

Probabilistic Mission Design in Neuro-Symbolic Systems

Simon Kohaut¹, Benedict Flade², Daniel Ochs¹, Devendra Singh Dhimi³, Julian Eggert², Kristian Kersting^{1,4,5,6}

Abstract—Advanced Air Mobility (AAM) is a growing field that demands accurate modeling of legal concepts and restrictions in navigating intelligent vehicles. In addition, any implementation of AAM needs to face the challenges posed by inherently dynamic and uncertain human-inhabited spaces robustly. Nevertheless, the employment of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) beyond visual line of sight (BVLOS) is an endearing task that promises to enhance significantly today’s logistics and emergency response capabilities. To tackle these challenges, we present a probabilistic and neuro-symbolic architecture to encode legal frameworks and expert knowledge over uncertain spatial relations and noisy perception in an interpretable and adaptable fashion. More specifically, we demonstrate Probabilistic Mission Design (ProMis), a system architecture that links geospatial and sensory data with declarative, Hybrid Probabilistic Logic Programs (HPLP) to reason over the agent’s state space and its legality. As a result, ProMis generates Probabilistic Mission Landscapes (PML), which quantify the agent’s belief that a set of mission conditions is satisfied across its navigation space. Extending prior work on ProMis’ reasoning capabilities and computational characteristics, we show its integration with potent machine learning models such as Large Language Models (LLM) and Transformer-based vision models. Hence, our experiments underpin the application of ProMis with multi-modal input data and how our method applies to many important AAM scenarios.

Index Terms—Probabilistic Mission Design, Advanced Air Mobility, Neuro-Symbolic Systems

I. INTRODUCTION

MISSION design for intelligent transportation systems is tied to several challenges, mandating strict adherence to safety and security criteria. Simultaneously, representations of objectives, constraints, and execution strategies for navigating such a transportation system should be interpretable and adaptive, allowing certification of compliance with public laws and adapting to the individual operator’s needs. These issues are all the more pressing when considering the employment of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) in Advanced Air Mobility (AAM) applications such as logistic and emergency response systems. Although policies for AAM scenarios in human-inhabited spaces have emerged, frameworks that capture these




Fig. 1: **Probabilistic Mission Landscapes:** By employing Probabilistic Mission Design (ProMis) as presented in this work, one obtains Probabilistic Mission Landscapes (PML) as a basis for semantically and logically guided navigation. Each point of a PML is an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) probability of satisfying the agent’s navigation constraints under uncertainty. Due to the independence of each point, samples can be taken in parallel while interpolation is used to produce a continuous scalar field of probabilities.

regulations in planning and control while considering the uncertainty of background knowledge and perception, e.g., maps and deep learning models, are required.

To tackle these challenges, we believe that neuro-symbolic methods, integrating declarative, white-box models with powerful machine learning systems, are a promising foundation for future AAM systems. More specifically, probabilistic logic programs, e.g., as illustrated in Listing 1 and informed by querying geographic information systems such as in Listing 2, provide an adaptable and interpretable representation for the laws and uncertainties of the agent’s navigation. On top of pure First-Order Logic (FOL), probabilistic logic programs assign categorical distributions to the FOL’s atoms (variable-free symbols). Furthermore, Hybrid Probabilistic Logic Programs (HPLP) use both discrete and continuous distributions, thereby representing a so-called hybrid relational domain where probability mass and probability density functions are assigned to the FOL simultaneously [1]. Especially in probabilistic robotics [2] where it is not enough to deal with categorical data, HPLPs are a promising research direction.

In contrast to research focusing on optimizing the agent’s trajectory according to energy, time, or collision avoidance criteria [3]–[5], we aim to enable mission design through such

¹ Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Lab, Department of Computer Science, TU Darmstadt, 64283 Darmstadt, Germany
firstname.surname@cs.tu-darmstadt.de

² Honda Research Institute Europe GmbH, Carl-Legien-Str. 30, 63073 Offenbach, Germany
firstname.surname@honda-ri.de

³ Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence Group, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, TU Eindhoven, 5600 MB Eindhoven, Netherlands

⁴ Hessian AI

⁵ Centre for Cognitive Science

⁶ German Center for Artificial Intelligence (DFKI)

```

% A person who owns a drone is likely to operate it
0.9::operates_drone(X) :- person(X), owns_drone(X).

% Slight influence of friends on owning a drone
0.2::owns_drone(X) :- friend(X, Y), owns_drone(Y).

% Background knowledge
person(justus).
person(jonas).
owns_drone(justus).
friend(jonas, justus).

% Chance of Jonas operating a drone
query(operates_drone(jonas)). % = 0.18

```

Listing 1: Probabilistic modeling with ProbLog [7], a probabilistic logic programming language that combines FOL with probability theory. This model illustrates ProbLog’s basic usage and describes how friends can influence each other in their decisions, e.g., of owning and operating a drone. Here, rules and facts are probabilistic, resulting in a generative model providing arbitrary marginal and conditional probabilities.

neuro-symbolic systems. Hence, in prior work, we introduced Probabilistic Mission Design (ProMis), which automatically translated uncertain, crowd-sourced map data into declarative, probabilistic programs as generative models of the likelihood of an agent’s state satisfying a set of rules [6]. To this end, we will show how ProMis improves navigation by providing a neuro-symbolic framework that unifies multi-modal data sources, mission settings, and constraints into an interpretable and adaptable basis for intelligent transportation systems. ProMis generates Probabilistic Mission Landscapes, as shown in Figure 1. Each point in the agent’s state space is assigned an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) probability of its likelihood to satisfy all navigation constraints from policymakers and operators alike.

