high-dimensional system it may not be easy to explicitly represent the free state space, but in sampling-based methods it is not necessary to create this space. It is the job of the collision checker to accept a configuration of the robot and quickly determine whether or not this state is in collision.

Nearest neighbor searching is another cornerstone of sampling-based methods. It is from the ability of determining whether two states of the robot are close that many of the common approaches are able to effectively find paths through a high-dimensional space. Distances, however, are not easy to compute in non-Euclidean spaces where many of the interesting problems reside. Kd-trees offer one way to perform this search, but the optimal connection strategy for samples remains elusive.

The core OMPL library cleanly implements all of these primitives of sampling-based motion planning. Chapter 3 shows how the planners bundled with OMPL can be used to directly solve motion planning queries, and Chapter 4 details how these primitives map to concepts within the open motion planning library.

Chapter 3

Getting Started with OMPL.app

OMPL.app provides a graphical front-end to the core OMPL library, and allows a user to see many of the ideas from sampling-based motion planning in action. The GUI is written using Python and PyQt. OMPL.app comes bundled with the core OMPL library, and can be found at ompl.kavrakilab.org.

By using OMPL.app, introductory users to OMPL can get a sense of the current capabilities of the library and sampling-based motion planning. Currently, users can use geometric motion planning for rigid bodies in 2D and 3D, control a variety of simplified kinodynamic systems (e.g., unicycle, blimp, or car), and even a dynamic car using the Open Dynamics Engine. OMPL.app also demonstrates one possible way of representing the geometry of the robot and how to provide collision checking to the core library using a particular geometric representation.

3.1 Using OMPL.app

To launch OMPL.app, execute the `ompl_app.py` python script, which is found in the `omplapp/gui` directory. When the GUI is loaded, a window will be presented as in Figure 3.1.




Figure 3.1: OMPL.app at startup

OMPL.app requires us to do three things to solve a motion planning query: setup the workspace and the robot, select a planner to use, and bound the environment. These three items correspond to the tabs located in the upper right portion of the window.

3.1.1 Selecting a Robot and an Environment

First, a robot type must be selected. The traditional “piano mover’s” problem is a rigid body planning in 3D instance, so select “Rigid body planning (3D)”. Next, the environment and the robot itself must be loaded. OMPL.app comes packaged with a number of mesh models for 2D and 3D environments and robots. Go to the *File* menu at the top of the window and select *Open Environment*. This presents a dialog screen to open a file. Navigate to the `omplapp/resources/3D` directory and select the `Easy_env.dae` mesh to load. Then select *Open Robot* from the file menu and open `Easy_robot.dae` from the same directory. When the meshes are loaded, you will see an environment consisting of a wall partitioning the space into two parts with a small opening in the center (Figure 3.2). Rotate the view using the mouse to see both sides of the partitioned space and the “L” shaped robot inside the opening of the wall.




Figure 3.2: The “easy” environment loaded with the robot occupying the opening.

Next the start and goal configurations must be chosen. When a robot mesh is first loaded, the start and goal poses are equivalent. In the “easy” environment, the most interesting queries involve the robot maneuvering through the opening in the wall. One such configuration is $(270, 50, -200)$ and $(270, 50, -400)$, respectively. Set the start and goal positions to these values and click “Solve” to find a solution with the default planner. The default planner should not have too much trouble solving this query. When a solution is found the robot will become animated and travel along the computed path. If the planner fails to find a solution, repeat the solving process until one is found.

The user can also switch between an animated robot and a view of the discrete segments of the path by toggling the “Animate” check box. Also, a projection of the random samples can be seen by checking the “Show Exploration” box. In a bi-directional planner, the samples from each direction will be shown as different colors.




Figure 3.3: The “L” shaped robot moving through the narrow passage.

3.1.2 Choosing a Planner

Due to the wide variety in how sampling-based planners operate, selecting a different planner may yield better results for a specific query. Moreover, the amount of time allotted to the planner can be customized. In geometric instances, the collision checking resolution that is employed by the local planner can be changed to improve performance. For instances that use motion controls, the propagation step size for each control can be specified, as well as the range of possible steps to apply the control. In addition to these general parameters, many of these methods have parameters that can be tuned to further improve the time needed to solve a query and/or the quality of the solution returned. OMPL.app exposes these parameters, many of which are common amongst the various planners, under the “Planner” tab. The following defines the most common parameters seen in geometric and control based planners in OMPL:

Range: This parameter represents the maximum length of a motion to be added in the tree of motions. It greatly influences the runtime of the algorithm.

