Anticipating Degradation: A Predictive Approach to Fault Tolerance in Robot Swarms

James O'Keeffe

Abstract—An active approach to fault tolerance is essential for robot swarms to achieve long-term autonomy. Previous efforts have focused on responding to spontaneous electro-mechanical faults and failures. However, many faults occur gradually over time. Waiting until such faults have manifested as failures before addressing them is both inefficient and unsustainable in a variety of scenarios. This work argues that the principles of predictive maintenance, in which potential faults are resolved before they hinder the operation of the swarm, offer a promising means of achieving long-term fault tolerance. This is a novel approach to swarm fault tolerance, which is shown to give a comparable or improved performance when tested against a reactive approach in almost all cases tested.

Index Terms—Swarm Robotics; Multi-Robot Systems; Fault Tolerance.

I. INTRODUCTION & RELATED WORK

There is increasing interest in the application of Swarm Robotic Systems (SRS) to tasks across a wide variety of sectors and scenarios [1]. However, a significant barrier to the deployment of autonomous robots in many real-world applications is the risk of failure or loss of autonomous control in the field. SRS enjoy a degree of innate robustness – the ability to tolerate faults and failures in individual robots without significant detriment to the swarm as a whole – because of their redundancy and distributed control architectures [2]. While this is true in some cases, previous research shows that partially failed robots that exert influence on other robots in the swarm can significantly degrade overall performance [3], concluding that an active approach to fault tolerance is necessary if SRS are to retain long-term autonomy [4].

Active fault tolerance comprises some combination of autonomous fault detection, diagnosis, and recovery (FDDR) [5] [6]. Most previous work towards fault tolerance in SRS has focused on fault detection in isolation by injecting sudden sensor and actuator faults into individual robots, as if they had failed spontaneously (e.g. [7], [5], [8]). In this paper, *failure* refers to a robot's inability to perform its desired function (e.g. locomotion), while a *fault* is the root cause of the failure (e.g. the accumulation of debris on a motor that prevents it from turning).

Once a robot is detected as faulty, action must be taken to resolve the fault or otherwise prevent further detriment to system performance. So far, efforts towards fault tolerant SRS have focussed on reactive approaches to fault resolution – i.e. resolving faults *after* they have manifested as failures.

The work of J. O'Keeffe was supported by the Royal Academy of Engineering UK IC Postrdoctoral Fellowship award under Grant ICRF2223-6-121. J. O'Keeffe is with the Department of Computer Science, University of York, United Kingdom. james.okeeffe@york.ac.uk These approaches usually adopt one of the following strategies/assumptions: robots can autonomously repair themselves and/or other robots in the field [9] [6] or; a failed robot can simply be shut down and abandoned [8], prevented from interfering [10], or its disruptive potential neutralised by mitigating actions taken by the swarm [11]. Other potential options include: robots can be repaired by a human in the field or; failed robots can be retrieved autonomously or by a human and brought to a site where they can be repaired. However, there are conditions and limitations to each of the described approaches.

Robotic platforms available at the time of writing are broadly unable to autonomously self-repair or repair other failed robots in the field. Such functionality requires additional components, actuation, and control for each individual robot that could impose unaffordable costs to many SRS applications. Failed robots could be repaired or retrieved by a human in safe, open, controlled environments, but this may not be possible in environments that are inaccessible or dangerous, the latter of which is highlighted among the motivating usecase scenarios for SRS [2]. Similarly, autonomous retrieval of failed robots, either with appropriate manipulating actuators or via coordinated 'shunting', may be feasible in some scenarios, but is itself a challenging control problem that likewise may not be available to all platforms or possible in inaccessible or dangerous environments.

Shutting down, isolating, and/or abandoning faulty robots in the field offers a currently feasible recovery strategy for swarms that solves the swarm anchoring problem highlighted in collective photo-taxis scenarios [3], and has been adopted in other approaches to swarm fault tolerance ([8] [10]). Robots can also modify their own behaviour to mitigate potential disruption caused by a failed robot in some cases [11]. However, neither approach explicitly resolves the underlying problem which, if left unchecked, can become problematic in applications requiring a minimum number of functioning robots to operate for extended periods of time.