In summary, this work makes the following key contributions to neuro-symbolic and probabilistic AAM:

- We show how uncertain, e.g., crowd-sourced, map data can be compiled into hybrid probabilistic spatial relations as a vocabulary for expressing AAM rules in FOL, improving on the prior publication’s experimental evaluation of the computational demands and time constraints.
- We demonstrate how Transformer-based vision models such as the ChangeFormer architecture [8] can be integrated with ProMis, expanding on ProMis’ expressivity and showcasing its potential for future neural-perception systems to be incorporated into mission design.
- We employ a general-purpose LLM by first exemplifying how ProMis encodes aviation laws to automatically translate operators’ natural language prompts into valid new models, illustrating how a neural system can bridge the gap between non-experts and our method.
- We provide an Open Source implementation of the ProMis framework at <https://github.com/HRI-EU/ProMis>.

By these extensions and demonstrations, we pave the way for future intelligent transportation systems to be guided in their actions by declarative, probabilistic programs to respect a set of interpretable rules.

```

// Output format and timeout for request
[out:json][timeout:25];

// Requested ways and relations within a bounding box
(
  way["highway"="primary"]({bbox});
  way["highway"="secondary"]({bbox});
  way["highway"="footway"]({bbox});
  relation["natural"="bay"]({bbox});
  relation["building"]({bbox});
);

// Return retrieved data
out body; >; out skel qt;

```

Listing 2: An example of querying data from OpenStreetMap (OSM) using the Overpass Query Language. Analogously to predicates employed in Listing 1, one can see how data is associated via a tagging system. For example, major city roads are related by sharing their association with the *highway* tag. Here, a selection of geographic features is requested to access and analyze the environment within the given bounding box.

II. RELATED WORK

In Europe, the advancement of UAS and Urban Air Mobility (UAM) is significantly influenced by the Single European Sky Air Traffic Management Research (SESAR) initiative. When SESAR introduced its first Master Plan in 2009, the concept of AAM was not considered, with drones merely mentioned in passing. However, with subsequent editions of the Master Plan, particularly the 2015 release [9] and the 2017 Drone Outlook Study [10], the integration of UAS into European airspace gained momentum.

Besides substantial funding allocated to drive development, regulations and operational restrictions have been introduced concurrently to ensure the safety of drone operations. Notably, the EU regulation 2019/947 [11], implemented in 2019, underscores the coexistence of unmanned and manned aircraft within shared airspace, emphasizing rigorous risk assessments, such as through the Specified Operations Risk Assessment (SORA method) [12].

Recent research endeavors have enhanced safety analysis and risk assessment methodologies. For instance, Rothwell and Patzek [13] have contributed by employing satisfiability checks on symbolic models to verify and improve mission planning for UASs. In contrast, the authors of [14] highlight the importance of directly fitting the output of safety analysis and risk assessment to map or environmental data. More specifically, they propose to improve the visual representation and enable data exploration by displaying interactive representations of mission parameters. This approach improves integration with environmental data, positively impacting the effectiveness of safety analysis and risk assessment in real-world scenarios.

Several studies, such as [15] and [16], have introduced approaches that integrate visual maps with risk models to calculate and visually represent risks associated with UAS operations. These models prioritize risk assessment based on formal frameworks, identifying potential hazards and safety concerns, especially ground casualties and transportation network disruptions. Even if humans are in full control, unawareness of situations may quickly lead to life-threatening




Fig. 2: **The Probabilistic Mission (ProMis) system architecture:** We propose a transformation of static and dynamic data sources, including (neural) sensors and geospatial data, via our Probabilistic Clause Modules (PCM) into continuous and categorical distributions over the agent’s navigation space. Subsequently, a Hybrid Probabilistic Logic Program (HPLP) is generated and combined with laws, constraints as well as operator preferences. Given the parameters of the mission, the so obtained generative model can be used to validate the agent’s navigation space by solving the respective sum-product problem. Hence, we obtain a Probabilistic Mission Landscape (PML) that can be stored or employed for planning and mission analysis.

scenarios. Therefore, keeping the operator or pilot informed of the ongoing mission is critical. For example, controlled flight into terrain accounts for a significant proportion of aviation fatalities [17]. For this reason, rich visualizations of the mission in progress have been developed to avoid blind spots in decision-making [18]. Inspired by air traffic management, they aim to improve flight safety by enabling operators to gain a better situational understanding and awareness of obstacles by displaying the intended trajectory and environment. By providing insight into the mission and its environment from information sources, operators can react to threats and optimize their behavior [19], [20].

Beyond the visual line of sight, understanding the individual agent’s design goals and application domain is crucial to employing autonomous agents beyond the necessity of a fine-tuned control system. For instance, in agricultural applications, robots can leverage weather forecasts to plan their missions, enabling them to determine when and how to perform tasks to, e.g., avoid wet or muddy terrain [21]. Symbolic reasoning systems are a suitable basis for an adaptable and interpretable system to formalize and verify behavior and its constraints.

One of the earliest programmatic reasoning systems in First-Order Logic (FOL) is Prolog [22], developed in 1972 by Alain Colmerauer. Prolog has inspired numerous applications, from natural language processing [1] to robotics [23]. Extensions that embrace uncertainties in formal logic like Bayesian Logic Programs [24] and Probabilistic Logic Programs [7], [25] have been introduced to allow for probabilistic inference in FOL models. While they are not formulated for end-to-end learning in tandem with artificial neural networks, newer models like DeepProblog [26] and SLASH [27] have been introduced to close this gap. The objective of such Neuro-Symbolic AI methods is to combine the strengths of deep learning architectures with symbolic, formally well-justified, and inherently interpretable systems. Our work is further motivated by hybrid formulations of probabilistic logic programming on which noteworthy progress has been made in recent years [1], extending syntax and semantics of probabilistic logic to account for discrete and continuous distributions.

