Artificial Spatial Cognition for Robotics and Mobile Systems: brief survey and current open challenges
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Abstract—Remarkable and impressive advancements in the areas of perception, mapping and navigation of artificial mobile systems have been witnessed in the last decades. However, it is clear that important limitations remain regarding the spatial cognition capabilities of existing available implementations and the current practical functionality of high level cognitive models [1, 2]. For enhanced robustness and flexibility in different kinds of real world scenarios, a deeper understanding of the environment, the system, and their interactions-in general terms-is desired. This long abstract aims at outlining connections between recent contributions in the above mentioned areas and research in cognitive architectures and biological systems. We try to summarize, integrate and update previous reviews, highlighting the main open issues and aspects not yet unified or integrated in a common architectural framework.
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I. BRIEF SURVEY

A. Initial models for spatial knowledge representation and main missing elements

Focusing on the spatial knowledge representation and management, the first contributions inspired by the human cognitive map combined metric local maps, as an Absolute Space Representation (ASR), and topological graphs [3]. This way, they could be merged together into a Memory for Immediate Surroundings (MFIS) [4]. As a related approach, the Spatial Semantic Hierarchy (SSH) [5] was the first fundamental cognitive model for large-scale space. It evolved into the Hybrid SSH [6], which also included knowledge about small-scale space as isolated local maps connected by topological relations. This fundamental work was undoubtedly groundbreaking, but it did not go beyond basic levels of information abstraction and conceptualization [7]. Moreover, the well motivated dependencies among different types of knowledge (both declarative and procedural) were not further considered for general problem solving [8]. The SSH model was considered suitable for the popular schema of a “three layer architecture”, without explicitly dealing with processes such as attention or forgetting mechanisms. This lack of principled forgetting mechanisms has been identified by the Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM) robotics community as a key missing feature of most existing mapping approaches [9, 10].

B. The role of cognitive architectures and their relation to other works in the robotics community

Cognitive architectures provide a solid approach for modeling general intelligent agents and their main commitments support the ambitious requirements of high level behavior in arbitrary situations for robotics [11]. A more recent model of spatial knowledge, the Spatial/Visual System (SVS) [12] designed as an extension of the Soar cognitive architecture, proposed a different multiplicity of representations—namely symbolic, quantitative spatial and visual depicive. The spatial scene is a hierarchy tree of objects/entities and their constitutive parts, with intermediate nodes defining the transformation relations between parts and objects. Other works in the robotics field employ similar internal representation ideas [13-15], and other ones included the possibility to hypothesize geometric environment structure in order to build consistent maps [16]. While a complete implementation of this approach not only for geometrical primitives but for all kind of objects requires solving the corresponding segmentation and recognition problems for the given sensor data in a domain independent manner (which is far beyond the state of the art), keeping the perceptual level representations within the architecture enhances functionality. There is a very active research community addressing these difficult perception challenges.

The recognition process should not only use visual, spatial and motion data from the Perceptual LTM but also conceptual context information[8, 17] and episodic memories associated to remembered places [18], from Soar’s Symbolic LTM. This should also apply to the control laws and navigation techniques for different situations [19, 20]. The existence of motion models for the objects can significantly improve navigation in changing and dynamic environments, which is one of the main problems in real world robotic applications [21, 22].

A novel cognitive architecture specifically designed for spatial knowledge processing is the Casimir architecture [23], which presents rich modeling capabilities pursuing human-like behavior. Navigation, however, has not been addressed, and this work has scarcely been discussed in the robotics domain.

One of the latest spatial models is the NavModel [24], designed and implemented for the ACT-R cognitive architecture. Besides considering multi-level representations for spatial knowledge, this model presents three navigation strategies with varying cognitive cost. The first developed implementation assumes known topological localization at room level, while a subsequent implementation incorporates a mental rotation model. This work focuses on the cognitive load and does not deal with lower level issues. Many details regarding route generation, route following, dynamic changes, map management etc. are not addressed.

In order to point out how topics are addressed by the Cognitive Architectures and the Robotics communities, we...
compiled Table I as a comparison. The contrast regarding memory management capabilities and uncertainty considerations seems to be especially relevant. The lack of approaches combining both allocentric and egocentric representations is also remarkable.

### TABLE I. COMPARISON OF TOPICS ADDRESSED BY THE COGNITIVE ARCHITECTURES AND ROBOTICS COMMUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Architectures Community</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Perception, Robotics, Vehicles Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT-R/S, CLARION</td>
<td>Egocentric spatial models</td>
<td>[25, 26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIDA, SOAR-SVS</td>
<td>Allocentric spatial models</td>
<td>[10, 27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casimir, LIDA, SOAR-SVS</td>
<td>Object based/semantic representations</td>
<td>[7, 13-15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAR-SVS</td>
<td>Explicit motion models / dynamic information about the environment</td>
<td>[28, 29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Memory management, forgetting mechanisms</td>
<td>[20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended LIDA [30]</td>
<td>Uncertainty considerations</td>
<td>Most mapping and navigation approaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To conclude, Table II presents a summary of surveys.

### TABLE II. SUMMARY OF SURVEYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robotics and Cognitive Mapping</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAM and Robust Perception</td>
<td>[9, 10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational cognitive models of spatial memory</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object recognition</td>
<td>[31, 32]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial knowledge in brains</td>
<td>[18]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## II. CURRENT OPEN CHALLENGES

The previous analysis indicates that the big challenge comes to closing the gap between high level cognitive models and actual implementations for robust perception and navigation competences in artificial mobile systems. To reduce this existing gap, we identify three main goals:

- Combination of allocentric and egocentric models using different levels of features/objects + topology/semantics.
- Acquisition and integration of motion models and dynamic information for the elements/objects.
- Integration of global mapping & loop closure capabilities with extensive declarative knowledge about features relevance and forgetting mechanisms with episodic memory. Management of STM and LTM for localization and navigation.
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