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Abstract—Planning high-speed trajectories for UAVs in unknown environments requires extremely fast algorithms able to solve the trajectory generation problem in real-time in order to be able to react quickly to the changing knowledge of the world, but that guarantee safety at all times. The desire of maintaining computational tractability typically leads to optimization problems that do not include the obstacles (collision checks are done on the solutions) or to formulations that use a convex decomposition of the free space and then impose an ad hoc allocation of each interval of the trajectory in a specific polyhedron. Moreover, safety guarantees are usually obtained by having a local planner that plans a trajectory with a final “stop” condition in the free-known space. However, these two decisions typically lead to slow and conservative trajectories. We propose FaSTraP (Fast and Safe Trajectory Planner) to overcome these issues. FaSTraP obtains faster trajectories by enabling the local planner to optimize in both free-known and unknown spaces. Safety guarantees are ensured by always having a feasible, safe back-up trajectory in the free-known space at the start of each replanning step. Furthermore, we present a Mixed Integer Quadratic Problem (MIQP) formulation in which the solver can choose the interval allocation and where a heuristics for the time allocation is computed efficiently using the result of the previous replanning iteration. This proposed algorithm is tested both in simulation and in real hardware, showing agile flights in unknown cluttered environments.

I. INTRODUCTION

Navigating through unknown environments entails repeatedly generating collision-free, dynamically feasible trajectories that are executed over a finite horizon. Similar to that in the Model Predictive Control (MPC) literature, safety is guaranteed by ensuring a feasible solution exists indefinitely. If we consider \( \mathbb{R}^3 = O \cup F \cup U \) where \( F, O, U \) are disjoint sets denoting free-known, occupied-known, and unknown space respectively, safety is guaranteed by constructing trajectories that are entirely contained in \( F \) with a final stop condition. This can be achieved by generating motion primitives that do not intersect \( O \cup U \) [1]–[3], or by constructing a convex representation of \( F \) to be used in an optimization [4]–[6]. However, both approaches lead to slow trajectories in scenarios where \( F \) is small compared to \( U \cup O \). This paper presents an optimization-based approach that reduces the aforementioned limitations by solving for two optimal trajectories at every planning step (see Fig. 1): one in \( U \cup F \), and another one in \( F \).

Decomposing the free space into \( P \) overlapping polyhedra along a path connecting a start \( A \) to goal \( E \) location (see Fig. 1), the usual approach is to divide the total trajectory into \( N = P \) intervals [4]. On one hand, this simplifies the problem because no integer variables are needed, as each interval is forced to be in one specific polyhedron. On the other hand, however, the time allocation problem becomes much harder, as there are \( N \) different \( dt_n \) (time allocated for each interval \( n \)). Moreover, the trajectory ends up being much more conservative, because the optimizer is only allowed to move the extreme points of each interval of the trajectory in the overlapping areas. To overcome these two problems, we propose the use of the same \( dt \) for all the intervals, and use \( N > P \) intervals, encoding the optimization problem as a MIQP. Moreover, and as the minimum feasible \( dt \) depends on the state of the UAV and on the specific shape of \( O \cup U \) at a specific replanning step, we also propose an efficient way to compute a heuristics of this \( dt \) using the result obtained in the previous replanning iteration.

In summary, this work has the following contributions:

- A framework that ensures feasibility of the entire MPC algorithm and guarantees safety without reducing the nominal flight speed by allowing the local planner to plan in \( F \cup U \) while always having a safe trajectory in \( F \).
• Reduced conservatism of the MIQP formulation for the interval and time allocation problem of the flight trajectories compared to prior work.
• Extension of our previous work [7], (where we considered the interaction between the global and local planners) by proposing a way to compute very cheaply a heuristics of the cost-to-go needed by the local planner to decide the direction towards which optimize.
• Simulation and hardware experiments showing agile flights in completely unknown cluttered environments.

II. RELATED WORK

Planning strategies for UAVs in the literature could be classified according to the space where the local planner optimizes and the specific formulation of the optimization problem.