III. METHODS

A. An Architecture for Probabilistic Mission Design

This section introduces an architecture for logically constrained, probabilistic mission design. With ProMis, we aim at a Probabilistic Mission design flow (see Figure 2) that addresses the needs of all involved stakeholders.

First, a **public body** defines and regulates public traffic areas. This includes the classifications and categorizations of autonomous agents and their operations, giving rise to a need to develop safe and legally compliant mission models. In addition to creating rules for public spaces, they provide data on critical infrastructure or areas privately operated agents should not enter, e.g., geofences protecting the space around airports. Hence, the public body thereby provides *static knowledge* and the aforementioned *laws*.

Second, the **operator** of the autonomous agent determines the mission’s target and additional *constraints* on top of legal requirements. As operators may not possess the necessary engineering expertise to program their requirements manually, intuitive interfaces are necessary. Additionally, operators with AAM-specific qualifications can directly influence what the autonomous agent is authorized to do under their supervision. While the operator’s preferences cannot supersede those of the public body concerning public grounds, they can impose additional restrictions on valid missions by specifying risk-averse rules or preferences.

Third, the **manufacturer** has the most extensive knowledge of the autonomous agent’s capabilities for detection, localization, and tracking, facilitating the *agent’s perception* through hardware sensors and *neural information processing*. For example, a logistics drone may provide estimates of its weight and camera-based localization of people below to minimize the risk for bystanders. Manufacturers may also limit vehicle use for licensing, safety, or hardware protection reasons. Therefore, they can further add to the *constraints* of the mission.

ProMis incorporates the contributions of these three in the form of *static knowledge*, *laws and constraints*, and *agent*




Fig. 3: **Sampling spatial relations from uncertain maps:** With an expectation of map features’ true location and the respective error parameters, we can generate map variations to estimate the parameters of hybrid probabilistic spatial relations. Here, the distance of point \mathbf{x} to the closest road and its variations is computed.

perception. A neuro-symbolic vocabulary of spatial relations between the agent’s state space and relevant geographic features, e.g., roads, buildings, or bystanders, is obtained by estimating the parameters of distributions modeling the mission environment. Hence, public, operator, and manufacturer background knowledge can be expressed in a Hybrid Probabilistic Logic Program (HPLP) to facilitate probabilistic reasoning for mission design. Overall, we make the following important contributions: (i) the architecture of ProMis, integrating multi-modal input data of AAM settings with hybrid probabilistic logic, (ii) the generation of neuro-symbolic distributional clauses from typed map data and neural perception, and (iii) the inference of Probabilistic Mission Landscapes (PML) as scalar fields of probabilities across the agent’s mission space.

B. Neuro-Symbolic Spatial Relations

ProMis combines mission constraints, domain knowledge, and a regulatory framework into a single Hybrid Probabilistic Logic Program (HPLP). HPLPs intertwine formal logic with probability theory over hybrid relational spaces, i.e., categorical and continuous distributions [1]. While HPLPs are domain-agnostic models in which probabilistic logic can answer a wide range of queries, we will focus on treating data for UAV navigation in this section. We will consider three types of data sources as background knowledge \mathcal{K} : Static knowledge, e.g., geographic features such as the placement of roads or buildings, agent perception retrieved from hardware sensors and machine learning models, e.g., neural networks for bystander detection, and the operator status, e.g., their location or what license they hold.

To parameterize the generated HPLP from this data, we propose Probabilistic Clause Modules (PCM) as a collection of mappings from application-specific data models in \mathcal{K} into a set of parameters of continuous and categorical distributions \mathcal{D} . Hence, each entry in this distributional knowledge base \mathcal{D} relates a spatial relation a to its probability p or its distribution’s parameters θ . This means that logical propositions in HPLPs can not only be true or false but rather follow discrete or continuous distributions to parameterize the probability of a solution to the modeled problem:

$$p :: a :- l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n. \quad (\text{Discrete})$$

$$a \sim p(\theta) :- l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n. \quad (\text{Continuous})$$

```
% Distributional clauses from uncertain map data
distance(x0, building) ~ normal(20, 0.5).
distance(x1, building) ~ normal(19, 0.4).
...
0.9::over(x0, primary).
0.8::over(x1, primary).
...

% Distributional clauses from a neural sensor
0.0::change(x0).
0.7::change(x1).
...
```

Listing 3: Distributional, spatial clauses within the final HPLP \mathcal{P} . Here, the parameters of *distance* and *over* are estimated from uncertain maps, *change* is produced from a deep learning model over satellite images.

This means if the right-hand side conjunction of literals l_i is true, head a is true with probability p , or its value follows the distribution $p(\theta)$. If the right-hand side is empty, we consider a a fact independent of any other symbols. This formalization of knowledge in uncertain domains is especially interesting when considering uncertain spatial relations from neural sensors, crowd-sourced maps, or low-cost sensory equipment. Consider the binary spatial relations *over*(\mathbf{x}, t) and *distance*(\mathbf{x}, t), telling whether the agent state \mathbf{x} is located over a geographic feature of type t , e.g., a building or person on the ground, and the distance of \mathbf{x} to such a type t . We will show (i) how these parameters can be obtained through statistical means from uncertain geographic data in Section III-B and (ii) the integration of deep learning architectures in Section IV-B.

Let a map $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \tau)$ be a triple of vertices \mathcal{V} , edges \mathcal{E} and tagging function τ . Each vertex \mathbf{v} is located in a d -dimensional space \mathbb{R}^d of Cartesian coordinates. If a path exists between two vertices in \mathcal{V} across edges in \mathcal{E} , they are part of the same *feature* f . For each vertex $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}$, the function $\tau(\mathbf{v}) = \mathcal{T}$ produces a set \mathcal{T} of tags belonging to v .

