Asynchronous Behavior Trees with Memory aimed at Aerial Vehicles with Redundancy in Flight Controller

Evgenii Safronov¹, Michael Vilzmann², Dzmitry Tsetserukou¹, and Konstantin Kondak²

Abstract—Complex aircraft systems are becoming a target for automation. For successful operation, they require both efficient and readable mission execution system. Flight control computer (FCC) units, as well as all important subsystems, are often duplicated. Discrete nature of mission execution systems does not allow small differences in data flow among redundant FCCs which are acceptable for continuous control algorithms. Therefore, mission state consistency has to be specifically maintained. We present a novel mission execution system which includes FCC state synchronization. To achieve this result we developed a new concept of Asynchronous Behavior Tree with Memory and proposed a state synchronization algorithm. The implemented system was tested and proven to work in a real-time simulation of High Altitude Pseudo Satellite (HAPS) mission.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays the complexity of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) and their tasks is growing rapidly. Drones are suggested for the last-mile delivery [1] and other civil services. Continuous UAV operation in the urban area increase the damage risk for the citizens. One of the possibilities to reduce this risk is to increase safety standards for such operations. Subsystem redundancy is a part of common safety standards on aerial vehicles. Mission plan accomplishment involves interaction of all robot subsystems with the mission execution system. Therefore, the size of the mission plan increases and it introduces the need for easy-readable, efficient, and reliable control architecture (CA) with FCC redundancy support. One of the common CAs is Behavior tree (BT), originated from game industry. They have been widely used because of their modularity and reactivity properties. BTs are popular and wide-adopted control architecture for non-playable characters (NPC) in the computer games industry [2]. The idea of NPC is common to autonomous agents in robotics, therefore research for application of BT architecture in the robotics area is a promising topic. Behavior tree was suggested as a CA for unmanned aerial vehicles in [3], [4]. There are several studies on behavior tree applications in other areas of robotics, e.g., surgical robot [5] and robotic assistants [6]. Scientists touched many aspects of BT, such as a generalization of other CA [7], mathematical model formulation [8], automated BT construction using genetic algorithms [9] or Linear Temporal Logic formulas [10], and others. The comprehensible introduction to synchronous BT in robotics could be found in [11].

One of the recent topics in this area is asynchronous (or event-driven) BT, which are deviant from classical synchronous BT formulation. It was shown that asynchronous BT outperforms synchronous in continuous-time mission simulation [12]. Being flexible and reactive, behavior trees frequently require sort of inner memory, e.g., for a way-point missions.

To solve this issue, the Reset and Latch node combination was suggested [13] as an alternative to control nodes with memory [14]. A similar interaction between nodes could be also done by a "blackboard" - a key-value table which is accessible by all tree nodes and sometimes other software modules. Although some authors argue that this approach "does not lend itself well to encapsulation and, as a result, frustrates subtree reuse" [15], blackboards are widely used in both behavior tree frameworks for video game industry applications [2] and in robotics [5], [6].

This work is devoted to designing a mission execution system for unmanned aircraft systems. Our target platform is HAPS (Fig. 1). In order to achieve continuous flight for several days or months, they have to be autonomous. It leads to additional attention to the reliability of the system and efficiency of the executor. To achieve the required level of hardware reliability, HAPS has redundancy on the flight control computers (FCC). However, this redundancy should be additionally supported on the software level. Missing the data samples or different order of received messages order would break consistency of mission execution state on redundant FCC units. This issue might lead to unstable behavior of the HAPS, e.g. attempting execution of different commands.

To maintain state consistency on all FCCs we developed statespace synchronization procedure. To satisfy the goal for efficiency we took an advantage of asynchronous BT propaga-

Fig. 1: Elektra Two Solar by Elektra Solar GmbH - an example of HAPS platform, one of the goal application for developed framework.
In our BT architecture interaction both with the other modules and between nodes is done completely by the blackboard, called further a memory. Action and Condition nodes executes modifying and non-modifying functions over memory.

We introduce a new Skipper control node which is symmetric to the well-described Selector and Sequence.

The paper structured as follows: in Section II we describe changes in semantics and new nodes. Section III is devoted to explaining the asynchronous mechanism of calls propagation in the tree from receiving a new information sample to sending out changes. In section IV we describe how to support hardware redundancy on FCC with the developed framework. Section V denoted to implementation and conducted tests. In section VI there are a conclusion and future work plans.