According to planning space of the local planner, several approaches can be distinguished. Some methods use only the current sensing data [2], [3], and the local planner is usually forced to obtain a trajectory within the field of view. In other works, the UAV creates a map of the environment using this depth sensing data. Within this second category, in some works [7]–[9], the local planner only optimizes inside \( F \), which guarantees safety if the local planner has a final stop condition. However, specially at points where great part of the world is unknown (such as corners), this clearly limits the speed of the flight. Another option could be to allow the local planner to optimize in \( F \cup U \), and use the trajectory obtained as the one that the UAV will fly. But this clearly leads to unsafe trajectories if there is an obstacle in the unknown space.

As far as the optimization problem itself is concerned, two approaches can be highlighted. The first one does not include the obstacles in the optimization problem [7], leading for some formulations to closed-form solutions [1]–[3] or in general to very small replanning times [7]. These methods benefit from high-computation speeds, but they usually need to check for collision after the primitives are generated. However, this often prevents the local planner from being able to generate trajectories through several obstacles.

The other approach is to include the obstacles in the optimization problem. This is usually done using a convex decomposition of \( F \) given as a series of \( P \) overlapping polyhedra [4]–[6]. As the trajectory is usually decomposed of \( N \) third (or higher)-degree polynomials, to guarantee that whole trajectory is inside the polyhedra, Bézier Curves [6], [10] or the sum-of-squares condition [5], [11] are often used. There is therefore both an interval (in which polytope each interval is) and a time allocation (how much time is assigned to each interval) problem. For the interval allocation, a usual decision is to use \( N = P \), and force each interval to be inside its corresponding polyhedron [6]. However, this sometimes can be very conservative, since the solver can only choose to place the two extreme points of each interval in the overlapping areas. Another option, but with higher computation times, is to use binary variables [5], [11] to allow the solver to choose the specific interval allocation. For the time allocation, different techniques are used. One is to impose a fixed time allocation using a specific velocity profile [4], which can be very conservative, and can cause infeasibility in the optimization problem. Another one is to encode the optimization problem as a bi-level optimization problem, and use gradient descent to iteratively obtain these times [12], [6]. However, this usually leads to higher replanning times.

III. ALGORITHM

A. Planning

In the algorithm proposed, Jump Point Search (JPS) is used as a global planner. JPS finds the shortest piecewise linear path between two points in a 3D uniformly-weighted voxel grid, guaranteeing optimality and completeness but running one order of magnitude faster than A* [13], [4].

For the local planner, we distinguish these three different jerk-controlled trajectories (some of the points will be precisely defined later, see Fig. 3):

• Whole Trajectory: This trajectory goes from \( A \) to \( E \), and it is contained in \( F \cup U \). It has a final stop condition.
• Safe Trajectory: It goes from \( R \) to \( F \), where \( R \) is a point in the Whole Trajectory, and \( F \) is any point inside the polyhedra obtained by doing a convex decomposition of \( F \). It is completely contained in \( F \) (free space), and it has also a final stop condition to guarantee safety.
• Committed Trajectory: This trajectory consists of two pieces: The first part is the interval \( A \rightarrow R \) of the Whole Trajectory. The second part is the Safe Trajectory. It is also guaranteed to be inside \( F \) (see explanation below).

This trajectory is the one that the UAV will execute in case no feasible solutions are found in the next replanning steps.

The quadrotor is modeled using triple integrator dynamics with state vector \( x^T = [x^T \bar{x}^T \ddot{x}^T] = [x^T \dot{v}^T a^T] \) and control input \( u = \ddot{x} = j \) (where \( x, v, a \), and \( j \) are the vehicle’s position, velocity, acceleration, and jerk, respectively).

