

Extending Structural Causal Models for Use in Autonomous Embodied Systems

Rhys Howard

Oxford Robotics Institute, Dept. of Eng. Sci., University of Oxford, 17 Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3PJ, UK

RHYSHOWARD@LIVE.COM

Lars Kunze

Bristol Robotics Laboratory, T-Block, UWE Bristol, Bristol, BS16 1QY, UK

LARS.KUNZE@UWE.AC.UK

Abstract

Much work has been done to develop causal reasoning techniques across a number of domains, however the utilisation of causality within autonomous systems is still in its infancy. Autonomous systems would greatly benefit from the integration of causality through the use of representations such as structural causal models (SCMs). The system would be afforded a higher level of transparency, it would enable post-hoc explanations of outcomes, and assist in the online inference of exogenous variables. These qualities are either directly beneficial to the autonomous system or a valuable step in building public trust and informing regulation.

To such an end we present a case study in which we describe a module-based autonomous driving system comprised of SCMs. Approaching this task requires considerations of a number of challenges when dealing with a system of great complexity and size, that must operate for extended periods of time by itself. Here we describe these challenges, and present solutions. The first of these is SCM contexts, with the remainder being three new variable categories — two of which are based upon functional programming monads. Finally, we conclude by presenting an example application of the causal capabilities of the autonomous driving system. In this example, we aim to attribute culpability between vehicular agents in a hypothetical road collision incident.

Keywords: Causal Systems, Autonomous Vehicles, XAI, Structural Causal Models

1. Introduction

Causality has been established as an important aspect of systems that wish to be transparent, avoid confounders, and provide post-hoc explanations for outcomes and behaviours (Hellström, 2021; Diehl and Ramirez-Amaro, 2022). However there are few examples of these systems being developed and used in practice. While examples of causality applied within autonomous systems such as robotics (Cannizzaro and Kunze, 2023), these often rely upon simplifications such as a grid-world representation, which limits the immediate usefulness for real-world application. Here we aim to explore the process of bridging the gap between causal literature and real-world applications.

Establishing accountability and transparency for complex autonomous systems (CASs) is critical to building public trust and enabling proper regulation of such systems, especially when risk to humans is involved. While there has been much emphasis placed on the development of methods such as neural networks in recent times, these methods have been demonstrated to possess poor transparency and explainability (von Eschenbach, 2021). By

integrating causality alongside the concept of a black-box for autonomous systems (Winfield et al., 2022), we can facilitate future development and regulation in a responsible manner mirroring other fields (e.g. the airline industry).

In this paper, we aim to present a case study of developing a CAS comprised of SCMs by considering the case of an autonomous vehicle (AV). We implement a model of an AV that is fully described in terms of an SCM graph structure. Importantly, attempting to do so introduces a number of challenges which must be considered, and here we present a discussion and describe our solution. Finally, we provide an example of applying the aforementioned system to a collision scenario involving several vehicles in order to aid in assigning culpability. Finally we present a summary of the paper and paths for future work.

2. Related Work

2.1. Causality in XAI

Causal models have been identified as valuable in representing relationships between variables in a multitude of domains (Mainzer, 2010). Here we focus upon the use of causality within CASs, due to the utility of explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) for such systems (e.g. AVs, service robots). XAI refers to AI either augmented with or inherently possessing the ability to explain its behaviour. This can either be achieved by the AI actively providing explanations or by passively providing mechanisms through which the AI’s mechanisms can be interpreted. Regardless of the exact approach, causal models have been identified as a core concept of XAI (Gunning and Aha, 2019). Critically, recent work has shown that many interpretations of accountability are rooted in causality (Kacianka et al., 2019, 2020; Llorca et al., 2023). This implies that not only are causal systems desirable for interpretation purposes, but are also critical for building accountable complex systems. This will be required of high-risk embodied AI systems such as autonomous vehicles deployed in the real world, as it will be hard to establish public trust and regulations otherwise.

2.2. Causality in Autonomous Systems

Multiple works have described the increasing need to incorporate causal models as a component of autonomous systems (Gadd et al., 2020; Hellström, 2021). One of the most popular uses of causality here is to describe the behaviour of autonomous systems at various levels of abstraction. At the highest level, Smith and Ramamoorthy (2020) describes the application of overhead image saliency analysis to allow causal reasoning on robot behaviour. Castri et al. (2023) aims for a similar goal but applies a combination of existing observation- and intervention-based techniques to develop a method that continuously learns a causal model. At the most discrete level, Baumann et al. (2022) extend upon existing work (Rubenstein et al., 2018) by identifying the causal structures inherent to dynamical system using the controllability of certain variables to carry out interventions. Additionally, there is other work which aims to give robots an understanding of the behaviour of other agents (e.g. humans) through causal modelling (Wich et al., 2022).

An adjacent field of research is utilising existing causal models to aid in discovering root causes or providing explanations. To this end Ibrahim et al. (2019) present a semi-autonomous method for combining a mixture of fault / attack models and domain knowledge

in order to provide a holistic causal model. This in turn supports the derivation of explanations for the cyber-physical systems upon which they focus. In the same field, [Diehl and Ramirez-Amaro \(2022\)](#) give a method entirely focused upon using an existing causal model to produce explanations for failures by comparing the observed variable values with the closest variable values that produce a non-failure outcome. Other works take a slightly different approach, focusing on responsibility attribution for agents producing a given outcome ([Franklin et al., 2022](#); [Triantafyllou and Radanovic, 2023](#)).

Within robotics in particular, causality has also been applied to planning. For example, [Diehl and Ramirez-Amaro \(2023\)](#) expands upon their previous work on post-hoc explanations to anticipate failures and take corrective action. More generally, causality has attracted attention from the reinforcement learning (RL) community, who aim to develop methods that can balance exploring to learn a causal model and exploiting it ([Bareinboim et al., 2015](#); [Gasse et al., 2022](#); [He et al., 2023](#)). While this makes these techniques applicable across a number of domains, it is not suitable for high risk applications such as autonomous driving. Here recent work by [Cannizzaro and Kunze \(2023\)](#) explores combining SCMs and partially observable Markov decision processes (POMDPs) for the purposes of probabilistic robot planning under confounded decision-making.

