ARTICLE IN PRESS

Aerospace Science and Technology ••• (••••) •••-•••

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

62

63

64

65

66

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Aerospace Science and Technology





www.elsevier.com/locate/aescte

Onboard mission allocation for multi-satellite system in limited communication environment

Zixuan Zheng, Jian Guo*, Eberhard Gill

Delft University of Technology, Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 18 January 2018 Received in revised form 21 March 2018 Accepted 15 May 2018 Available online xxxx

Keywords.

Mission allocation problem Multi-satellite system Game theory Negotiation mechanisms

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to seek the suitable local objectives for each satellite to optimal the global mission allocation strategy with a global utility function. This paper uses a game-theoretical formulation for a multi-satellite system in which the satellites are viewed as a unique unit with their self-interests. To solve the problem, the first is to identify the utility functions for individual satellite, align them to form the global utility function which can represents the allocation requirements. The second is to design the suitable negotiation mechanisms that can be equipped on each satellite so they can pursue the optimization by their own interest. The Utility-based Regret play, the Smoke Signal play, and the Broadcast-based play are proposed as negotiation mechanisms for the team to cooperate under the distributed and decentralized system structure. The simulation results illustrate that using these mechanisms can help this multi-satellite system reaches a near-optimal allocation profile. The effectiveness of proposed mechanisms are demonstrated by comparing their simulation results with several existing mechanisms under different scale of participant number.

© 2018 Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.

Abbreviations

30		
39	MAS	Multi-agent System
40	MSS	Multi-satellite System
41	GPM	Global Precipitation Measurement
42	SBSS	Space-based Space Surveillance
43	MSMA	Multi-satellite Mission Allocation
44	MRTA	Multi-robot Task Allocation
45	WSN	Wireless Sensor Networks
46	UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicles
47	UGV	Unmanned Ground Vehicles
48	UUV	Unmanned Underwater Vehicles
49	MCTS	Monte Carlo Tree Search
50	GA	Genetic Algorithm
51	URP	Utility-based Regret Play
52	SSP	Smoke Signal Play
53	BBP	Broadcast-based Play
54	DSL	Discovering the Sky at the Longest Wavelengths mission
55	OBC	On-board Computer
56	ACL	Agent Communication Languages
57	KQML	Knowledge Query and Manipulation Language
58	FIPA	Foundation for Intelligent Physical Agents
59		
60		_
61	* Corresponding author.	

Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: Z.Zheng@tudelft.nl (Z. Zheng), J.Guo@tudelft.nl (J. Guo), E.K.A.Gill@tudelft.nl (E. Gill).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ast.2018.05.022

1270-9638/© 2018 Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.

(2018), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ast.2018.05.022

UFP Utility-based Fictitious Play RMP **Regret Matching Play** P2P Point-to-point **JADE** Java Agent DEvelopment Framework AFP Action-based Fictitious Play RT Respond Time MBA Market-based Auction

1. Introduction

Please cite this article in press as: Z. Zheng et al., Onboard mission allocation for multi-satellite system in limited communication environment, Aerosp. Sci. Technol.

As the rapid development of technology, many space applications that are impossible for a single satellite to achieve become feasible and attainable by using the Multi-satellite systems (MSS). A multi-satellite system consists of multiple satellites that interact in an area. They can either cooperate with others to accomplish a global goal, or they can be self-interested satellites to achieve their own goal through team negotiation. Each satellite in an MSS is considered as an agent, which acts autonomously, making decisions based on its knowledge. The objectives of these multisatellite missions can be demonstration of technologies (Proba-3 [1], QB50 [2]), global precipitation estimation (Global Precipitation Measurement (GPM) Mission [3], TMPA [4]), Earth observation (GRACE [5]), ground surveillance (Space-based Space Surveillance (SBSS) [6]), etc. By using the MSS, these space missions are done in a more reliable, cheaper, and faster way compare with single satellite system. However, with the size growth for the MSS in Z. Zheng et al. / Aerospace Science and Technology ••• (••••) •••-•••

2

5

6

7

the future missions, the workload for ground operators is increasing for solving problems like the task allocation, group formation, cooperative object, fault detection and tracking. Therefore, employing onboard intelligence system is the future trend. Our research focused on how to enhance the onboard system of individual satellite so the entire MSS can automatically solve the Mission Allocation (MSMA) problems through negotiation and cooperation.