Goal bias: In the process of randomly selecting states in the state space to attempt to go towards, the algorithm may in fact choose the actual goal state with some probability. This probability is a real number between 0.0 and 1.0; it should not be too large, and usually lies around 0.05.

Border fraction: Planners such as `KPIECE` use a discretization of a projection of the state space to guide the exploration. This discretization consists of a set of cells. The border fraction is the fraction of time spent focusing the exploration on border cells (cells at the exploration “frontier”). This represents the minimum percentage used to select cells that are on the border (minimum because if 95% of cells are on the border, they will be selected with 95% chance, even if the border fraction is set to 0.9 (90%)).

Max. nearest neighbors: The maximum number of nearest neighbors for which a connection will be attempted when a new configuration sample is added.

Every effort is made to set the defaults for these settings to values that are conducive in general planning environments. However, depending on the difficulty of the query, these settings may need to change to yield better performance. Consult the literature for the different planners to understand how changing a specific parameter will change the behavior of a method in a particular instance.

3.1.3 Bounding the Environment

By default, the robot is constrained to move inside a tight bounding box around the environment, the start pose, and the goal pose. The bounding box is visualized in OMPL.app as the white frame around the environment and robot. These bounds apply to a reference point for the robot; the origin of the coordinate frame that defines its pose. This means that parts of the robot can stick outside the bounding box. It also means that if the reference point for your robot is far away from the robot itself, you can get rather unintuitive results. The reference point is whatever the origin is in the mesh; OMPL.app is not using the geometric center of the mesh as the reference point.

3.1.4 Saving and Replaying Solution Paths

OMPL.app also has the ability to save the current solution path and reload that path for viewing in the future. Once a problem has been solved, the solution found can be saved to a text file by selecting “Save Path” from the File menu. A save dialog will be presented to select a directory and filename to save the path to. Similarly, the path can be reloaded and replayed by selecting “Load path” from the File menu. The environment or robot mesh data is not saved in this path file. The same environment and robot must be reselected by the user to replay the same path.

3.2 OMPL.app vs. OMPL

OMPL.app builds upon the motion planning functionality in OMPL by specifying a geometric representation for the robot and its environment, and provides a collision checking mechanism for the representation to the existing planners in the library. OMPL.app makes use of open-source collision checking libraries [9, 10]. The core Open Motion Planning Library does not explicitly represent the robot or the environment, and it is up to the user to make this decision for their particular application.

OMPL has also been integrated with ROS. In ROS the robot and environment can be represented with geometric meshes, but a model of the environment can also be obtained as a point cloud from sensor data. ROS also provides a file format for specifying articulated mechanisms that, when parsed, cause the appropriate state space for planning to be created.

Chapter 4

Planning with OMPL

The Open Motion Planning Library provides an abstract representation for all of the core concepts in motion planning, including the state space, control space, state validity, sampling, goal representations, and planners. This chapter discusses OMPL and how its components relate to the ideas from the motion planning literature. The first section discusses the design considerations of the library. The second section maps the components of OMPL to their logical equivalents in the motion planning literature. The third elaborates on the use of OMPL for solving motion planning queries using sampling-based techniques composed from the objects described in Chapter 2. The fourth section details the compilation of code written using OMPL, and the final discusses OMPL's benchmarking capabilities.

There exists a wide variety of documentation, tutorials, and other examples regarding the use of OMPL at ompl.kavrakilab.org. Specifically, the website has extensive resources for installation, hands-on tutorials, as well as the API documentation. Additionally, a group exists at sourceforge.net called “ompl-users”, which contains a forum for posting comments, questions, and bug reports.

4.1 Design Considerations

OMPL is flexible and applicable to a wide variety of robotic systems. As a consequence to this flexibility, the library does not explicitly represent the geometry of the workspace or the robot operating in it. This is deliberate since there exists a vast amount of file formats, data structures and other means of representation for robotic systems. As a result, the user must select a computational representation for the robot and provide an explicit state validity/collision detection method. There does not exist a default collision checker in OMPL. This allows the library to operate with relatively few assumptions, allowing it to plan for a huge number of systems while remaining compact and portable.