Lastly, causality is finding use in augmenting observation and state representation. In the realm of computer vision, [Zhang et al. \(2023\)](#) provides an overview of computer vision tasks and the utilisation of causality within them. A primary reason for applying causality here is to minimise the risk of spurious correlations between variables ([Ding et al., 2022](#)). Outside of computer vision, causality has also been discussed or applied to problems involving the epistemic ([Stocking et al., 2022](#)) and aleatoric ([Cannizzaro et al., 2023](#)) uncertainty associated with observations.

2.3. Causality in Autonomous Vehicles

While we provide a general approach for building causally integrated CASs, here we give an overview of causality for autonomous vehicles as this is the topic of our case study.

A useful area of research to consider are works that have carried out causal discovery benchmarks on autonomous vehicle related data. [McDuff et al. \(2021\)](#) present *CausalCity*, a technique for generating semi-realistic data exhibiting vehicle-following behaviour. This work is useful in that it evaluates three causal discovery techniques — NRI ([Kipf et al., 2018](#)), NS-DR ([Yi et al., 2020](#)), and V-CDN ([Li et al., 2020b](#)) — with the caveat that these were given video data as input, as opposed to time series variable data. In terms of work utilising time series data, [Howard and Kunze \(2023b\)](#) gives an evaluation across 10 further causal discovery methods. They find that many contemporary causal discovery techniques struggle to cope with the qualities exhibited by driving agents.

Since then, further work has attempted to overcome this, with some measure of success ([Howard and Kunze, 2023a](#)). However, this work fails to utilise formal definitions of SCMs and relies upon overly basic kinematics. Other work has attempted to utilise causal discovery as part of a wider process, for example [de Haan et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Samsami et al. \(2021\)](#) integrate causal discovery as part of imitation learning on vehicles, while [Tang et al. \(2022\)](#) extends NRI to include semantic labelling for the purposes of generating explanations for vehicle behaviour. Lastly, some work considers the influence image data has on decision

making in vehicles (Kim and Canny, 2017; Li et al., 2020a), however this is only relevant to camera-based systems.

Once causal models have been discovered or crafted, they can then be utilised within the autonomous driving domain. By far the largest use of these models is the previously discussed explanation and responsibility attribution capabilities (Ibrahim et al., 2019; Diehl and Ramirez-Amaro, 2022; Franklin et al., 2022; Triantafyllou and Radanovic, 2023). However, there has been some work focusing more specifically on utilising these models for explanation specifically for autonomous vehicles (Gyevnar et al., 2023). Additionally, while it is once again specific to camera-based systems, explainability is an important area of research within deep vision-based methods (Zablocki et al., 2022), particularly given that many of these methods are effectively black boxes.

Another use of established causal models is to augment generative methods. In particular, Ding et al. (2023) utilise causal models for the purposes of better generating data for driving scenarios, given that causal models better represent inter-variable relationships than associative probabilistic models alone.

Arguably one of the closest works to our own is presented by Maier et al. (2023). They use SCMs to describe a two-vehicle braking scenario and carry out causal inferences using it. However the SCM relies upon a high level of abstraction, and as a result the structural equations associated with the variables must be learnt, and rely upon the CARLA simulator¹ to do so. This restricts the use of the model to the two-vehicle braking scenario and limits the level of granularity at which interventions can be carried out.

Lastly, while the type of causality they explore does not align with the established practices of the field, Thomas and Groth (2023) nonetheless present an interesting discussion of causality in autonomous driving. They go as far as to propose a new framework that satisfies the requirements presented by several existing standards and frameworks. This makes the work interesting in terms of building a practical system, even if the framework in its current form does not support the kind of causal reasoning established by Pearl (2009).

2.4. Our Contribution

Having described a variety of related work, we can now describe how this work stands apart as a novel contribution to the field. Crucially, while some works have utilised SCMs to describe systems and inter-agent interactions (Ibrahim et al., 2019; Maier et al., 2023; Cannizzaro and Kunze, 2023) these are very high level. This affects the resolution at which we can carry out causal reasoning, as these high-level variables are effectively composed of many low-level primitive variables. Furthermore, the SCMs in these works are limited in scope to specific systems or scenarios.

While work has been conducted to carry out causal reasoning with a higher resolution underlying model (Howard and Kunze, 2023a; Thomas and Groth, 2023), the instances we are aware of do not utilise formally defined SCMs, which limits their use with existing formal causal reasoning methods.

Therefore, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to describe the construction of a detailed SCM for use in an autonomous system. Furthermore, we describe some of the challenges encountered through this and the novel elements developed to overcome them.

1. <https://carla.org/>

In summary, through the autonomous vehicle oriented case study, we aim to explore the process of engineering SCMs to act as a foundation for CASs. In doing so, we also present a discussion on how to transition from theoretical formulations of causality, to real-world applications.

3. Background

3.1. Structural Causal Models

In this work we integrate causality into an autonomous system by defining it in terms of SCMs. An SCM $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{F}, P(\mathcal{U}) \rangle$, is defined in terms of exogenous variables \mathcal{U} , endogenous variables \mathcal{V} , deterministic functions \mathcal{F} , and a probability distribution over \mathcal{U} given as $P(\mathcal{U})$. The exogenous variables represent factors outside of the modelled system, and have their values determined by probability distributions that are independent of all other system variables. Meanwhile the endogenous variables have their values determined by the deterministic functions, defined in terms the parents of \mathcal{V} . For any given endogenous variable $V \in \mathcal{V}$, its parents $Pa(V) \subset (\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{U})$ are comprised of any number of endogenous variables and at most one exogenous variable. Given that SCMs are in a sense an extension of Directed Acyclical Graphs (DAGs), an SCM must also be devoid of cycles.

3.2. Complex Autonomous Systems

Before we can discuss the building CCASs we must first establish what a complex autonomous system (CAS) is. The autonomous nature of the systems discussed in this work is less of a domain restriction, and more of a motivating factor due to these systems having inherently less oversight. However, the knowledge drawn from this discussions indeed has applications to complex systems outside of autonomous systems.