8 Many academic studies reviewed some problems are similar 9 to the MSMA problems, such as the Multi-robot Task Allocation 10 (MRTA) problem [7,8], the Wireless Sensor Networks (WSN) de-11 ployment problem [9,10], the resources allocation problem [11, 12 12], the weapon-target assignment problem [13], and many other 13 problems related to Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) [14], Un-14 manned Ground Vehicles (UGV), and Unmanned Underwater Vehi-15 cles (UUV). Three types of approaches have been used to solve pre-16 vious problems. The Centralized approaches are most widely used 17 approaches, which typically requires one central controller to de-18 termine the mission assignment for each team member. Semsar 19 and Khorasani [15] proposed a centralized solution for a coopera-20 tive multi-UAV system by using the game theoretic approach, but 21 their assumptions can be invalid if the main controller is dam-22 aged and unable to control the rest UAVs. Kartal and Nunes [16] 23 introduced a centralized approach for MRTA uses the Monte Carlo 24 Tree Search (MCTS), which can find near-optimal solutions for non-25 trivial problems. Although using this method can generalize well 26 across data sets and provide guarantees, it requires more time 27 compare to other methods. Jose and Pratihar [17] used a cen-28 tralized Genetic Algorithm (GA) with greedy initialization function 29 for task allocation in a multi-robot system. However, this study 30 only concerned about three robots, once enlarge the number, the 31 convergence time will increase exponentially. One unique kind of 32 centralized approaches for task allocation problem is called cen-33 tralized auction. Several auctioning mechanisms can be used for 34 this approach, such as the greedy auction [18], or the combina-35 torial auction [19,20]. This approach do not require the central 36 auctioneer to keep track the internal model of other members, but 37 the utility computation of each participant still rely on the main 38 controller. The centralized approaches have the main advantage of 39 performing optimization based on the overall objective function, 40 which leads to a solution to be optimal or near-optimal. However, 41 the centralized approaches also suffer from several weaknesses. 42 Firstly, centralized approaches are strongly depend on the main 43 controller, which makes them vulnerable to this point of failure. 44 Secondly, they require steady communication between the main 45 controller and the participants, which brings limitations on com-46 munication hardware and the mission coverage field. Thirdly, the 47 demand on computational power of the main controller is high.

48 Many of the centralized approaches have focused on the anal-49 ysis of mission allocation problem under stable operating environ-50 ment. However, in our study, the mission operation environment is 51 in deep space. Some unpredictable situations may occur to every 52 member of the system, where centralized approaches are unreli-53 able under these scenarios. Therefore, the MSS needs to solve the 54 problem through the Distributed approaches and Decentralized ap-55 proaches. Kose [21] used the reinforcement learning approach for 56 solving the self-interested robot collaboration problems, but due 57 to the limited communication, the system could converge on a 58 sub-optimal solution. Zheng and Koenig [22] proposed a K-swaps 59 mechanism to help the distributed algorithms exchange assigned 60 tasks among agents to reduce the team cost. However, it is dif-61 ficult to find the suitable value for K which can provide good 62 performance on team cost and the computation time. Lang and 63 Fink [23] presented a quota-based negotiation mechanism for min-64 imizing the total cost for a multi-machine scheduling problem. 65 Later on in [24], they re-designed this mechanism by implement 66 simulated annealing. Raffard, Tomlin, and Boyd [25] introduced an

67 optimal distributed approach uses dual decomposition technique for a group of cooperative agents. However, the negotiation pro-68 69 cedure can only start when entire team is willing to cooperate. This assumption is not suitable for our case since satellites can-70 not establish the communication link with others all the time. 71 72 [in and Li [26] proposed a k-winners-takes-all (k-WTA) negotiation mechanism for multiple robots system under limited com-73 74 munication environment. However, in real-world application, the 75 single point failure on the winner could cause algorithm pause 76 and go backward to perform k-WTA again. Choi [27] proposed two 77 decentralized auction-based approaches, the consensus-based auc-78 tion algorithm and consensus-based bundle algorithm for a fleet 79 of autonomous mobile robots. Gao [28] proposed an evolutionary 80 computation decentralized approach using the genetic algorithm 81 for solving the MRTA problems. However, it is time consuming for all the agents agree to regret the current assignment if a task has 82 83 been bid. The main advantage of the non-centralized approaches is 84 the strong robustness that can tolerant the low level system failure. 85 The limitation of these approaches lay on the message communication between agents, if communication links are not sufficiently 86 reliable, the outcome may degrade. 87

Unlike centralized approaches, both distributed approaches and 88 89 decentralized approaches require cooperation and negotiation between participant agents. The main difference between these two 90 kinds approaches is the topology of the MAS. In our study, the 91 topology of the MSS is flexible due to changeable baseline be-92 tween satellites in the different phase of the mission. All non-93 centralized approaches mentioned before either cannot guarantee 94 the short allocation time and high success rate at the same time, 95 96 or the negotiation strategies are too complicated that consume too much onboard memory and power. For our space mission, sim-97 98 ple and reliable mechanisms are needed for different topology. The 99 main contribution of this paper is to propose three negotiation 100 & cooperation mechanisms for MSS to accomplish onboard mis-101 sion allocation problems. Targeting different topology the MSS may 102 face, we introduce the Utility-based Regret Play (URP) mechanism for the distributed structure, the Smoke Signal Play (SSP) and the 103 104 Broadcast-based Play (BBP) mechanisms are for the decentralized 105 structure. 106

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 formulates the MSMA problem along with some details about the organizational structure and decision-making theory; Section 3 illustrates the proposed three mechanisms; Section 4 presents simulation results to illustrate the performance of these mechanisms for solving the MSMA problem under the different structure. Finally, Section 5 concludes this paper.

2. Multi-satellite Mission Allocation problem

The MSMA problem can be divided into three sub-problems. Firstly, how to decompose the global goal into several sub-goals. Secondly, how to construct the organizational architecture based on different mission requirements. Thirdly, how to assign the subgoals to each satellite through the negotiation and cooperation mechanisms. Solving a mission allocation problem is a dynamic decision making procedure. It should be solved iteratively over time considering the changes of self-status or mission environment. Thus, choosing the suitable problem model and organizational architecture can lead to a more precise solution.

2.1. Organizational structures

The organizational structure provides a framework for activities and interactions between participant agents through the definition of characters, authority relationships and communication links [29]. In principle, the topology of the MSS usually follows three

123

124

125

126

127

128

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8057349

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/8057349

Daneshyari.com