II. CHANGES IN BEHAVIOR TREE FORMULATION

a) Semantics: it is hard to name certain BT formulation as a canonical because almost every work on Behavior Tree slightly varies its semantics. To have an impression of this, one can look at the comparison of BT frameworks [14]. The BT definition consists of a graph of nodes (\( V \)) and edges(\( E \)) which is directed tree, and memory, which is a key-value dictionary (\( \mathcal{V} \)).

Each node in behavior tree has a state: **Running**, **Success** or **Failure**. In the paper they are shorten respectively as \( \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{F} \). Nodes are separated into two groups: execution and control. Control nodes define the inner logic of the executor while execution nodes are aimed to interact with the environment. Each node has a tick function, which updates its state due to the definition of the node.

Significant changes in BT semantics comparing to other works are:

- Action and Condition nodes rely on external calls to corresponding middleware \( \rightarrow \) Action and Condition nodes are functions over inner memory. Hence both executed immediately and non-blocking.
- Conditions nodes invoke binary (\( \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{F} \)) functions, Action nodes might be in (\( \mathbb{R} \)) state \( \rightarrow \) Conditions might return one of (\( \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{F} \)) states, Actions always return \( \mathbb{S} \).
- The tick function is periodically applied to the root node, performing whole tree traversal \( \rightarrow \) Only start of the execution is done by a single tick applied to the root node. The rest is executed locally in asynchronous callback function.

b) Memory: in our approach BT interacts with outer scope by assigning and reading the memory changes. For simplicity reasons, we assume that all variables have floating-point values and string keys. Each variable has a **Scope** property:

\[
\forall v \in \mathcal{V}, \text{scope}(v) \in \{\text{Input}, \text{Output}\}
\]  

Only **Output** variables would be added to return of callback if some Action changes their value. We also remember last result \( \text{state}(\mathcal{N}) \subset \mathcal{V} \) of node evaluation. This is done to clearly define propagation rules.

c) Leaf nodes: as it is widely accepted [2], [14], there are two leaf executable nodes which are able to interact with the outer scope (through \( \mathcal{V} \)): Action and Condition. In a memory-based tree semantics of leaf nodes has to be changed. Action nodes could modify \( \mathcal{V} \) and always return \( \mathbb{S} \), as variables assignment could not fail or last for a significant time. Condition nodes could not modify the variables and return a state \( \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{S}, \mathbb{F}\} \). Condition node state is a function of \( \mathcal{V} \) subset. On a change of at least one variables from this subset a condition should be reevaluated. This subset is saved in a Condition definition for efficient search for changed condition.

Transferring an ability to have \( \mathbb{R} \) state to Condition node could be additionally motivated from a mission design point of view. Let us assume we have multiple agents (e.g. UAV) and at a certain step they need to wait for others. As for the previous works, you have to wait using an Action node or extra specially designed control nodes [14]. However, Action nodes usually represent work done by the agent itself, not by the others, which might complicate the readability. Now it can be done by a separate Action and a separate Condition node for each agent (Fig. 3). Another common example is handling multiple responses for one action (Fig. 4).

![Condition and Action nodes example.](image1)

![Multiple agents interaction example.](image2)

![Multiple responses for a single action example.](image3)


d) **Control nodes**: control nodes (which organize the tree logic) are Sequence, Selector, Parallel, and Skipper. First three are extensively described before [14], while Skipper is a new node type. However, it is a "sibling" of Sequence and Selector in terms of evaluation (see Table I).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>symbol</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Selector</th>
<th>Skipper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue on</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>=&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They all tick their children and check the state sequentially from first to last. If the child state belongs to the "Return" subset, control node return the state immediately. In the other case, they continue evaluation and return "Continue on" state. These 3 control nodes have similar evaluate functions, see Algorithm 2. There are several possible applications of a new control node. One can treat R state of a Condition node as undefined or unknown and implement passing the decision making to the next Condition node (Fig. 5).