Meanwhile, we define a system as complex if one cannot encapsulate the system via a traditional causal model — such as an SCM — either due to software engineering or practical constraints. Some examples of what may cause a system to be considered complex are given below:

- The system is comprised of several modules or classes which may or may not be combined e.g. a vehicle is a rigid body, but a rigid body is not necessarily a vehicle. As a result, there is ambiguity as to whether certain variables should be endogenous or exogenous that is determined by the exact combination of system components. In the previous example the force applied to a rigid body would be exogenous by default, but assuming the rigid body was a self propelled vehicle, the force would then be an endogenous variable determined by variables relating to the vehicle. SCMs by default provide no means of providing such adaptability.
- The system may require a large number of variables such that storing values or distributions across all variables would be infeasible. This is particularly true for autonomous systems expected to run for prolonged periods of time.
- Encapsulation is typically a desired quality of system modules, yet SCMs typically do not provide a means to track and modify meta information such as the current




Figure 1: An overview of the architecture of the causal autonomous system for vehicles.

time index. Most methods rely upon storing data to be input or inferred externally, however this violates encapsulation principles. Alternatively one can roll-out the time steps of the SCM such that all variables are represented for all relevant times. This once again proves to be an issue for long running autonomous systems, both because of the requirement to replicate the SCM for each time step, and because the number of time steps required increases with time, thus requiring dynamic modification of the SCM.

4. Case Study: Autonomous Vehicles

4.1. Overall System Design

The system we describe aims to represent autonomous vehicles and the interactions between them. To this end we combine a mixture of object oriented (OO) and functional paradigms. The OO aspects of the system are derived from the use of classes to represent various modules of the system. The class relations are then composed via a series of member variable and inheritance relations between classes. In addition, a member variable relation ties all vehicles to a shared environment object to facilitate inter-vehicle interactions.

The functional aspects of the system are inherent to the underlying SCM structure. In order for a function $f \in \mathcal{F}$ to maintain its deterministic nature it must be a pure function within a programming context. Namely the functions should not have side-effects such as file input/output or modifications to non-local variables (e.g. caching). Overcoming the restrictions of this will be one of the solutions discussed in the next section.

Fig. 1 depicts an overview of the system that illustrates the OO class relationships. A detailed specification of each of the underlying SCMs of these classes is given in Appendix A. However a brief description of the classes is provided below:

- **Rigid Body:** Represents the dynamics of a rectangular prism parallel to the ground plane in 2D. The rigid body can take force and torque from an environment as well from a second source, either from a member variable or inheritance relation.
- **FWD Car:** Represents a front wheel drive car that inherits from the rigid body class. Takes motor torque and steer from an external member variable / inheritance

relation source. These are translated into force and torque by modelling the car with a 2D front wheel drive dynamic bicycle model (Guiggiani, 2018).

- **Motor Torque Control FWD Car:** Provides a controller that outputs a motor torque based upon a goal speed and a target time to achieve this goal speed at. A high-level summary of the calculations carried out to do so is given in Algorithm 1 in Appendix B.
- **Steer Control FWD Car:** Provides a controller that outputs a steering angle based upon a goal lane and a target time to reach this goal lane by. A high-level summary of the calculations carried out to do so is given in Algorithm 2 in Appendix B.
- **Full Control FWD Car:** Inherits from both the motor torque control and steer control in order to provide the functionality of both.
- **Planner:** Plans for the autonomous vehicle and in doing so provides speed and lane goals for the control modules. Here we generate actions by combining a vectors of possible speeds, lanes and target times. The outcomes associated with carrying these actions out over a predetermined horizon is then approximated via simulation. Lastly, a configurable reward function is used to select the best action to take. We do not specify any particular reward function as that is beyond the focus of this work and the described system is reward function agnostic regardless. Additionally, in terms of the simulation there are two choices. The first is to utilise the described system itself to carry out the simulations. The second is to utilise another simulator to perform the simulations on the system’s behalf. This may be preferable if performance is a concern as a more lightweight simulator could be used, at the expense of transparency.
- **Rigid Body Environment:** Represents the environment rigid bodies operate within, facilitating inter-agent and agent-environment interactions.
 - **Entity:** Represents the combined influence of the environment on a given rigid body. Effectively aggregates collision forces / torques and adds drag force. The combined force / torque is then propagated to the corresponding rigid body.
 - * **Link:** Represents the influence of a second rigid body on a given rigid body. In this case, this just encapsulates the calculation of collision force / torque between the two rigid bodies.

4.2. SCM Function Monads

The previous subsection described the fact that by default the functions of an SCM should be pure, or in other words lacking side-effects. Here we describe the concept of monads in the context of SCM functions, drawing upon work conducted within the field of functional programming to facilitate potentially impure operations (Wadler, 1992). With that being said, the monads introduced in this work are pure and thus can be used within an SCM.

To briefly summarise the concept of monads, $M a$ represents the access of a type a under the context given by the monad M . What exactly this context represents depends upon the monad, ranging from file input/output operations, to list construction, to representing

option types. In addition to a monad acting as a functor it must provide the following functions:

- **Return:** $a \rightarrow M a$
Wraps expression of type a in a monad M . This is used by variables that carry out additional computations to wrap their return value.
- **Bind:** $(M a) \rightarrow (a \rightarrow M b) \rightarrow (M b)$
Converts an expression of type $M a$ to an expression of type $M b$ by unwrapping $M a$ and applying $a \rightarrow M b$. This is used in an SCM to propagate monads wrapping parent return values to the values returned by their children.

Thus we can use monads as a means of executing computations that fall outside the remit of what is typically possible with an SCM. In our work, monads are not explicitly represented in code, but nonetheless provide a theoretical underpinning to justify such computations in code. Most of this work is described in terms of variables rather than their types. As such we utilise a function $\tau(\cdot)$ to return the type for a given variable. This allows us to generically define the monads without specifying explicit types.