A conscious effort is also made to limit the number of external dependencies necessary to compile and execute the code in OMPL. The majority of the third party code utilized in the library used comes from Boost [11], which allows OMPL to function in most major operating systems. Currently, OMPL is supported on Linux and Mac OS X. Windows installation of the core OMPL

library is also possible by compiling from source. Installation of OMPL.app on Windows can also be done, but this is recommended only for experienced Windows developers as the installation of the dependencies is challenging.

4.2 OMPL Foundations

Chapter 2 showed that many sampling-based motion planners require a few similar components to solve a planning query: a sampler to compute valid configurations of the robot, a state validity checker to quickly evaluate a specific robot configuration, and a local planner to connect two samples along a collision free path. OMPL provides most of these components in similarly named classes. The following OMPL classes are analogous to ideas in traditional sampling-based motion planners:

StateSampler The `StateSampler` class implemented in OMPL provides methods for uniform and Gaussian sampling in the most common state space configurations. Included in the library are methods for sampling in Euclidean spaces, the space of 2D and 3D rotations, and any combination thereof with the `CompoundStateSampler`. The `ValidStateSampler` takes advantage of the `StateValidityChecker` to find valid state space configurations.

NearestNeighbors This is an abstract class that is utilized to provide a common interface to the planners for the purpose of performing a nearest neighbor search among samples in the state space. The core library has several types of nearest neighbor search strategies at its disposal, including Geometric Near-neighbor Access Trees (GNATs) [12] and linear searches. It is also possible to use an external data structure and supply the core library with this implementation.

StateValidityChecker The `StateValidityChecker` is tasked with evaluating a single state to determine if the configuration collides with an environment obstacle and respects the constraints of the robot. A default checker is *not* provided by OMPL for reasons stated in Section 4.1. Since this component is an integral part of sampling-based motion planning it is necessary for the user to provide the planner a callback to such a method to ensure that all configurations are feasible for the robot.

MotionValidator The `MotionValidator` class (analogous to the local planner) checks to see if the motion of the robot between two states is valid. At a high level, the `MotionValidator` must be able to evaluate whether the motion between two states is collision free and respects all the motion constraints of the robot. OMPL contains the `DiscreteMotionValidator`, which uses the interpolated movements between two states (computed by the `StateSpace`) to determine if a particular motion is valid. This is an approximate computation as only a finite number of states along the motion are checked for validity (using the `StateValidityChecker`).

OptimizationObjective Certain motion planners can meet optimization objectives as well. These objectives can implement different cost functions. The `OptimizationObjective` class provides an abstract interface to the relevant operations with costs that the planners need. There are multiple default optimization objectives already implemented. For example, to minimize path length, a `PathLengthOptimizationObjective` (derived from `OptimizationObjective`) can be used.

ProblemDefinition A motion planning query is specified by the `ProblemDefinition` object. Instances of this class define a start state and goal configuration for the robot, and the optimization objective to meet, if any. The goal can be a single configuration or a region surrounding a particular state. Solutions to motion planning queries are also retrieved using this class.

4.3 Solving a Query

The previous set of objects are just a subset of the classes used in OMPL. Figure 4.1 shows the hierarchy of the major components of OMPL and how they are interrelated.




Figure 4.1: The hierarchy of the high level components of OMPL. Objects highlighted in dark blue are required to be instantiated by the user.

The object oriented nature of OMPL allows the user to inherit from currently existing components or create brand new components to plan for a specific system. When solving a particular query, the user is not required to instantiate all of the objects detailed in Figure 4.1. In fact, most of these objects have default implementations that are sufficient for general planning.

Geometric Planning For geometric motion planning, the user must define and instantiate the state space object for the robot, and provide a start and goal configuration in that space to define the motion planning query. Any planner defined in the geometric namespace can then be employed to solve the motion planning query. Some of these planners (as indicated by the planner specification) also follow optimization objectives.

Planning with Controls Like geometric planning, when planning with controls the user must define and instantiate the state space for the robot, and provide a start and goal configuration. In addition, the user must define valid control inputs via a `ControlSpace` object, and provide a method for computing how the system state changes when applying valid controls using a `StatePropagator` instance. The user can use any planner in the control namespace to compute a solution.

