Two Perspectives on Representation Learning

Joseph Modayil

Reinforcement Learning and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory University of Alberta

Reasoning & Learning:

Two perspectives on knowledge representation

► For reasoning with a model:

- Expressiveness of the model (e.g. space, objects, ...)
- Planning with the model is useful for a robot

- ► For learning to predict the consequences of a robot's behaviour:
 - Semantics defined by the robot's future experience
 - Online, scalable learning during normal robot operation

An Analogy with Scientific Knowledge

- Reasoning and learning have complementary strengths that are analogous to scientific theories and experiments.
 - Scientific theories enable broad generalization within a limited domain. Scientific theories enable effective reasoning even when inaccurate.
 - Experiments measure the world without needing model assumptions. Many experiments are needed to understand the world.
- ► Two approaches for connecting theories and experiments.
 - Top-down: Theories have experimentally verifiable predictions.
 - Bottom-up: Many verifiable predictions can generalize to a single theory.
 - Note: A single prediction a (very) partial model of the world.

Rich representations that support reasoning

Reasoning with rich representations

- Useful analogs to human-scale abstractions can be constructed from robot experience.
 - The robot constructs models from its sensorimotor experience by searching for particular statistical structures.
 - The models describe spaces and objects.
 - The robot reasons within these models to achieve goals.

Representing sensor configurations (Modayil, 2010)

- Sensors in similar physical configurations yield highly correlated time-series data. (e.g. GP assumption)
- Invert this: use time-series data to construct a manifold of sensor configurations.



Learned geometry from real robot data

Cosy Localization Database





Method:

- 1. Define local distances between strongly correlated sensors
- 2. Use the fast maximum variance unfolding algorithm to construct a manifold

Conclusion: A robot's experience can contain enough information to recover approximate local sensor geometry (and perhaps global geometry).

Representing Objects

(Modayil & Kuipers, 2007)

- Intuition: Moving objects can be distinguished from a static world.
- Approach: Use violations of a stationary background model to perceive moving objects.









Objects: Background Model

The agent has a model of the static environment

- Occupancy grid
- ► Observation model (pose,map) → observation
- Operators to move the robot to a target pose
- Update of the map and robot pose at each time-step



Objects: Perception

Method

1. Consider sensor readings that violate expectations of a static model.

2. Cluster them in space and then time.

3. Compute new perceptual features from the clusters.

distance = average sensor reading angle = average sensor location



Objects: Learned Shapes



Note: shape models have size information

Objects: Learning Operators

Method:

- 1. Perform motor babbling to collect data.
- 2. Use batch learning to find contexts and motor outputs that reliably change an attribute every timestep (one second timesteps).
- 3. Evaluate the learned operators.

Operator 4: Decrease distance to object

Description: distance(τ), decrease, δ < -0.19

```
Context: distance(\tau) \ge 0.43
angle(\tau) \le 132
angle(\tau) \ge 69
```

Motor outputs: (0.2 m/s, 0.0 rad/s)

Objects: Using Operators



Learning models that support reasoning

- Representations that support human-scale abstract reasoning can be learned from sensorimotor experience.
 - Is a robot's sensorimotor stream sufficient for learning all useful knowledge?
- ► How can the learning process be improved?
 - Simple unified semantics with broad applicability
 - Clarify assumptions
 - Incremental learning algorithms
 - Remove need for human oversight

Rich representations that support learning

Learning to make predictions

► A prediction is a claim about a robot's future experience.

- Predictions verified by experiments are the foundation of scientific knowledge.
- Thus, the semantics of experimentally verifiable predictions could be a useful foundation for a robot's knowledge.
- An efficient online, incremental algorithm would enable the robot to make and learn many such predictions in parallel.
- e.g. Temporal-difference reinforcement learning algorithms.

General value functions (GVF)

 $V^{\pi,\gamma,r,z}(s) = \mathbb{E}[r(s_1) + \ldots + r(s_k) + z(s_k)|s_0 = s, a_{0:k} \sim \pi, k \sim \gamma]$ these four functions define the semantics of an experimentally verifiable prediction policy $\pi : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow [0, 1]$ The Experimental Question pseudo reward $r: \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ By selecting actions with the policy, how much reward will be received before termination? termination $\gamma: \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow [0, 1]$ terminal reward $z: \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$

Note 1: A GVF is a value function, but with a generic reward and termination. Note 2: A constant termination probability corresponds to a timescale.

The Horde Architecture

(Sutton et al, 2011)

GVF predictions can be learned in parallel and online.



The firehose of experience





Timesteps (0.1 second)

Predictions of a Light Sensor

- r = Light3
- $\gamma = 0.9875$
- $\begin{aligned} \pi &= \text{Robot behaviour} \\ z &= 0 \end{aligned}$

The predictions learned online by $TD(\lambda)$ are comparable to the ideal predictions and approach the accuracy of the best weight vector. (shown after 3 hours of experience)



Scales to thousands of predictions

(Modayil, White, Sutton, 2012)



All experience & learning performed within hours!

Learning predictions about different policies

- Off-policy learning enables the robot to learn the consequences of following different policies from a single stream of experience.
- Gradient temporal-difference algorithms provide stable, incremental, off-policy learning.(Maei & Sutton, 2009)
- ► Works at scale with robots. (White, Modayil, Sutton, 2012)

Summary

Abstract models can be learned from sensorimotor experience.

- Learned models of sensor space and objects that support goal-directed planning.
- A broad class of predictive knowledge can be learned at scale.
 - General value function predictions express an expected consequence of a precise experiment.
 - Temporal-difference algorithms can learn to make such predictions incrementally during normal robot experience.
- Robots could benefit from a tighter integration between learning from experience and reasoning with models.

Bibliography

Model Learning

- Modayil, J., and Kuipers, B. J. 2007. Autonomous development of a grounded object ontology by a learning robot. In Proc. 22nd National Conf. on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-2007).
- Modayil, J. 2010. Discovering sensor space: Constructing spatial embeddings that explain sensor correlations. In IEEE 9th International Conference on Development and Learning (ICDL).

Prediction Learning

- Maei, H. R., and Sutton, R. S. 2010. GQ(λ): A general gradient algorithm for temporal-difference prediction learning with eligibility traces. In Proceedings of the Third Conference on Artificial General Intelligence.
- Modayil, J.; White, A.; and Sutton, R. S. 2012. Multi-timescale nexting in a reinforcement learning robot. SAB 2012. Springer. 299–309.
- Sutton, R. S.; Modayil, J.; Delp, M.; Degris, T.; Pilarski, P. M.; and Precup, D. 2011. Horde: A scalable real-time architecture for learning knowledge from unsupervised sensorimotor interaction. In Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS).
- White, A., Modayil, J., and Sutton, R.S. 2012. Scaling Life-long Off-policy Learning. In Second Joint IEEE International Conference on Development and Learning and on Epigenetic Robotics (ICDL-EpiRob).