4.3. Complex System Solutions

4.3.1. SCM CONTEXT

When working with SCMs operating with temporal data, there are typically a few ways of modelling temporal aspects within the SCM. A summary of these is given by [Assaad et al. \(2022\)](#). The most abstract representation is a summary time-graph, which has variables causally connected regardless of any temporal lag. This is fine for some use-cases but for our system this would lead to cycles within the SCM. At the opposite end is a full time-graph, which rolls out to cover every time step. This however leads to a large SCM with the need to dynamically expand it further as time proceeds. Lastly there is the window time-graph, which captures a small window of time with the SCM. The approach we take somewhat mirrors this, albeit focused on a single time step given none of the causal relations have a time lag greater than this. This is reflective of the Markov property of the system we consider, i.e. the next world state depends only on the current world state. In this sense the SCM as a whole describes a transition function. However, in contrast to previous work ([Cannizzaro and Kunze, 2023](#)) we represent the time step transition within the SCM itself.

The first step in facilitating this is to introduce the idea of a variable context \mathcal{C} . A variable context is a thread-local static data structure that holds meta information utilised across SCMs for computations. It is important to note that this contextual information must not be used as a means to introduce exogenous data, as this is the purpose of exogenous variables. In the case of our work, the two pieces of information stored in \mathcal{C} are the current time and the time step size. These collectively act as a time index proxy for the SCM. Thus, rather than using a summary time-graph, or rolling out the full time-graph, we can use the variable context to select which time step is currently being captured by the SCM.

4.3.2. TEMPORAL INTERACTION VARIABLES

While the concept of a variable context allows us to focus upon a specific time step transition it does not immediately allow us to represent temporal causal relationships. In order to

represent these we present several temporal interaction variable types:

$$f_{V_{T^{\delta^*}}} \in \mathcal{F} : \tau(V_P) \rightarrow T^{\delta^*} \tau(V_P) \quad (1)$$

Example: Multiplying mean velocity by the time step size to get the position change between time steps.

$$f_{V_{T^{\delta/}}} \in \mathcal{F} : \tau(V_P) \rightarrow T^{\delta/} \tau(V_P) \quad (2)$$

Example: Calculating the acceleration necessary to achieve the speed resulting from elastic collision of two rigid bodies in the space of a single time step.

$$f_{V_{T^{\text{diff}}}} \in \mathcal{F} : \tau(V_P) \rightarrow T^{\text{diff}} \tau(V_P) \quad (3)$$

Example: Calculating the difference between the current time and the goal time for accomplishing an action.

$$f_{V_{T^-}} \in \mathcal{F} : \tau(V_P) \rightarrow T^- \tau(V_P) \quad (4)$$

Example: Getting the position associated with the previous time step for the purpose of calculating the position associated with the current time step.

All of these variable types rely upon various monads, determine their value from a return function, and have a single parent. $V_{T^{\delta^*}}$ and $V_{T^{\delta/}}$ are simple, they determine their value from the product and quotient between the parent V_P and the time step size respectively. Since the time step size is for all intents and purposes constant for any given application, the purity of these function is a given. $V_{T^{\text{diff}}}$ is slightly more complicated, representing the difference between the time provided by the parent V_P and the current time given by the variable context \mathcal{C} . V_{T^-} is arguably the most complex, representing the derivation of V_P for the previous time step. This is achieved by subtracting the time step size from the current time stored in \mathcal{C} , determining V_P and then reverting the current time to its original value. Both $V_{T^{\text{diff}}}$ and V_{T^-} maintain function purity given that they are both analogous to functions as they would be represented as a full time-graph. In other words, envisage V_{T^-} was recursively replaced by a roll-out of the SCM. Then imagine $V_{T^{\text{diff}}}$ replaced its references to \mathcal{C} with constant values determined by the time as represented by that part of the rolled out SCM. Given that the resulting SCM would be pure, and these operations effectively achieve the operations of $f_{V_{T^{\text{diff}}}}$ and $f_{V_{T^-}}$, we can state that these functions are also themselves pure.

4.3.3. BUFFER VARIABLES

As discussed in Sec. 3.2 there are ideally two conditions we want to maintain with regards to data relevant to an SCM. The first is that we do not necessarily want to store data for every variable, particularly when the data is captured across many time steps and there are a large number of variables present. While there is some work which has been carried out on determining which variables to capture data for (Kacianka et al., 2020), these methods do not necessarily specify how this data should be stored. Another consideration to have is that in order to abide by software engineering principals of encapsulation, data relevant to the SCM should be stored within its class and accessed via member functions.




Figure 2: Illustration of the means of connecting system modules via socket variables. Here exogenous variables are indicated with circles, endogenous variables with squares, and socket variables with octagons. Variable B effectively acts as an exogenous variable with a default distribution for when module 1 operates alone, but when connected to module 2 via variable Y it acts as an endogenous variable, providing a proxy for Y .

Thus we define a buffer variable $V_B \in \mathcal{V}$ as having a single parent $V_P \in \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{V}$ and a function $f_{V_B} \in \mathcal{F} : \tau(V_P) \rightarrow B\tau(V_P)$. Here B is a monad and f_{V_B} is effectively its return function. The computation carried out by the constructor of B is to internally buffer or cache the value / distribution given by the parent V_P when f_{V_B} is called, such that by default any future calls to f_{V_B} will return the buffered data. Importantly, the buffered value is specific to the time step stored in the SCM context as introduced in Sec. 4.3.1.

There are instances where one may want to override this behaviour, such as when carrying out counterfactual queries where variable values / distributions may be altered. However, use of this monad should not result in impure behaviour due to the variable only caching data generated by the SCM itself. The main use-case for buffering is to specify where data should be recorded in order to minimise the storage of non-useful information.

4.3.4. SOCKET VARIABLES

When engineering systems it is desirable to pursue the practice of modularisation. This is the practice of separating code into packaged files / libraries in order to develop specific aspects of the system in isolation. In doing so, there is reduced entanglement between modules and developing the modules becomes simpler, as each addresses a particular sub-problem. However, by default SCMs do not support the idea of modularisation since exogenous and endogenous variables are explicitly distinct sets within an SCM. One can hypothetically join two SCMs together by constructing a new SCM in which the graphical structures of the original graphs are joined at a given variable. However, assuming each SCM has a class which specifies member functions, the resulting type of this joining operation would need a new class unique to the particular combination of SCMs. This limits flexibility and falls contrary to the principals of modularisation.