To obtain an HPLP representation of a map \mathcal{M} , ProMis requires a generative model of map features to extract parameters of probabilistic spatial relations. To model the spatial error in the stored vertices, we utilize an affine transformation, i.e., a translation and a linear map, as a model. Analogous to prior work [28], we consider for each $\mathbf{v}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{V}$, being the j -th vertex of the i -th feature, the following affine map:

$$\Phi^{(n)} \leftarrow \phi(\alpha_i) \quad (\text{Transformation})$$

$$\mathbf{t}^{(n)} \leftarrow \kappa(\beta_i) \quad (\text{Translation})$$

$$\mathbf{v}_{i,j}^{(n)} = \Phi^{(n)} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{i,j} + \mathbf{t}^{(n)} \quad (\text{Generation})$$

Here, $\phi(\alpha_i)$ and $\kappa_{i,j}$ are parameterized generators of N linear maps $\Phi^{(n)}$ and translations $\mathbf{t}^{(n)}$. Obtaining a collection of N randomized maps $\mathcal{M}^{(n)}$ samples then allows for empirically estimating the parameters of hybrid probabilistic spatial relations using a testing function $j(\mathcal{M}^{(n)}, \mathbf{x}, t)$.

Consider the running examples of *over*(\mathbf{x}, t) and *distance*(\mathbf{x}, t) as discrete probability and continuously distributed random variables, respectively, relating state \mathbf{x} and environment feature of type t . We draw random maps and sample the spatial relations’ value for state \mathbf{x} and type t to compute the distributions’ respective parameters. Via this process, we




Fig. 4: **Probabilistic Clause Modules express uncertainties in geospatial data:** Here, an urban center’s road network and building base areas were queried from crowd-sourced data. Assuming known parameters of the individual feature’s spatial uncertainty, random maps have been generated to obtain data for computing the statistics required by ProMis. Here, the mean (a) and variance (b) model the distance to the closest road, computed independently for each point in a regular grid within the agent’s navigation space. From the cumulative distribution function of $\mathcal{N}(\mu_D, \sigma_D^2)$, or more generally via sampling, we can obtain the probability of a regulatory constraint being met, e.g., keeping a distance of over 30 meters from any street (c). Finally, (d) shows the probability of a location in the agent’s navigation space being occupied by buildings. For visual clarity, (a-c) shows high values in cyan and low values in red, with the inverse colormap being employed in (d).

can empirically estimate statistical moments, e.g., mean and variance:

$$\widehat{\mu}_j = \frac{1}{N} \sum_n j(\mathcal{M}^{(n)}, \mathbf{x}, t)$$

$$\widehat{\sigma}_j^2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_n (j(\mathcal{M}^{(n)}, \mathbf{x}, t) - \widehat{\mu}_j)^2$$

Hence, the parameters of the spatial relations can be computed via the method of moments by choosing the appropriate j . For example, assume $distance(\mathbf{x}, t)$ to be a normally distributed random variable $D \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_D, \sigma_D^2)$. That is, the function $j(\mathcal{M}^{(n)}, \mathbf{x}, t)$ shall compute the Euclidean distance from \mathbf{x} to the closest feature $f \in \mathcal{M}^n$ for which $t \in \tau(\mathbf{v}), v \in f$. This is illustrated in Figure 3. In this setting, we can immediately set $\mu_D = \widehat{\mu}_j$ and $\sigma_D^2 = \widehat{\sigma}_j^2$. Except for an exchange of function j , e.g., instead of checking for each map if \mathbf{x} lies within or outside any feature of type t , the process is analogous for categorical relations such as $over(\mathbf{x}, t)$.

Finally, ProMis generates an HPLP that encodes these distributions for all considered states and types. As illustrated in Listing 3, the distributions are written as probabilistic facts in HPLP form. The respective state is further assigned a symbolic name instead of a numeric value. Note that this Listing also includes parameters obtained from a neural sensor on geographic changes, which we will discuss in Section IV-B. Based on this set of spatial relations, regulations from the local authorities, operator demands, or manufacturer limitations can be expressed in the following section of the HPLP.

C. Probabilistic Mission Landscapes

We now introduce the concept of Probabilistic Mission Landscapes (PML) $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}(\vec{x}) = y$, a scalar field over an agent’s state space \mathbf{x} . A PML represents the success probability $y \in [0, 1]$ of querying the HPLP \mathcal{P} for the *landscape* atom at the respective location. Given the mission as background

knowledge, constraints, and inference parameters described before, ProMis achieves this in three steps. First, a First-Order Logic solver grounds \mathcal{P} , translating it into a variable-free, propositional form with only ground atoms \mathcal{A} . Second, the grounded program is solved into a Conjunctive Normal Form, enumerating all models $m \in M$ for which the *landscape* relation’s right-hand side literals are all true, and each atom $a \in A$ is assigned a Boolean value. Finally, the probabilities of the models are summed up in a grid of probabilities for a legal and safe arrival at each location:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{m \in M} \prod_{a \in A} P(a = m(a))$$

Note that the probability of the continuous distributions is either achieved via the Cumulative Distribution Function or through sampling, depending on whether a closed-form solution is available. Since efficient solving and inference schemes are out-of-scope for the presentation of ProMis, we refer to state-of-the-art tools for inference in HPLPs, e.g., Hybrid Relational ProbLog [1]

The PML is computed for a pre-defined set of states \mathbf{x} within the mission environment. For example, given an origin point, dimensions towards east and north, and a resolution, a raster of points can be evaluated from which the PML is completed using, e.g., linear interpolation. Our experiments on ProMis and PML generation show not only the outcome in terms of estimated parameters and PMLs but also the complexity of running these tasks for different choices of granularity and environments.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Spatial Relations from Crowd-Sourced Map Data