Let \( n = 0 : N − 1 \) denote the specific interval of the trajectory and \( p = 0 : P − 1 \) the specific polyhedron. If \( j(t) \) is constrained to be constant in each interval \( n = 0 : N − 1 \), then the whole trajectory will be a spline consisting of third degree polynomials. Matching the cubic form of the position for each interval

\[
\begin{align*}
x_n(\tau_n) &= a_n \tau_n^3 + b_n \tau_n^2 + c_n \tau + d_n, \quad \tau_n \in [0, dt]
\end{align*}
\]

with the expression of a cubic Bézier curve:

\[
\begin{align*}
x_n(\tau_n) &= \sum_{k=0}^{3} \binom{3}{k} \left( 1 - \frac{\tau_n}{dt} \right)^{3-k} \left( \frac{\tau_n}{dt} \right)^k r_{nk}, \quad \tau_n \in [0, dt]
\end{align*}
\]

we can solve for the control points \( r_j (j = 0 : 3) \) associated with this Bézier curve

\[
\begin{align*}
r_{n0} &= d_n, \quad r_{n1} = \frac{c_n dt + 3d_n}{3} \\
r_{n2} &= \frac{b_n dt^2 + 2c_n dt + 3d_n}{3} \\
r_{n3} &= \frac{a_n dt^3 + b_n dt^2 + c_n dt + d_n}{3}
\end{align*}
\]
Let us denote the sequence of $P$ overlapping polyhedra as $\{A_p \leq c_p\}, p = 0 : P - 1$ and introduce binary variables $b_{np}, (p \text{ variables for each interval } n = 0 : N - 1)$. Hence, as a Bézier curve is contained in the convex hull of its control points, we can ensure that the whole trajectory will be inside this convex corridor by forcing that all the control points to be in the same polyhedron (6), [10]) with the constraint $b_{np} = 1 \implies \text{interval } n \text{ in polyhedron } p$, and at least in one polyhedron with the constraint $\sum_{p=0}^{P-1} b_{np} \geq 1$. The optimizer is free to choose in which polyhedron exactly. The complete MIQP solved in each replanning step (using Gurobi, [14]) for both the Safe and the Whole trajectories is this one:

$$\min_{j_n} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \|j_n\|^2$$

s.t. $x_0(0) = x_{init}$

$$x_n(\tau) = a_n \tau^2 + b_n \tau + c_n \forall n, \forall \tau \in [0, dt]$$

$$v_n(\tau) = \dot{x}_n(\tau) \forall n, \forall \tau \in [0, dt]$$

$$a_n(\tau) = b_n(\tau) \forall n, \forall \tau \in [0, dt]$$

$$J_n = 6a_n \forall n$$

$$b_{np} = 1 \implies \begin{cases} A_p r_{n1} \leq c_p \\ A_p r_{n2} \leq c_p \\ A_p r_{n3} \leq c_p \end{cases} \forall n, \forall p$$

$$\sum_{p=0}^{P-1} b_{np} \geq 1 \forall n$$

$$b_{np} \in \{0, 1\} \forall n, \forall p$$

$$x_{n+1}(0) = x_n(dt) \quad n = 0 : N - 2$$

$$\|a_n(0)\|_\infty \leq v_{max} \forall n$$

$$\|a_n(1)\|_\infty \leq a_{max} \forall n$$

$$\|j_n\|_\infty \leq j_{max} \forall n$$

In the optimization problem above, $dt$ (same for every internal $n$) is computed as

$$dt = f \cdot \max\{T_{v_x}, T_{v_y}, T_{v_z}, T_{a_x}, T_{a_y}, T_{a_z}, T_{j_x}, T_{j_y}, T_{j_z}\}/N$$

(2)

where $T_{v_i}, T_{a_i}, T_{j_i}$ are the solution of the constant-input motions in each axis $i = x, y, z$ by applying $v_{max}$, $a_{max}$ and $j_{max}$ respectively. $f \geq 1$ is a factor that is obtained according to the solution of the previous replanning step (see Fig. 4): The optimizer will try values values of $f$ (in increasing order) in the interval $[f_{worked,k-1} - \gamma, f_{worked,k-1} + \gamma]$ until the problem converges. Here $f_{worked,k-1}$ is the factor that made the problem feasible in the previous replanning step. Note also that, if $f = 1$, then $dt$ is a lower bound on the minimum time per interval required for the problem to be feasible.