Thus we provide a novel definition for modular SCMs $\mathcal{M}' = \langle \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{F}, P(\mathcal{U}), P(\mathcal{S}) \rangle$. This adds \mathcal{S} and $P(\mathcal{S})$ to the definition, the set of socket variables and the default probability distributions over these socket variables. Socket variables by default behave like exogenous variables, drawing upon $P(\mathcal{S})$. However, unlike exogenous variables one can *plug in* another variable, causing the socket variable to draw from that variable in lieu of $P(\mathcal{S})$. Given




Figure 3: Illustration of fault attribution analysis for a scene in which the red vehicle overtakes and the green vehicle speeds up, resulting on a head-on collision. Each subfigure shows left to right: the initial scene with intended behaviour, the final scene outcome, and a depiction of data propagation through the underlying SCM.

that access to the SCMs we describe is limited to the member functions specified by class definitions, one can control which SCMs may be joined, and how they are joined. This can then be used to represent inheritance or composition relations between modules. We illustrate this process in Fig. 2.

4.4. Implementation

The final system is comprised of ~ 200 variables distributed across the various system modules. Nearly all of these variables represent primitive low-level operations alone (e.g. product, sum, negation) in order to maximise function reuse and minimise the complexity of tasks such as back propagation. In some cases however, such as collision detection, more complex functions are utilised. While this does notably reduce the complexity of the SCM itself, integrating these complex functions is nonetheless a goal for future work.

In terms of the code itself, the causal autonomous vehicle system was implemented in C++20 on Ubuntu 20.04. A full guide to the system specifications is given in Appendix C. Furthermore, we make our code available via a GitHub repository².

4.5. Example Application

In order to demonstrate the merit of the causal autonomous system resulting from this case study, we describe an example of the SCM being utilised post-hoc to attribute fault to vehicular agents involved in a collision. In order to do so, we carry out counterfactual infer-

2. <https://github.com/cognitive-robots/scm-aes-paper-resources>

ence to imagine alternate outcomes based upon interventions on the behaviour of vehicles, similar to past works (Howard and Kunze, 2023a; Diehl and Ramirez-Amaro, 2022).

An overview of the observed scene is shown in Fig. 4.5. In this scene a red vehicle overtakes a blue vehicle, and following this a green vehicle going the opposite direction speeds up. The red vehicle does not have sufficient time to complete the process of overtaking before it collides head on with the green vehicle. Thus in order to help determine which agents are at fault we should intervene upon their planned behaviour in counterfactual imaginings of how the scene would have played out, and whether a collision still would have occurred. Here we have Fig. 4.5 depict the imagined scene without green speeding up, Fig. 4.5 depict the imagined scene without red overtaking, and Fig. 4.5 depict the imagined scene devoid of either of these actions.

By considering all outcomes shown in Fig. 3, we can see that neither action in isolation would have been sufficient to cause the collision, and that both were necessary for the collision to have occurred. This naively would point fault at both agents for the outcome, however there are several factors that can be considered to refine this diagnosis. The first and most simple to consider is the matter of temporal precedence, i.e. the green vehicle sped up after red had already begun overtaking, and thus it is to blame. In lower risk cases — outside of autonomous driving — this alone may be helpful in determining fault. However, another angle to consider is the norms and laws that apply. While the green vehicle is indeed suspect here for accelerating after red had begun overtaking, one could also argue that red was ultimately at fault for attempting to overtake without consideration for incoming traffic. Lastly there is also the matter of partial observation to consider. Although it has not been represented in our SCM, nor in our collision scene, there may be instances where partial observation (e.g. because of a hill, foliage, etc.) may absolve a party of blame, provided that they acted appropriately with the information they had available.

5. Conclusion & Future Work

This paper has described the challenges associated with incorporating causal models as an integral part of complex autonomous systems and explored how these can be overcome by presenting a case study within the autonomous vehicle domain. In doing so, we explain how the architecture of the case study was developed in such a way as to adhere to coding paradigms such as object orientation, modularisation, and encapsulation. Achieving this required the introduction of SCM contexts, in addition to temporal interaction, buffer and socket variables, the with a couple of these being grounded in the concept of monads taken from functional programming. Lastly, we describe a qualitative example of the application of causality within a post-hoc collision analysis scenario, where the underlying SCM can be used to infer information regarding fault attribution.

Given that this work has aimed primarily to describe engineering a causal system the focus has been on discussing elements of a qualitative nature. As such, with the groundwork laid by this paper we would suggest an ablation study be conducted with the architecture and a variety of driving data in order to analyse the efficacy of such a system from a quantitative point of view. In addition, while not a high priority, replacing high complexity functions such as those used in planning and collision detection with collections of SCM variables and functions would do more to further our goal of a highly transparent causal

system. To conclude, we argue that at least within the domain of autonomous systems the focus of contemporary work has been on providing useful theoretical contributions. We however aim to push, both in this work and future work, the readiness of causal modelling to be used in autonomous systems for academia, industry, and beyond.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the EPSRC project RAILS (grant reference: EP/W011344/1) and the Oxford Robotics Institute research project RobotCycle.