We start our experiments by demonstrating the computation of two spatial relations from crowd-sourced, i.e., often unreliable, map data. Namely, we consider the $over(\mathbf{x}, building)$



Fig. 5: **Neural sensing of geographic change:** Before (a) and after (b) images taken by a satellite provide the input for the ChangeFormer, resulting in a prediction of change (c) after training the model on ground-truth data (d). By associating the prediction with points in state-space, it is translated into HPLP clauses as in Listing 3. Note how the ChangeFormer is, on the one hand, not perfect and missed some of the construction sites in the west, but, on the other hand, identified a building that is not part of OpenStreetMaps at the time of writing (center-top).

and $distance(x, road)$ spatial relations. To this end, we query data from OpenStreetMap using Overpass akin to Listing 2. For the map generation process, we assume the geometry to have a simple translational error, which we draw from a Gaussian $\vec{t} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \text{diag}(10m, 10m))$ and uniformly apply to all vertices of the same feature. For this experiment, we place the origin of the mission space in Darmstadt, Germany (latitude = 49.878091, longitude = 8.654052). Further, we compute the parameters on a 1000×1000 raster using the method of moments, as presented in Section III, from 50 generated maps in a 1 km^2 area. The so-obtained parameters are visualized in Figure 4.

B. Neural Perception in Probabilistic Mission Design

Beyond statistical analysis of, e.g., geographic information systems, neural perception is an important ingredient in ProMis’s ability to reason based on the agent’s immediate surroundings. Hence, in this section, we consider the classification output of a Transformer-based vision model for inclusion in the generated HPLP. While the potential for neural perception is vast, ranging from locating bystanders on the ground to detecting forest fires, we will consider change detection from satellite images as an example of translating neural perception into spatial relations. For this, we have trained a ChangeFormer [8] following the training approach described in [29], employing the LEVIR-CD dataset [30] to learn to detect salient changes from satellite images.

The LEVIR-CD dataset is an urbanization monitoring dataset featuring before and after image pairs of developing suburbs, e.g., allowing the ChangeFormer to detect construction sites and newly finished buildings. Further, the ChangeFormer is a Siamese-like architecture that applies feature extraction on four scales to both the before- and after-images. Next, the features are compared via a learned difference module, and the resulting comparison features are fed through fully connected up-sampling layers to produce the change map. Hence, each pixel of the change map corresponds to

a categorical distribution indicating the probability of being a change.

We choose this example for two reasons: First, regardless of semantics, generating HPLP relations from the ChangeFormer output is analogous to any other neural perception that can be mapped to the agent’s navigation space. Second, besides encoding the ChangeFormer’s output into the HPLP and providing a more expressive language for mission design, its semantics can be leveraged to detect outdated map data. Hence, as seen in Figure 5, neural perception is not only a more dynamic form of obtaining mission-related knowledge but opens up the ability to reason on the differences between multiple modes of input data. Of course, the same reasoning goes in reverse, with the map data being more complete than the ChangeFormer’s detection.

Listing 3 depicts how the ChangeFormer detections are integrated into the HPLP as new spatial relation $change(x)$. Here, each probability of the output is analogous to the demonstration of the $over(x, t)$ relation, written as the conditional probability of the HPLP fact. In contrast to prior work, the relation is unary and not connected to a specific type due to the less specific semantics of the ChangeFormer.

C. Reasoning on Neuro-Symbolic Navigation Spaces

In the previous two sections, we demonstrated the creation of three spatial relations based on statistical geographic data and neural perception. Now, we integrate this data for various locations and application scenarios into HPLPs and present possible outcomes of employing ProMis.

First, consider Listing 4. It encodes a simple set of mission constraints for an AAM scenario in an inner-city environment. For example, the UAV’s valid airspace is confined to parks and areas near major roads. Further, Visual-Line-of-Sight (VLOS) is required and modeled as dependent on the weather and the distance to the operator located at the center of the mission space. Figure 6 visualizes these three conditions and the resulting $landscape(x)$. We have applied the same mission parameters (origin, extends, and resolution) as in Section IV-A.




Fig. 6: **Adaptable mission design with ProMis:** Probabilistic Mission Landscapes (PML) express the probability of a First-Order Logic model being satisfied over the navigation space. Each picture from (a) to (c) shows a different constraint, while (d) presents a simple PML as a logical conjunction of the other three. A color map from cyan (high) to red (low) visualizes the probability of a point satisfying the respective model. Further, values below a threshold are transparent to unveil the map data underneath. This example illustrates how ProMis allows one to adapt a mission to geospatial relations and logical connections.




Fig. 7: **ProMis generalizes to a variety of scenarios:** Here, we show the result of utilizing ProMis in (a) an urban city park with adjacent major road sections, (b) a bay area with increased visual-line-of-sight over open waters and accessible service roads, and (c) a major junction with pedestrian crossings where a green signal allows crossing one from side to the other. Finally, (d) shows a scenario where the airspace right above passenger and cargo rails in the vicinity of the train station can be patrolled. High probabilities of fulfilling all constraints are plotted in cyan and low probabilities in red. Values below 0.1 have been removed, revealing the map underneath.

In Figure 7, we further show ProMis being applied to a broad set of scenarios with differently chosen flight restrictions.