Alg. 1 gives the full approach (see also Fig. 3). Let $P$ be the current position of the UAV. The point $A$ is chosen in the Committed Trajectory of the previous replanning step with an offset $dt$ from $P$. This offset $dt$ is computed by multiplying the total time of the previous replanning step by $\alpha \geq 1$. The idea here is to dynamically change this offset to ensure that most of the times the solver is able to find the next solution in less than $\delta t$. Then, the final goal $G_{term}$ is projected into the sliding map $M$ (centered on the drone) in the direction $\hat{G}_{term} \cdot \hat{A}$ to obtain the point $G$. Next, we run JPS from $A$ to $G$ (line 5) to obtain $JPS_a$.

The local planner then has to decide which direction is the best one towards which optimize (lines 6-11). Instead of blindly trusting the last JPS solution ($JPS_a$) as the best direction for the local planner to optimize (note that JPS is a zero-order model, without dynamics encoded), we take into account the dynamics of the UAV in the following way. First, we modify the $JPS_{k-1}$ so that it does not collide with the new obstacles seen (Fig. 2), then we find the points $I_1$ and $I_2$.

**Algorithm 1: FaStRaP**

**Data:** Current Position of the UAV $P$, Committed$_{k-1}$, JPS$_{k-1}$, $G_{term}$, $O$, $F$, $U$, $r$

**Function Replan:**

1. $k \leftarrow k + 1$, $dt \leftarrow \alpha \Delta t_{k-1}$ and $\delta t' \leftarrow \beta \Delta t_{k-1}$
2. Choose point $A$ in Committed$_{k-1}$ with offset $dt$ from $P$
3. $G \leftarrow$ Projection of $G_{term}$ into map $M$
4. $JPS_a \leftarrow$ Run JPS $A \rightarrow G$
5. $JPS_b \leftarrow$ Modified $JPS_{k-1}$ so that $JPS_{k-1} \cap O = \emptyset$
6. $\delta t_a \leftarrow$ Lower bound on $dt A \rightarrow D$
7. $\delta t_b \leftarrow$ Lower bound on $dt A \rightarrow D$
8. $J_a = N \cdot \delta t_a + \|JPS_a([0, \gamma])\|
9. $J_b = N \cdot \delta t_b + \|JPS_b([0, \gamma])\|
10. $JPS_k \leftarrow \text{argmin}_i \{J_a, J_b\}$
11. $\text{JPS}(\cdot, JPS_k)$
12. $\text{safe} \leftarrow \text{Convex Decomp. in } O \text{ using } JPS_{in}$
13. $\text{safe} \leftarrow [\text{safe}_{k-1} - \gamma, \text{safe}_{k-1} + \gamma]$ In the optimization problem above, $dt$ (same for every interval $n$) is computed as

$$dt = f \cdot \max\{T_{v_x}, T_{v_y}, T_{v_z}, T_{a_x}, T_{a_y}, T_{a_z}, T_{j_x}, T_{j_y}, T_{j_z}\}/N$$

(2)

where $T_{v_i}, T_{a_i}, T_{j_i}$ are the solution of the constant-input motions in each axis $i = x, y, z$ by applying $v_{max}$, $a_{max}$ and $j_{max}$ respectively. $f \geq 1$ is a factor that is obtained according to the solution of the previous replanning step (see Fig. 4): The optimizer will try values values of $f$ (in increasing order) in the interval $[f_{worked,k-1} - \gamma, f_{worked,k-1} + \gamma]$ until the problem converges. Here $f_{worked,k-1}$ is the factor that made the problem feasible in the previous replanning step. Note also that, if $f = 1$, then $dt$ is a lower bound on the minimum time per interval required for the problem to be feasible.

Alg. 1 gives the full approach (see also Fig. 3). Let $P$ be the current position of the UAV. The point $A$ is chosen in the Committed Trajectory of the previous replanning step with an offset $dt$ from $P$. This offset $dt$ is computed by multiplying the total time of the previous replanning step by $\alpha \geq 1$. The idea here is to dynamically change this offset to ensure that most of the times the solver is able to find the next solution in less than $\delta t$. Then, the final goal $G_{term}$ is projected into the sliding map $M$ (centered on the drone) in the direction $\hat{G}_{term} \cdot \hat{A}$ to obtain the point $G$. Next, we run JPS from $A$ to $G$ (line 5) to obtain $JPS_a$.