References

- Charles K Assaad, Emilie Devijver, and Eric Gaussier. Survey and evaluation of causal discovery methods for time series. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 73:767–819, 2022.
- Elias Bareinboim, Andrew Forney, and Judea Pearl. Bandits with unobserved confounders: A causal approach. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015.
- Dominik Baumann, Friedrich Solowjow, Karl Henrik Johansson, and Sebastian Trimpe. Identifying causal structure in dynamical systems. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=X2BodlyLvT>.
- Ricardo Cannizzaro and Lars Kunze. Car-despot: Causally-informed online pomdp planning for robots in confounded environments, 2023.
- Ricardo Cannizzaro, Jonathan Routley, and Lars Kunze. Towards a causal probabilistic framework for prediction, action-selection & explanations for robot block-stacking tasks. In *IROS 2023 Workshop - Causality for Robotics*, Oct 2023.
- Luca Castri, Sariah Mghames, and Nicola Bellotto. From continual learning to causal discovery in robotics. In Martin Mundt, Keiland W. Cooper, Devendra Singh Dhami, Adéle Ribeiro, James Seale Smith, Alexis Bellot, and Tyler Hayes, editors, *Proceedings of The First AAAI Bridge Program on Continual Causality*, volume 208 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 85–91. PMLR, Feb 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v208/castri23a.html>.
- Pim de Haan, Dinesh Jayaraman, and Sergey Levine. Causal confusion in imitation learning. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/file/947018640bf36a2bb609d3557a285329-Paper.pdf>.
- Maximilian Diehl and Karinne Ramirez-Amaro. Why did i fail? a causal-based method to find explanations for robot failures. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7(4): 8925–8932, 2022. doi: 10.1109/LRA.2022.3188889.

- Maximilian Diehl and Karinne Ramirez-Amaro. A causal-based approach to explain, predict and prevent failures in robotic tasks. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 162:104376, 2023. ISSN 0921-8890. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.robot.2023.104376>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921889023000155>.
- Hao Ding, Jintan Zhang, Peter Kazanzides, Jie Ying Wu, and Mathias Unberath. Carts: Causality-driven robot tool segmentation from vision and kinematics data. In Linwei Wang, Qi Dou, P. Thomas Fletcher, Stefanie Speidel, and Shuo Li, editors, *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2022*, page 387–398, Cham, 2022. Springer Nature Switzerland. ISBN 978-3-031-16449-1.
- Wenhao Ding, Haohong Lin, Bo Li, and Ding Zhao. Causalaf: Causal autoregressive flow for safety-critical driving scenario generation. In Karen Liu, Dana Kulic, and Jeff Ichnowski, editors, *Proceedings of The 6th Conference on Robot Learning*, volume 205 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 812–823. PMLR, 14–18 Dec 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v205/ding23a.html>.
- Matija Franklin, Hal Ashton, Edmond Awad, and David Lagnado. Causal framework of artificial autonomous agent responsibility. In *Proceedings of the 2022 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, AIES ’22, page 276–284, New York, NY, USA, 2022. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450392471. doi: 10.1145/3514094.3534140. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3514094.3534140>.
- Matthew Gadd, Daniele de Martini, Letizia Marchegiani, Paul Newman, and Lars Kunze. Sense–assess–explain (sax): Building trust in autonomous vehicles in challenging real-world driving scenarios. In *2020 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 150–155, 2020. doi: 10.1109/IV47402.2020.9304819.
- Maxime Gasse, Damien GRASSET, Guillaume Gaudron, and Pierre-Yves Oudeyer. Causal reinforcement learning using observational and interventional data, 2022. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=RW_GTtTfHJ6.
- Massimo Guiggiani. *The Science of Vehicle Dynamics: Handling, Braking, and Ride of Road and Race Cars*. Springer, 2018.
- David Gunning and David Aha. Darpa’s explainable artificial intelligence (xai) program. *AI Magazine*, 40(2):44–58, Jun 2019. doi: 10.1609/aimag.v40i2.2850. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/aimagazine/index.php/aimagazine/article/view/2850>.
- Balint Gyevar, Cheng Wang, Christopher G. Lucas, Shay B. Cohen, and Stefano V. Albrecht. Causal explanations for sequential decision-making in multi-agent systems, 2023.
- Tom He, Jasmina Gajcin, and Ivana Dusparic. Causal counterfactuals for improving the robustness of reinforcement learning, 2023.
- Thomas Hellström. The relevance of causation in robotics: A review, categorization, and analysis. *Paladyn, Journal of Behavioral Robotics*, 12(1):238–255, 2021. doi: doi:10.1515/pjbr-2021-0017. URL <https://doi.org/10.1515/pjbr-2021-0017>.

- Rhys Howard and Lars Kunze. Simulation-based counterfactual causal discovery on real world driver behaviour. In *2023 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 1–8, 2023a. doi: 10.1109/IV55152.2023.10186705.
- Rhys Peter Matthew Howard and Lars Kunze. Evaluating temporal observation-based causal discovery techniques applied to road driver behaviour. In Mihaela van der Schaar, Cheng Zhang, and Dominik Janzing, editors, *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Causal Learning and Reasoning*, volume 213 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 473–498. PMLR, 11–14 Apr 2023b. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v213/howard23a.html>.
- Amjad Ibrahim, Severin Kacianka, Alexander Pretschner, Charles Hartsell, and Gabor Karsai. Practical causal models for cyber-physical systems. In Julia M. Badger and Kristin Yvonne Rozier, editors, *NASA Formal Methods*, page 211–227, Cham, 2019. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-030-20652-9.
- Severin Kacianka, Amjad Ibrahim, Alexander Pretschner, Alexander Trende, and Andreas Lüdtke. Extending causal models from machines into humans. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, 308:17–31, Oct 2019. doi: 10.4204/eptcs.308.2. URL <https://doi.org/10.4204/eptcs.308.2>.
- Severin Kacianka, Amjad Ibrahim, and Alexander Pretschner. Expressing accountability patterns using structural causal models, 2020.
- Jinkyu Kim and John Canny. Interpretable learning for self-driving cars by visualizing causal attention. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, Oct 2017.
- Thomas Kipf, Ethan Fetaya, Kuan-Chieh Wang, Max Welling, and Richard Zemel. Neural relational inference for interacting systems. In Jennifer Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2688–2697. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/kipf18a.html>.
- Chengxi Li, Stanley H. Chan, and Yi-Ting Chen. Who make drivers stop? towards driver-centric risk assessment: Risk object identification via causal inference. In *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 10711–10718, 2020a. doi: 10.1109/IROS45743.2020.9341072.
- Yunzhu Li, Antonio Torralba, Anima Anandkumar, Dieter Fox, and Animesh Garg. Causal discovery in physical systems from videos. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 9180–9192. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020b. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/6822951732be44edf818dc5a97d32ca6-Abstract.html>.
- David Fernández Llorca, Vicky Charisi, Ronan Hamon, Ignacio Sánchez, and Emilia Gómez. Liability regimes in the age of ai: a use-case driven analysis of the burden of proof. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 76:613–644, 2023.