First, the full model of Listing 4 is shown, including a condition on the agent’s battery charge to be sufficient to return to the operator’s location. Second, we apply ProMis to a Bay Area, where we augment the definition of VLOS to extend over open waters if the weather is clear, demonstrating how relating rules to the GIS-provided tagging system can lead to different behaviors based on the underlying map and uncertain weather conditions. The third scenario is a pedestrian crossing in a metropolitan environment where the UAV cannot enter the airspace above the roads. An exception is made for crossings while the traffic light shows green, showing how local perception or connections to other traffic systems may be leveraged here. Finally, a scenario in which the UAV can fly over a rail network used for passenger and cargo transport is shown. Here, the UAV is forbidden to stray from the rails or base station. A threshold over the PML further facilitates planning in mission design, as shown in Figure 7.

```
% Background knowledge and perception of drone
initial_charge ~ normal(90, 5).
discharge ~ normal(-0.2, 0.1).
weight ~ normal(2.0, 0.1).

% Visual line of sight
1/10::fog; 9/10::clear.
vlos(X) :- fog, distance(X, operator) < 250;
          clear, distance(X, operator) < 500.

% Charge to return to the operator
can_return(X) :- B is initial_charge,
                O is discharge, D is distance(X, operator),
                0 < B + (2 * O * D).

% Permit to fly in parks or close to major roads
permit(X) :- over(X, park);
             distance(X, primary) < 10.

% The Probabilistic Mission Landscape
landscape(X) :- vlos(X), weight < 25,
               permit(X), can_return(X).
```

Listing 4: Operator-written model for urban AAM scenario. The resulting PMLs are shown in Figures 6 and 7.




Fig. 8: **Large Language Model integration:** LLMs can generate appropriate code from a natural language description of an operator’s mission requirements by providing them with an example of ProMis programs, e.g., Listing 4. Hence, ProMis can be employed even by non-expert operators, paving the way for safe navigation based on natural language prompts.

D. Probabilistic Mission Design with Large Language Models

Because ProMis allows us to limit the operations of an agent by First-Order Logic, we can leverage the fact that Large Language Models (LLM) can generate program code from natural language descriptions. We employ ChatGPT¹ as LLM to demonstrate this approach. To do so, we must tell the LLM what a ProMis program is and describe its elements. For this, we pass Listing 4 together with the request of translating the following prompts into equivalent ProMis code, underlining the need for the *landscape* clause to be included and to use the *distance* and *over* relations as exemplified. Then, we can provide the mission description of an operator who cannot or likes to avoid engineering the First-Order Logic required by ProMis. Figure 8 shows the operator’s prompt, describing their situation and mission requirements in natural language, the LLM’s response, the generated ProMis program, and the computed PML. However, creating a fine-tuned model is desirable to avoid errors, e.g., hallucinations, in the generated code. Further, the LLM’s decisions, e.g., distance boundaries, might not align with the operator’s intentions and require additional interactions.

E. Parallelization and Interpolation in ProMis

To assess the suitability of PML for mission design, we need to analyze the time taken to compute landscapes at different resolutions. Without further strategy, the inference time will grow quadratically in the resolution. This means obtaining high-resolution PMLs quickly becomes impractical, even on a powerful computation device. Time measurements have been obtained on an 8-core Intel i7 9700K.

First, we consider how much time the ProMis pipeline needs to spend for each individual step in Figure 9. This evaluation shows how computing the parameters, i.e., the steps demonstrated in Section IV-A, dominates the time taken for computing a full PML. In the second place, running the inference itself is costly, i.e., evaluating the sum-product obtained for the generated and solved HPLP query. On the other hand, generating the HPLP and solving the logic are minor expenses within ProMis.




Fig. 9: **Runtime per ProMis-step:** Among the sampling of (i) spatial relation parameters, (ii) programming the HPLP, (iii) solving the FOL, and (iv) inferring probabilities, the first and last steps dominate how much time is spent on PML creation. Hence, more efficient parameter estimation and inference schemes are crucial in large or dynamic environments.

Because of how ProMis generates the HPLP and the *landscape*(x) is defined, the probability distributions of each location in the navigation frame are identically and independently distributed. Therefore, we can split the inference task into multiple processes, parallelize the task, and reduce computation time while retaining exact inference. When splitting the area s -times into four equal parts with each step, we obtain 4^s smaller models to process in parallel. The impact on ProMis’ runtime is shown in Figure 10.

Tiling is an important consideration, and the tiling factor is a parameter with a critical impact on computation time. Furthermore, tiling also allows for distributing work across multiple computing devices. One might prioritize computing tiles close to the agent first and queue up the rest for a later inference cycle. Of course, since tiling makes use of parallel computing, moving the inference algorithms to a manycore processor is a promising direction for future work.

Sampling a high-resolution PML can be necessary for the mission’s success and safety. However, the ideal resolution will depend on the employed model and geography, with oversampling possibly wasting time and energy. Hence, it is important to discuss the impact of choosing higher or lower resolutions in the first place. Depending on the lateral and longitudinal extension of the inference area and the frequency of spatial complexity in the map, the resolution can be chosen lower without losing much accuracy.

To this end, we analyze the loss of accuracy compared to a reference PML computed in a high resolution in the previously shown scenarios of Figure 7. We do so by running ProMis at the same origin points and dimensions with a change in resolution. Then, each PML is upsampled using linear interpolation and compared to the reference PML with a 200×200 resolution. Figure 11 shows the results for each scenario individually. A trade-off between landscape quality and runtime needs to be considered here. For instance, delaying the start of a mission to investigate the potential task space may be appropriate for a user but infeasible if quick decisions need to be made by the UAV itself. Hence, ProMis might greatly benefit from adaptive sampling schemes that decide online how many samples of the PML need to be taken and at what locations.

¹<https://chatgpt.com/>, accessed July 01.2024




Fig. 10: **Tiling reduces inference time:** Instead of solving the entire navigation space simultaneously, we can divide the inference task repeatedly, decreasing the computational cost. However, repeating this step too often, due to the cost of managing processes, actually increases the overall inference time. Horizontal and vertical resolutions are equal.