The local planner then has to decide which direction is the best one towards which optimize (lines 6-11). Instead of blindly trusting the last JPS solution ($JPS_a$) as the best direction for the local planner to optimize (note that JPS is a zero-order model, without dynamics encoded), we take into account the dynamics of the UAV in the following way. First, we modify the $JPS_{k-1}$ so that it does not collide with the new obstacles seen (Fig. 2), then we find the points $I_1$.
The Safe Trajectory is computed as in lines 16-20. First we choose the point \( R \) along the Whole Trajectory, with an offset \( \delta t \) from \( A \) (this \( \delta t \) is computed by multiplying the previous replanning time by \( \beta \geq 1 \)), and run convex decomposition using the part of \( JPS_{ln} \) that is in \( F \), obtaining the polyhedra \( Poly_{safe} \). Then, we solve the MIQP from \( R \) to any point \( F \) inside \( Poly_{safe} \) (this point \( F \) is chosen by the optimizer).

In the both convex decompositions presented above, one polyhedron is created for each segment of the piecewise linear paths. To obtain a less conservative solution (i.e. bigger polyhedra), we first check the length of segments of the JPS path, creating more vertexes if this length exceeds certain threshold \( l_{max} \). Moreover, we truncate the number of segments in the path to ensure that the number of polyhedra found does not exceed a threshold \( P_{max} \). This helps reduce the computation times (see Sec. IV).

Finally (line 21), we compute the Committed Trajectory by concatenating the piece \( A \rightarrow R \) of the Whole Trajectory, and the Safe Trajectory. Note that in this algorithm we have run two decoupled optimization problems per replanning step: (1) one for the Whole Trajectory, and (2) one for the Safe Trajectory. This ensures that the piece \( A \rightarrow R \) is not influenced by the braking maneuver \( R \rightarrow F \), and therefore guarantees a higher nominal speed on this first piece. The intervals \( P \rightarrow A \) and \( A \rightarrow R \) have been designed so that most of the times at least one replanning step can be solved within that interval. Moreover, to prevent the (very rare) cases where both \( A \) and \( R \) are in \( F \), but the piece \( A \rightarrow R \) is not, we check that piece \( A \rightarrow R \) against collision with \( U \). If any of the two optimizations in this algorithm fails, or the piece \( A \rightarrow R \) intersects \( U \), the UAV does not commit to any trajectory in that replanning step, and continue executing the Committed Trajectory of the previous replanning step.

The safety guarantee is proven by construction: the drone will only fly Committed Trajectories, which are always guaranteed to be in \( F \).

B. Mapping

For the mapping, we use a sliding map centered on the UAV that moves as the UAV flies. We fuse a depth map into the occupancy grid using the 3D Bresenham’s line algorithm for ray-tracing [15], and \( O \) and \( U \) are inflated by the radius of the drone to ensure safety.

IV. RESULTS

A. Simulation

We first test FaSTraP in 10 random forest environments (see Fig. 5) and compare the flight distances achieved against the following seven different algorithms: Incremental approach (no goal selection), random goal selection, optimistic
Safe Trajectory is planned only in a P as a function of the MIQP of the Safe Trajectory is approximately constant and 7 for the Safe Trajectory. Note that the runtime for 63% FaSTraP achieves an improvement of Table III. Both algorithms have a similar total distance, but shown in Fig. 5, and obtain the results that appear on P < P of the times The number of intervals N imposed for the results of this table are v of 52% algorithms in Table I). FaSTraP achieves an improvement previous algorithm (time values are not available for all other distance. Completion times are compared in Table II to our factors the MIQPs include all the trials until convergence (with different RRT simulation. RRT* (unknown space = free), conservative RRT* (unknown space = occupied), “next-best-view” planner (NBVP) [15], Safe Local Exploration [9], (see [9] for details), and Multi-Fidelity [7]. The results are shown in Table I, which highlights that FaSTraP achieves a 8 – 51% improvement in the distance. Completion times are compared in Table II to our previous algorithm (time values are not available for all other algorithms in Table I). FaSTraP achieves an improvement of 52% in the completion time. The dynamic constraints imposed for the results of this table are \( v_{\text{max}} = 5 \text{ m/s}, \ a_{\text{max}} = 5 \text{ m/s}^2 \) and \( j_{\text{max}} = 8 \text{ m/s}^3 \).