- Robert Maier, Lisa Grabinger, David Urlhart, and Jürgen Mottok. Causal models to support scenario-based testing of adas. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, pages 1–17, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TITS.2023.3317475.
- Klaus Mainzer. Causality in natural, technical, and social systems. *European Review*, 18(4):433–454, 2010. doi: 10.1017/S1062798710000244.
- Daniel McDuff, Yale Song, Jiyoung Lee, Vibhav Vineet, Sai Vemprala, Nicholas Gyde, Hadi Salman, Shuang Ma, Kwanghoon Sohn, and Ashish Kapoor. Causality: Complex simulations with agency for causal discovery and reasoning, 2021.
- Judea Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge university press, 2009.
- Paul K. Rubenstein, Stephan Bongers, Bernhard Schoelkopf, and Joris M. Mooij. From deterministic odes to dynamic structural causal models, 2018.
- Mohammad Reza Samsami, Mohammadhossein Bahari, Saber Salehkaleybar, and Alexandre Alahi. Causal imitative model for autonomous driving, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.03908>.
- Simón C. Smith and Subramanian Ramamoorthy. Semi-supervised learning from demonstration through program synthesis: An inspection robot case study. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, 319:81–101, Jul 2020. doi: 10.4204/eptcs.319.7. URL <https://doi.org/10.4204/eptcs.319.7>.
- Kaylene Caswell Stocking, Alison Gopnik, and Claire Tomlin. From robot learning to robot understanding: Leveraging causal graphical models for robotics. In Aleksandra Faust, David Hsu, and Gerhard Neumann, editors, *Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Robot Learning*, volume 164 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1776–1781. PMLR, Nov 2022. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v164/stocking22a.html>.
- Chen Tang, Nishan Srishankar, Sujitha Martin, and Masayoshi Tomizuka. Grounded relational inference: Domain knowledge driven explainable autonomous driving, 2022.
- Stephen Thomas and Katrina M Groth. Toward a hybrid causal framework for autonomous vehicle safety analysis. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part O: Journal of Risk and Reliability*, 237(2):367–388, 2023.
- Stelios Triantafyllou and Goran Radanovic. Towards computationally efficient responsibility attribution in decentralized partially observable mdps. In *Proceedings of the 2023 International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, AAMAS ’23, page 131–139, Richland, SC, 2023. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems. ISBN 9781450394321.
- Warren J von Eschenbach. Transparency and the black box problem: Why we do not trust ai. *Philosophy & Technology*, 34(4):1607–1622, 2021.
- Philip Wadler. The essence of functional programming. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*, pages 1–14, 1992.

Alexander Wich, Holger Schultheis, and Michael Beetz. Empirical estimates on hand manipulation are recoverable: A step towards individualized and explainable robotic support in everyday activities. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, AAMAS '22, page 1382–1390, Richland, SC, 2022. International Foundation for Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems. ISBN 9781450392136.

Alan F. T. Winfield, Anouk van Maris, Pericle Salvini, and Marina Jirotko. An ethical black box for social robots: a draft open standard, 2022.

Kexin Yi, Chuang Gan, Yunzhu Li, Pushmeet Kohli, Jiajun Wu, Antonio Torralba, and Joshua B. Tenenbaum. Clevrer: Collision events for video representation and reasoning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 8, 2020.

Éloi Zablocki, Hédi Ben-Younes, Patrick Pérez, and Matthieu Cord. Explainability of deep vision-based autonomous driving systems: Review and challenges. *Int. J. Comput. Vision*, 130(10):2425–2452, oct 2022. ISSN 0920-5691. doi: 10.1007/s11263-022-01657-x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11263-022-01657-x>.

Kexuan Zhang, Qiyu Sun, Chaoqiang Zhao, and Yang Tang. Causal reasoning in typical computer vision tasks, 2023.

Appendix A. Detailed SCM Specification

Shape / Area

-  Exogenous / Socket Variable
-  Endogenous Variable
-  Buffer Variable
-  Previous Time Step Variable
-  Time Step Size Product Variable
-  Time Step Size Quotient Variable
-  Current Time Difference

Colour = Data Source Class

Border

-  Private Variable
 -  Public Variable
 -  Socket Variable
 -  Output Variable
- Colour = Data Target Class

Figure 4: SCM Legend.

A.1. Rigid Body




Figure 5: Rigid Body SCM.

A.1.1. NON-PRIMITIVE FUNCTIONS

- $ORect(pos, rot, length, width)$: Constructs an oriented rectangle object with central position pos , rotation ros , length $length$ and width $width$.

A.2. FWD Car




Figure 6: FWD Car SCM.

A.3. Motor Torque Control FWD Car




Figure 7: Motor Torque Control FWD Car SCM.

A.3.1. NON-PRIMITIVE FUNCTIONS

- $to_secs(duration)$: Converts an abstract duration representation $duration$ to seconds.

A.4. Steer Control FWD Car




Figure 8: Steer Control FWD Car SCM.

A.4.1. NON-PRIMITIVE FUNCTIONS

- $to_secs(duration)$: Converts an abstract duration representation $duration$ to seconds.
- $map_point(lane_id, pos)$: Projects pos onto the closest point along the central path of the lane indicated by $lane_id$.