V. CONCLUSION

We have presented ProMis, a neuro-symbolic architecture for Probabilistic Mission Design based on Hybrid Probabilistic Logic Programs. ProMis facilitates adaptable and interpretable mission design by encoding quasi-static and dynamic knowledge, e.g., geographic map data and neural agent perception, into First-Order Logic parameterized by discrete and continuous distributions. The hybrid probabilistic nature of the underlying inference mechanisms allows for considering many types of input data and relations of real-world robot navigation tasks, such as discrete occupancy probabilities or continuous distance measures.

ProMis produces Probabilistic Mission Landscapes (PML), scalar fields of probabilities over the agent’s state-space expressing how likely the underlying model is satisfied given the uncertain input data. Hence, ProMis facilitates advanced mission design tasks such as granting clearance to a trajectory, explaining why clearance was denied, or choosing an optimal mission setting, e.g., as shown in [31]. Legal, operator, and manufacturer background knowledge can be considered in navigation tasks through manual encodings of a domain expert’s requirements or automatic translation from natural language by employing an LLM.

Moving forward, some limitations require investigation. First, ProMis’ application is limited if the parameters of spatial relations need frequent recomputation, i.e., sampling and computing the distribution parameters prohibits fast updates to the PML. Second, solving the logical query of the HPLP can become an expensive task with complex mission constraints or when a larger variety of spatial relations is introduced. Finally, updating the belief expressed in the PML under real-time requirements demands advances in knowledge compilation and reasoning techniques, e.g., incorporating caching mechanisms for quasi-static parts of the solving process.

Nevertheless, we have shown that ProMis intertwines important stakeholders and the autonomous agent, serving transparency and adaptation to human input while providing inference on mission-related, uncertain values. Overall, we believe that ProMis provides an effective foundation for Advanced Aerial Mobility where low-level perception and high-level rules go hand in hand.




Fig. 11: **Interpolation of low-resolution PMLs:** Here, we see the Mean Squared Error (MSE) when creating low-resolution PMLs and comparing them to a 200×200 reference PML using linear interpolation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Eindhoven University of Technology authors received support from their Department of Mathematics and Computer Science and the Eindhoven Artificial Intelligence Systems Institute. Map data © OpenStreetMap contributors, licensed under the Open Database License (ODbL) and available from <https://www.openstreetmap.org>. Map styles © Mapbox, licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License (CC BY 3.0) and available from <https://github.com/mapbox/mapbox-gl-styles>.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Nitti, T. De Laet, and L. De Raedt, “Probabilistic logic programming for hybrid relational domains,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 103, no. 3, pp. 407–449, 2016.
- [2] S. Thrun, “Probabilistic robotics,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 52–57, 2002.
- [3] F. Chen, Y. Lu, B. Cai, and X. Xie, “Multi-Drone Collaborative Trajectory Optimization for Large-Scale Aerial 3D Scanning,” in *2021 IEEE International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality Adjunct (ISMAR-Adjunct)*, 2021, pp. 121–126.
- [4] Z. Guan, S. Wang, L. Gao, and W. Xu, “Energy-Efficient UAV Communication with 3D Trajectory Optimization,” in *2021 7th International Conference on Computer and Communications (ICCC)*, 2021, pp. 312–317.
- [5] N. Hohmann, S. Brulin, J. Adamy, and M. Olhofer, “Three-dimensional urban path planning for aerial vehicles regarding many objectives,” *IEEE Open Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 4, pp. 639–652, 2023.
- [6] S. Kohaut, B. Flade, D. S. Dhimi, J. Eggert, and K. Kersting, “Mission Design for Unmanned Aerial Vehicles using Hybrid Probabilistic Logic Programs,” in *26th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2023.
- [7] L. De Raedt, A. Kimmig, and H. Toivonen, “Problog: A probabilistic prolog and its application in link discovery,” in *IJCAI*, vol. 7. Hyderabad, 2007, pp. 2462–2467.
- [8] W. G. C. Bandara and V. M. Patel, “A transformer-based siamese network for change detection,” in *IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium*, 2022, pp. 207–210.
- [9] SESAR Joint Undertaking, “European ATM master plan: The Roadmap for Delivering High Performing Aviation for Europe: Executive view: Edition 2015,” 2015.
- [10] —, “European Drones Outlook Study,” 2017.
- [11] The European Commission, “Commission Implementing regulation EU 2019/947 of 24 May 2019,” 2019.
- [12] European Union Aviation Safety Agency, “Acceptable Means of Compliance (AMC) and Guidance Material (GM) to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/947,” pp. 1–130, 2019.
- [13] C. D. Rothwell and M. J. Patzek, “An Interface for Verification and Validation of Unmanned Systems Mission Planning: Communicating Mission Objectives and Constraints,” *IEEE Transactions on Human-Machine Systems*, vol. 49, no. 6, pp. 642–651, dec 2019.