SimpleSetup `SimpleSetup` provides a way to encapsulate the various objects necessary to solve a geometric or control query in OMPL. When using `SimpleSetup`, the user only supplies the state space, start state, and goal state (and state propagator for planning with controls). Specifically, `SimpleSetup` instantiates the `SpaceInformation`, `ProblemDefinition`, and `Goal` objects. Additionally, `SimpleSetup` allows for the retrieval of all of these subcomponents for further customization. This means that `SimpleSetup` does not inhibit any native functionality of OMPL, and ensures that all objects are properly created before planning takes place. Moreover, `SimpleSetup` exposes fundamental function calls for ease of use. For example, the function “solve” from the `Planner` class is available in `SimpleSetup`, and it is not necessary for the user to extract the `Planner` from the `SimpleSetup` instance to do so.

4.4 Compiling Code with OMPL

Once a new planner, sampler, collision checker, or other motion planning component has been developed, it is simple to integrate with OMPL for testing. There are two methods for compiling code with OMPL. If the base library is modified (e.g., a new planner is added to `ompl/geometric/planners`), simply re-run `cmake` to reconfigure the makefiles for that particular component of the code. If the new code does not exist in a directory known to `cmake`, `ompl/src/ompl/CMakeLists.txt` will need to be updated to search in the extra directory.

If OMPL has been installed, new code can be compiled independently from OMPL. The core OMPL library can be linked into the final binaries using the traditional linking step. For example, if compiling with GCC, simply link the code with `(-lompl)`, and direct the compiler to search the install directory for the library. A similar linking procedure can be employed with other compilers.

4.5 Benchmarking

The ability to compare two or more planners has never been easier than with OMPL. OMPL provides a `Benchmark` class that attempts a specific query a given number of times, and allows the user to try any number of planners. Additionally, the `Benchmark` instance can be configured to fail an attempt after a specific amount of time or when the planner exhausts a given amount of memory. If multiple instances of the same type of planner are to be benchmarked (e.g., with different sets of settings), changing the planner name is a good idea (`Planner::setName()` function), so that the results can be distinguished.

When the benchmarking has finished, the `Benchmark` instance will write a log file to the current working directory containing information regarding every planning attempt. OMPL is packaged with a Python script to parse this log file and create an SQL database with the planning information. The Python script can also query this database and generate a series of plots using `matplotlib`, like those in Figure 4.2.




Figure 4.2: Example benchmarking plots. (top) The percentage of instances solved by various planners during one benchmark run. (bottom) A box plot showing the amount of time needed for various planners to solve a planning instance

Chapter 5

Advanced Topics in OMPL

This chapter explains some of the more advanced features of OMPL. This section is not meant to explain all of the expert level concepts, but to give the user an idea about some commonly used optional features of the library and how they can be included in the code. API documentation is updated regularly at ompl.kavrakilab.org, and includes the following concepts, among others.

5.1 State Space Construction

OMPL provides implementations for several common states spaces, including \mathbb{R}^n for Euclidean spaces and $SO(2)$ and $SO(3)$ for the space of rotations in 2D and 3D respectively. Many systems operate in spaces that are combinations of \mathbb{R}^n and orientations. For example, the classic “piano mover’s” problem operates in $SE(3)$, which is a combination of \mathbb{R}^3 and $SO(3)$. OMPL contains an implementation of the $SE(2)$ and $SE(3)$ state spaces for such instances.

In complex systems, like highly articulated robot arms, it is infeasible to enumerate all possible state spaces. However, the state spaces in many of these systems can be decomposed into smaller spaces (like the $SE(3)$ example). To accommodate this, OMPL allows for the construction of such spaces through the `CompoundStateSpace` class, which allows state spaces to be formed from a combination of their subcomponents. The existing state spaces all provide operator overloads for the ‘+’ and ‘-’, allowing readable and intuitive code to be written when constructing such spaces.

5.2 Planner Customization

In the motion planning literature, there exist many variants of the classical planning algorithms that change only one component of the planning algorithm in order to achieve benefits in certain instances. Many of the planners that come bundled with OMPL are highly customizable, and in some cases it isn’t necessary to derive a new planner from the existing code base to recreate one of these variations or test a new idea or algorithm.