![Fig. 5: Skipper for treating R state as unknown.](image)


e) **Latch concept**: another interesting application of Skipper node is an implementation of Latch concept (Fig. 6). Latch remembers the first S or F returned state of subtree and do not evaluate the subtree until reseted [13]. Supplementary

![Fig. 6: Latch concept implementation with Skipper node. Also illustration for nodes order assignment.](image)

**Algorithm 1 Callback function**

```python
1: function CALLBACK(sample)
2:     ▷ argument and return type is dict
3:     tree.memory.set(sample)
4:     for all c ∈ tree.changed_conditions() do
5:         nodes_to_tick.insert(c, A_f)
6:     end for
7:     while not nodes_to_tick.empty() do
8:         node, tick_type = nodes_to_tick.pop_front()
9:         state, tick_type = node.tick(tick_type)
10:        if tick_type ∈ {A_R, C_R} then
11:            nodes_to_tick.insert(node.parent)
12:        end if
13:        for all c ∈ tree.changed_conditions() do
14:            nodes_to_tick.insert(c, A_f)
15:        end for
16:     end while
17:     return memory.get_changes(Output)
18: end function
```

a) **Tick types**: in synchronous trees tick was always propagated in a top-down or Fall manner. In the asynchronous tree we have to define rules for bottom-up or Rise propagation. In order to do this, we added a tick_type parameter for the tick function. Moreover, tick function returns the state of the node and a tick type, which should be applied to the parent. For efficient propagation we add another category - ticks might be either Activating or Checking. The second one is used when we do not need to evaluate recursively subtrees of a control
node and could look only on their last state updates. So, 4

tick types are Activating Fall ($A_F$), Activating Rise ($A_R$),

Checking Fall ($C_F$) and Checking Rise ($C_R$). $A_F$ represent

the propagation manner that is happening in synchronous trees

(parent recursively ticks children, we activate actions). $A_R$

is rising of $A_F$ (bottom up, child adds parent to nodes to tick

queue). $A_R$ happens when state changes from Running to

Success/Failure implying continuing the paused $A_F$ tick. $C_R$

represent bottom-up propagation of state checking (without

activation of any action node). $C_F$ refers to look-up for

child state (without further fall). $N_T$ or $\emptyset$ symbol is used

when no tick required.

The definition of tick is the same for each node, but it

requires another function, evaluate. This function is unique

for each node type. Evaluate accepts tick type argument

and return the resulting state of the node evaluation. Definition

of both tick and evaluate functions (see Alg. 3, 2) discussed later after explaining tick propagation rules.

b) Order of nodes in the tree: there might be different

Condition nodes which functions are depended on the same

variable. On the change of this variable several Condition

nodes might change their state. Undefined order of bottom-

up propagation of conditions change could lead to different

output results. So, we have to clarify the order of nodes in

nodes to tick queue. One needs to ensure that the parent

would not be evaluated before the child and children would

be evaluated from left to right. These rules are exactly the

description of Kleene-Brouwer order. To compare, each node

holds an order, which is a array of integers. The root node has

an order containing one number $\{0\}$. Then, each node adds

to the back its index in a children list of its parent. See also a

behavior tree example with nodes order (Fig. 5).

c) Propagation rules: the propagation rules could be

clearly defined by two tables for each type of a node. First

table – return tick table (see Table II) – is same for all node
types and illustrates which tick type would applied to the

parent node in the case of bottom-up propagation. The returned

tick type depends only on the state before node evaluation

and the state after. So, the diagonal elements of the table

are $\emptyset$, meaning there would be no bottom-up propagation in

case the state of the node was not changed. The same if the

state changed to $\mathbb{R}$ from either $\mathbb{S}$ or $\mathbb{F}$. This change could

be treated as activating from the bottom to the top. We forbid such

changes because task activation is naturally triggered from top
to down. However, altering elements in a table is a flexible way
to change rules of tick propagation. Success to Failure changes

are $C_R$ because they do not imply any local task resuming.

Finally, $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{S}$ or $\mathbb{F}$ changes are $A_R$.

![Table II: Return table](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State before</th>
<th>$\mathbb{R}$</th>
<th>$\mathbb{S}$</th>
<th>$\mathbb{F}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\mathbb{R}$</td>
<td>$A_R$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$A_R$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathbb{S}$</td>
<td>$A_F$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$C_R$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathbb{F}$</td>
<td>$A_F$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$C_R$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III – call table – illustrates how the control node

should evaluate the children. The tick type passed as argument
to evaluate function depends on a current state and a tick type

passed as argument to tick function. Different control nodes

might have different evaluation tick tables. Let’s thoroughly
describe the content of the evaluation tick table for Sequence.
$A_F$ column represents the activation process. All the nodes

are recursively evaluated from the top to down, actions met

are called. The rest is specific for async BT. Second column

in $\mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbb{F}$ rows shows the ban for bottom-up activation

propagation. Last 2 columns mean that for $\mathbb{S} \leftrightarrow \mathbb{F}$ transition

tree does not resume any activation process. So, we can just

look for the states locally without deep tree traversal and action

executions.