- [14] B. Rakotonarivo, N. Drougard, S. Conversy, and J. Garcia, "Supporting drone mission planning and risk assessment with interactive representations of operational parameters," in *2022 International Conference on Unmanned Aircraft Systems (ICUAS)*. IEEE, jun 2022, pp. 1091–1100.
- [15] S. Primatesta, A. Rizzo, and A. la Cour-Harbo, "Ground Risk Map for Unmanned Aircraft in Urban Environments," *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, vol. 97, no. 3-4, pp. 489–509, mar 2020.
- [16] N. Raballand, S. Bertrand, S. Lala, and B. Levasseur, "DROSERA: A DRONE Simulation Environment for Risk Assessment," in *Proceedings of the 31st European Safety and Reliability Conference (ESREL 2021)*. Singapore: Research Publishing Services, 2021, pp. 354–361.
- [17] D. Kelly and M. Efthymiou, "An analysis of human factors in fifty controlled flight into terrain aviation accidents from 2007 to 2017," *Journal of safety research*, vol. 69, pp. 155–165, 2019.
- [18] L. J. Prinzel, A. T. Pope, S. P. Williams, R. E. Bailey, J. J. Arthur, L. J. Kramer, and P. C. Schutte, "System and method for aiding pilot preview, rehearsal, review, and real-time visual acquisition of flight mission progress," 2012, uS8164485B2.
- [19] J. G. Grabowski, F. C. Curriero, S. P. Baker, and G. Li, "Exploratory spatial analysis of pilot fatality rates in general aviation crashes using geographic information systems," *American journal of epidemiology*, vol. 155, no. 5, pp. 398–405, 2002.
- [20] J. L. Burt, J. P. Chamberlain, K. M. Jones, and J. T. Coyne, "The impact of a weather information system display on general aviation pilot workload and performance," SAE Technical Paper, Tech. Rep., 2002.
- [21] T. Duckett, S. Pearson, S. Blackmore, B. Grieve, W.-H. Chen, G. Cielniak, J. Cleaversmith, J. Dai, S. Davis, C. Fox *et al.*, "Agricultural robotics: the future of robotic agriculture," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.06762*, 2018.
- [22] A. Colmerauer, "An introduction to Prolog III," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 33, no. 7, pp. 69–90, 1990.
- [23] S. Zaman, N. U. Haq, M. I. Gul, and A. Habib, "Robotic navigation based on logic-based planning," in *2017 International Conference on Communication, Computing and Digital Systems (C-CODE)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 396–401.
- [24] K. Kersting and L. De Raedt, "Bayesian logic programs," *arXiv preprint cs/0111058*, 2001.
- [25] D. Fierens, G. Van den Broeck, J. Renkens, D. Shterionov, B. Gutmann, I. Thon, G. Janssens, and L. De Raedt, "Inference and learning in probabilistic logic programs using weighted boolean formulas," *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 358–401, 2015.
- [26] R. Manhaeve, S. Dumancic, A. Kimmig, T. Demeester, and L. De Raedt, "Deepprolog: Neural probabilistic logic programming," *advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [27] A. Skryagin, W. Stammer, D. Ochs, D. S. Dhami, and K. Kersting, "SLASH: Embracing probabilistic circuits into neural answer set programming," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.03395*, 2021.
- [28] B. Flade, S. Kohaut, and J. Eggert, "Error Decomposition for Hybrid Localization Systems," in *2021 IEEE International Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 149–156.
- [29] D. Ochs, K. Wiertz, S. Bußmann, K. Kersting, and D. S. Dhami, "Effective risk detection for natural gas pipelines using low-resolution satellite images," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/16/2/266>
- [30] H. Chen and Z. Shi, "A spatial-temporal attention-based method and a new dataset for remote sensing image change detection," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 12, p. 1662, 2020.
- [31] S. Kohaut, B. Flade, D. S. Dhami, J. Eggert, and K. Kersting, "Towards probabilistic clearance, explanation and optimization," in *2024 International Conference on Unmanned Aircraft Systems (ICUAS)*, 2024, pp. 911–916.



Simon Kohaut graduated from the Technical University of Darmstadt, Germany, with a bachelor's degree in Computer Science and a master's degree in Autonomous Systems. Since 2022, he is pursuing his Ph.D. with the Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Lab in collaboration with the Honda Research Institute. His fields of interest are Neuro-Symbolic systems with a focus on probabilistic logic and its application in navigation under time and safety constraints.



Benedict Flade studied simulation and control of mechatronic systems and received a master's degree from TU Darmstadt, Germany. Since 2016, he is working as a scientist at the Honda Research Institute Europe GmbH. His research aims to improve both terrestrial and aerial intelligent transportation systems. Specifically, his research interests cover environment representation concepts, digital cartography, and vehicle localization systems, including both absolute and map-relative positioning approaches.



Daniel Ochs graduated from the Technical University of Darmstadt, Germany, with a bachelor's degree in Business Informatics and a master's degree in Computer Science. Since 2022, he is pursuing his Ph.D. with the Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Lab. His fields of interest are Neuro-Symbolic AI and multimodal models for Visual Question Answering.



Devendra Singh Dhami joined the Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence group at TU Eindhoven as an Assistant Professor in 2023. Before moving to Eindhoven, he completed his doctorate at the University of Texas at Dallas in 2020. Afterward, he spent three years as a postdoctoral researcher at TU Darmstadt in Germany and became a junior research group leader at the Hessian Center for Artificial Intelligence in 2022. Devendra's research interests currently focus on successfully incorporating causality and reasoning into deep learning systems.



Julian Eggert received his Ph.D. degree in physics from the Technical University of Munich. In 1999, he joined Honda R&D (Germany) and, in 2003, the Honda Research Institute, where he is currently a Chief Scientist and leads projects in artificial cognitive systems with applications in car and robotics domains. His fields of interest are generative models for perception, large-scale models for visual processing and scene analysis, and semantic environment models for context-embedded reasoning, situation classification, risk prediction, and behavior planning.



Kristian Kersting is a Full Professor at the Computer Science Department of the TU Darmstadt University, Germany. He is the head of the Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning lab, a member of the Centre for Cognitive Science, a faculty of the ELLIS Unit Darmstadt, and the founding co-director of the Hessian Center for Artificial Intelligence. After receiving his Ph.D. from the University of Freiburg in 2006, he was with the MIT, Fraunhofer IAIS, the University of Bonn, and the TU Dortmund. His main research interests are statistical relational artificial intelligence and deep (probabilistic) programming and learning.