An easy example is the nearest neighbor search performed in nearly all of the planners to find the closest existing state to a newly generated random sample. There are many algorithms to perform this search—both exact and approximate—and evaluating the best approach for one particular system can become time consuming. The `PRM` and `RRT` planners (among others) both provide a hook to replace the default nearest neighbor search with a user supplied object that derives from the abstract `NearestNeighbor` class. This allows users to develop compact and portable components for differing nearest neighbor schemes and test them without creating unnecessary planner objects that are simply one-off from one another. Similar possibilities exist not only with nearest neighbor searching, but also in other planning components, like state sampling and connection strategies.

5.3 Python Bindings

Users of OMPL are not bound to C++. Most of the API is exposed through a set of Python bindings from which users can create Python scripts to solve motion planning queries. These bindings are compiled separately from the OMPL core library, and require `Py++` and `Boost.Python` for correct operation. Ensure that these dependencies exist before installing OMPL to create the bindings. The Python bindings are still considered an experimental feature and all API documentation is for the C++ API (although we have tried to keep the python API as similar as possible). The easiest way to get started with the python bindings is by looking at a few of the demo programs.

The bindings are separated by `ompl` namespaces into python modules contained within one parent `ompl` module. For example, to use a geometric motion planner from OMPL, the `base` and `geometric` modules must be imported:

```
from ompl import base
from ompl import geometric
```

There are some subtle and some not-so-subtle differences between the C++ and Python APIs due to the differences between the two programming languages. A user checking the OMPL C++ API must note the following discrepancies when writing a program in Python:

- An STL vector of `int`'s is of type `vectorInt` in Python (analogously for other types).
- The C++ class `State` has been renamed `AbstractState`, while the C++ class `ScopedState<>` is called `State` in Python.
- The C++ class `ScopedState<RealVectorStateSpace>` is called `RealVectorState`. The `ScopedState`'s for the other pre-defined state spaces have been renamed analogously.
- The C++ class `RealVectorStateSpace::StateType` has been renamed to `RealVectorStateInternal` (analogously for the other state space types), to emphasize that a user should really be using `RealVectorState`.
- Use the `()` operator on a `ScopedState` in Python to retrieve a reference to a C++ `State`.
- The `print` method (for classes that have one) is mapped to the special python method `__str__`, so a C++ call like `foo.print(std::cout)` becomes `print foo` in python. Similarly,

a C++ call like `foo.printSettings(std::cout)` becomes `print foo.settings()` in python.

- The signature of the state validity checker is changed. In python the state validity checker has the following form:

```
def isStateValid(spaceInformation, state):  
    return spaceInformation.satisfiesBounds(state)
```

Bibliography

- [1] Jean-Claude Latombe. *Robot Motion Planning*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Norwell, MA, USA, 1991.
- [2] Howie Choset, Kevin M. Lynch, Seth Hutchinson, George A Kantor, Wolfram Burgard, Lydia E. Kavraki, and Sebastian Thrun. *Principles of Robot Motion: Theory, Algorithms, and Implementations*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, June 2005.
- [3] Steven M. LaValle. *Planning Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2006.
- [4] Lydia E. Kavraki, Petr Svestka, Jean-Claude Latombe, and Mark H. Overmars. Probabilistic roadmaps for path planning in high-dimensional configuration spaces. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, 12(4):566–580, 1996.
- [5] Steven M. LaValle and James J. Kuffner. Randomized kinodynamic planning. *International Journal of Robotics Research*, 17(5):378–400, 2001.
- [6] David Hsu, Jean-Claude Latombe, and Rajeev Motwani. Path planning in expansive configuration spaces. *International Journal of Computational Geometry and Applications*, 9(4/5):495–512, 1999.
- [7] Gildardo Sanchez and Jean-Claude Latombe. A single-query bi-directional probabilistic roadmap planner with lazy collision checking. In *Robotics Research*, volume 6 of *Springer Tracts in Advanced Robotics*, pages 403–417. 2003.
- [8] Ioan Şucan and Lydia E. Kavraki. A sampling-based tree planner for systems with complex dynamics. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 28(1):116–131, 2012.
- [9] Eric Larsen, Stefan Gottschalk, Ming C. Lin, and Dinesh Manocha. Fast proximity queries with swept sphere volumes. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 3719–3726, 2000.
- [10] Jia Pan, Sachin Chitta, and Dinesh Manocha. FCL: A general purpose library for collision and proximity queries. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, May 2012.
- [11] <http://www.boost.org/>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [12] Sergey Brin. Near neighbor search in large metric spaces. In *Proc. 21st Conf. on Very Large Databases*, pages 574–584, 1995.