Aside from implementing Latch concept with existing nodes

as it is shown in Fig. 6 one can make it as standalone control

node. The difference in call table would be the $C_F$ instead of


Fig. 7: Pipeline of incoming sample execution. Red arrows show the tick propagation inside the tree.
$A_F$ in the $A_R$ column. The same change could be applied for the Parallel node. All subtrees are activated through the initial $A_F$ tick, so the node does not need to activate them later.

d) **Tick and evaluate functions:** tick function would be the same for every node type (see the definition in Alg. 3). Its main purpose to obey propagation rules defined above and call the evaluate function with proper $\text{tick\_type}$ argument.

![Diagram](image.png)

**Fig. 8:** Synchronous subtree implementation.

To remove unwanted asynchronous callbacks from synchronous subtree one can simply leave the list of variable dependencies blank for each Condition node. Then there would be no bottom-up propagation inside this subtree.

### IV. Execution With Redundancy on Flight Control Computers

a) **Motivation:** many aircraft systems are equipped with redundant systems for safety reasons. As a consequence, Flight Control Computer (FCC) units are often doubled or tripled. This significantly improves the safety and reliability of unmanned flight. However, delay distribution in message transport might lead to entangling order of data samples, which come from different sources to different FCC units. It is not always possible or efficient to transfer all the data flow by reliable channels. That leads to the fact that some samples might be missed. As a result, FCC units would have different mission execution states. Therefore we need to synchronize the states of FCC mission execution systems.

b) **Approach:** in our system, any changes to the outer scope are transferred only after calling callback function. Assume we started the same trees on all FCCs. Then, result of callback is depended only on variable values $\var{V}$ and node states $\text{node\_state}(\mathcal{N}) \subset \mathcal{V}$. So, if all three FCCs have the same $\mathcal{V}$ before callback execution, they would have the same output. That means we need to be sure in variable values consistency before each callback. In fact, we have to synchronize variables only if some condition has changed. If no condition changed, there would be no tick propagation started and no output changes produced. Condition change events usually lead to the execution of some action and thus are much rare than incoming sample events. The developed memory and asynchrony features of BT helped to drastically reduce the amount of synchronization events.

This logic might be implemented by modifying core callback function and adding an extra independent BT $\text{sync\_tree}$ for synchronization logic. Fig. 9 shows the concept of this complementary BT. It consists of 5 main branches:

1) Condition that enables further execution.
2) Latched Action node that sends a hash of $\mathcal{V}$ to other FCCs.
3) Subtree that waits for the hashes from other FCCs and chooses a new master FCC if the current master is not responding.
4) Subtree that sends changes in $\mathcal{V}$ from the master FCC to slaves if their hashes differ.
5) Action that returns all variables to their initial values.

Real synchronization procedure and corresponding behavior tree might be even more complicated. We need to add timeout conditions to any communication with other FCC. One could also let only a master FCC send samples to other modules (this depends on the implementation of the other software modules).

### V. Implementation and Tests

a) **C++ framework:** we made a C++ framework with the implementation of described Asynchronous Behavior Tree with Memory concept. It includes tree construction and execution. For leaf nodes one can use pure C++ functions or construct nodes from simple expressions (such as $\text{velocity} == 0$.
To prove our system working we started three independent mission executors. Only one current master executor was allowed to send output to other modules. All FCC are shown to maintain the same state in long-time runs. Another test was a crash imitation by simultaneously stopping any of the executors at random time. In this case, the rest one or two executors choose a new master and the mission continues correctly.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We formulated a new Asynchronous behavior tree with memory approach. It includes a description of the memory layer, rules of tick propagation, control and leaf nodes definition. Overall, the developed BT functionality is richer and more flexible than previous definitions not losing in modularity or readability.

Our approach also allowed us to make a standalone C++ library. An ability for automated testing the BT logic outside the robot environment in a simple simulation mode (e.g. applying necessary input changes and checking the outputs) is also a benefit.

Our changes in BT semantics, especially memory layer, simplified the development of the synchronization algorithm for multiple FCCs. We demonstrated the possibility to use our framework on robotic systems with redundancy on FCC units and tested it in the simulation.

Our future plans include flight experiments of unmanned HAPS missions using a developed framework with triple redundancy support.
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