A.5. Full Control FWD Car

As described in Sec. 4.1, this module is essentially just a combination of the motor torque control and steer control modules. Thus if we define the motor torque control SCM as $\mathcal{M}'_{mt} = \langle \mathcal{U}_{mt}, \mathcal{V}_{mt}, \mathcal{S}_{mt}, \mathcal{F}_{mt}, P(\mathcal{U}_{mt}), P(\mathcal{S}_{mt}) \rangle$ and the steer control SCM as $\mathcal{M}'_s = \langle \mathcal{U}_s, \mathcal{V}_s, \mathcal{S}_s, \mathcal{F}_s, P(\mathcal{U}_s), P(\mathcal{S}_s) \rangle$ we can define the full control SCM as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}'_f = \langle & \mathcal{U}_{mt} \cup \mathcal{U}_s, \\ & \mathcal{V}_{mt} \cup \mathcal{V}_s, \\ & \mathcal{S}_{mt} \cup \mathcal{S}_s, \\ & \mathcal{F}_{mt} \cup \mathcal{F}_s, \\ & P(\mathcal{U}_{mt}) + P(\mathcal{U}_s) - P(\mathcal{U}_{mt})P(\mathcal{U}_s), \\ & P(\mathcal{S}_{mt}) + P(\mathcal{S}_s) - P(\mathcal{S}_{mt})P(\mathcal{S}_s) \rangle \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

A.6. Planner




Figure 9: Planner SCM.

A.6.1. NON-PRIMITIVE FUNCTIONS

- *calc_speed_goals(min, max, interval)*: Calculates a vector of potential speed goals based upon a minimum and maximum speed as well as an interval between them.
- *calc_time_goals(interval, horizon)*: Calculates a vector of potential time goals based upon the current time, a time horizon, and an interval between the current time and the current time plus the time horizon.
- *valid_lanes(pos)*: Determines valid lane goals based upon the vehicle's current position.
- *generate_actions(times, speeds, lanes)*: Generates a selection of actions based upon the vectors of times, speeds and lanes provided.
- *simulate_outcomes(actions, horizon)*: Simulates outcomes based upon the supplied vector of actions and a time limit within the simulation given by *horizon*. Outputs the outcomes as pairs with the actions that produced them.

- *calc_rewards(outcome_action_pairs, parameters)*: Calculates reward values for outcome-action pairs based upon the supplied reward parameters. Outputs the rewards as pairs with the actions that produced them.
- *max_reward_action(reward_action_pairs)*: Returns the action associated with the maximum reward in a vector of reward-action pairs.
- *speed_part(action)*: Returns the parts of the action associated with the speed goal.
- *lane_part(action)*: Returns the parts of the action associated with the lane goal.
- *val_part(action_goal)*: Returns the target value portion of an action goal.
- *time_part(action_goal)*: Returns the target time portion of an action goal.

A.6.2. NOTES

The planner SCM relies on substantially more non-primitive functions than the other classes. This is a limitation of this work, and one we hope to overcome in future work. However, it should be noted that for many uses of the causal integration of CASs the SCM structure of the planner is of less relevance. This is because most counterfactual inference queries would typically rely upon intervening on the actions / goals of agents, thus severing any connection between the planner and downstream classes.

A.7. Rigid Body Environment - Entity - Link




Figure 10: Link SCM.

A.7.1. NON-PRIMITIVE FUNCTIONS

- `check_collision(rect_1, rect_2)`: Returns a boolean value indicating whether `rect_1` is colliding with `rect_2`.
- `calc_contact(rect_1, rect_2)`: Assumes `rect_1` and `rect_2` are colliding and calculates the details of the collision. Returns a pair of vectors with the first vector being the point of contact, and the second vector being the direction of contact.

A.8. Rigid Body Environment - Entity




Figure 11: Entity SCM.

A.8.1. NON-PRIMITIVE FUNCTIONS

- ΣX : Sums the variables indicated by the contents of the set X .

A.9. Rigid Body Environment

The rigid body environment object itself does not have an underlying SCM, it primarily maps rigid bodies to their entity objects via a dictionary. It also provides member functions for creating and destroying link objects across entities as rigid bodies are added or removed from the environment.

Appendix B. Algorithms

Algorithm 1: Motor Torque Control

Data: vel_time_goal, vel_val_goal, max_motor_torque, min_motor_torque, min_horizon

Result: actual_motor_torque

time_error = vel_time_goal - time;

actual_horizon = max(time_error, min_horizon);

vel_error = vel_val_goal - vel;

req_acc = vel_error / actual_horizon;

req_force_plus_env = mass * req_acc;

req_force = req_force_plus_env - $\langle dir, env_force \rangle$;

req_motor_torque = req_force * wheel_radius;

actual_motor_torque = max(min(req_motor_torque, max_motor_torque),
min_motor_torque);

Algorithm 2: Steer Control

Data: lane_time_goal, lane_val_goal, max_steer, min_steer, min_horizon

Result: actual_steer

time_error = vel_time_goal - time;

actual_horizon = max(time_error, min_horizon);

exp_pos_diff = vel * actual_horizon;

exp_pos = pos + exp_pos_diff;

target_pos = lane_map(lane_val_goal, exp_pos);

target_pos_diff = target_pos - pos;

ang_sin = exp_pos_diff \times target_pos_diff;

ang_cos = $\langle exp_pos_diff, target_pos_diff \rangle$;

ang = ang_sin / ang_cos;

req_ang_vel = ang / actual_horizon;

req_ang_vel_axel_prod = req_ang_vel * Axel_dist;

req_steer = req_ang_vel_axel_prod / vel;

actual_steer = max(min(req_steer, max_steer), min_steer);

Appendix C. System Specifications

C.1. Hardware

- CPU: AMD Ryzen 9 3950X
- GPUs: Nvidia GeForce RTX 2070 SUPER, Nvidia GeForce GTX 750 Ti
- Storage: Samsung Electronics 970 EVO Plus NVMe M.2 Internal SSD

C.2. Software

- Kernel: Linux version 5.4.0-137-generic
- OS: Ubuntu 20.04.6 LTS “Focal”
- CMake: 3.16.3
- C++ Standard: 20
- GCC/G++: 10.5.0
- Libraries:
 - Eigen: 3.3.7-2
 - RapidJSON: 1.1.0
 - Qt: 5.12.8 (Components: Widgets)
 - SFML: 2.5.1 (Components: graphics)
 - Magic Enum: 0.8.1
 - LZ4 Stream: 3.1
 - RapidCSV: 8.80