We also test FaSTraP using the bugtrap environment shown in Fig. 5, and obtain the results that appear on Table III. Both algorithms have a similar total distance, but FaSTraP achieves an improvement of 63% on the total flight time. For both cases the dynamic constraints imposed are \( v_{\text{max}} = 10 \text{ m/s}, \ a_{\text{max}} = 10 \text{ m/s}^2 \), and \( j_{\text{max}} = 40 \text{ m/s}^3 \).

The timing breakdown of Alg. 1 as a function of the maximum number of polyhedra \( P_{\text{max}} \) is shown in Fig. 6. The number of intervals \( N \) was 10 for the Whole Trajectory and 7 for the Safe Trajectory. Note that the runtime for the MIQP of the Safe Trajectory is approximately constant as a function of \( P_{\text{max}} \). This is due to the fact that the Safe Trajectory is planned only in \( F \), and therefore most of the times \( P < P_{\text{max}} \). For the simulations and hardware experiments presented in this paper, \( P_{\text{max}} = 2 – 3 \) was used. The runtimes for JPS as a function of the voxel size of the map for the forest simulation are available in Fig. 7 of [7]. All these timing breakdowns were measured using an Intel Core i7-7700HQ 2.8GHz Processor.

B. Hardware

The UAV used in the hardware experiments is shown in Fig. 7. The perception runs on the Intel® RealSense, the mapper and planner run on the Intel® NUC, and the control runs on the Qualcomm® SnapDragon Flight. The attitude, IMU biases, position and velocity are estimated by fusing (via a Kalman filter) propagated IMU measurements with an external motion capture system.

The two experiments presented in this paper were done in similar obstacle environments with the same start point, but with different goal locations. In the first experiment (Fig. 8), the UAV performs a 3D agile maneuver to avoid the obstacles on the table. In the second experiment (Fig. 9) the drone flies through the narrow gap of the cardboard boxes structure, and then flies below the triangle-shaped obstacle. In these two experiments, the maximum speed was \( \approx 2.1 \text{ m/s} \).

Additional hardware experiments with different cluttered scenarios and aggressive flights (with velocities up to 3.65 m/s) are available on https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8mDH0K6dm4.
Fig. 8: Composite images of Experiment 1. The UAV must fly from start to goal. Snapshots shown every 670 ms.

Fig. 9: Composite image of Experiment 2. The UAV must fly from start to goal. Snapshots shown every 330 ms.

Fig. 10: Timing breakdown for the forest simulation and for the real hardware experiments. The parameters used are $P_{max} = 2$, $N = 10$ for the Whole Trajectory and $N = 7$ for the Safe Trajectory.

For $P_{max} = 2$, the boxplots of the runtimes achieved on the forest simulation (measured on an Intel Core i7-7700HQ) and on the hardware experiments (measured on the onboard Intel NUC with the mapper and the RealSense also running on it) are shown in Fig. 10. For the runtimes of the MIQP for the Whole and the Safe Trajectories, the 75th percentile is always below 32 ms.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This work presented FaSTraP, a fast and safe planner for agile flights in unknown environments. The key properties of this planner is that leads to a higher nominal speed than other works by planning both in $U$ and $F$, and ensures safety having always a safe path planned at the beginning of every replanning step. FaSTraP was also tested successfully both in simulation and in hardware experiments.

All the GAZEBO worlds used for the simulation are available at https://github.com/jtorde.
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