Although there are scenarios in which faults and failures as spontaneous events is appropriate (e.g. a robot being suddenly immobilised after becoming stuck on an obstacle), previous studies reveal that one of the most common causes of failure is the gradual degradation of sensor and actuator hardware [12]. These types of fault have so far been omitted from fault tolerant SRS literature, which focuses on identifying sudden failures in a sub-population of robots while the non-faulty robots retain uniform normal functionality. This narrows the problem space, such that the aim of fault detection is simply to detect failures as soon after occurrence as possible. In fact, Carlson et. al. [12] highlight that robots have a mean time



Fig. 1: A: Experimental setup for 20 robots in the open environment. The base is highlighted in light green and resource nests are indicated by the three grey circles opposite the robots. B: Experimental setup for 20 robots in the constrained environment. C: Example of how clusters of shutdown faulty robots can impede swarm progress by obstructing operational robots from their goals. For ease of user differentiation during experiments, shutdown robots appear as dark featureless cylinders of equivalent dimensions to the lighter coloured functioning robots. D: Example of severe disruption caused by robots shutdown in already constrained spaces, completely blocking access in some cases.

between failures (MTBF) that indicates the average length of uninterrupted time in which a robot can reliably operate before suffering some kind of fault or failure. If all robots have a MTBF, all robots can be considered as occupying some variable position on a scale of degradation at any point in time. This complicates the differentiation of faulty and normal behaviours. One must ascertain the point at which hardware degradation becomes problematic for the afflicted robot and for the rest of the swarm - i.e. there must be a defined level of operational acceptability, above which a robot can be considered healthy, and below which a robot can be considered faulty. Determining this level, and thus the desired point of fault detection, is a trade off - it is inefficient to allow a robot's performance to degrade excessively before attempting to resolve it, just as it is to declare robots faulty for the slightest reductions in performance.

Examining gradually occurring faults provides opportunities for new approaches to fault resolution and swarm fault tolerance in general. If robots are routinely serviced and repaired within their MTBF, and assuming there are no other adversarial factors, there should be few instances of failure during operation (if any). This is the underlying principle of preventative maintenance - identifying and resolving potential problems before they cause system downtime or serious damage to hardware. Preventative maintenance is widely employed across industrial machines for its long-term cost effectiveness and improvements to safety and reliability [13]. Similar in concept is *predictive maintenance*. Whereas preventative maintenance schedules maintenance work at regular specified intervals, predictive maintenance aims to schedule the work only as required - reducing individual downtime and resource expense [14]. A predictive maintenance approach to swarm fault tolerance, whereby the swarm detects faults early enough to allow the faulty robot a grace period in which to return itself to a safe area for receiving maintenance, could be effective in preventing failure in the field. This is a new approach to swarm fault tolerance that runs counter to traditionally held

views that robot swarms, by their definition, *must* be robust to the loss of individual robots [2]. It is unclear whether or not the interruptions to operation that are necessitated by a predictive approach to swarm fault tolerance would impose additional costs and/or performance reductions over a traditional reactive approach. This study therefore aims to provide an answer to that question.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 details experimental implementation and test scenario. Section 3 describes experimental results alongside relevant discussion. Section 4 concludes and identifies areas for future research.

II. METHODOLOGY

All experiments were conducted with Robot Operating System (ROS) 2 and Gazebo Classic.

This study considers a robot foraging scenario (a classic benchmark in SRS research [15]), in which robots gather resources in an enclosed arena of 10m x 10m. Robots begin each experiment at an area of the arena defined as the 'robot base', which spans the width of the arena along the row y = 2 (see Figure 1). The robot base is the area that foraged resources must be returned to and is assumed to be the only part of the arena that can be accessed by non-swarm agents, such as robotic arms). In most real-world scenarios, there must necessarily be a location from which robots can be accessed for maintenance and replacement, and from which foraged resources can be collected.

A homogeneous SRS of simulated TurtleBot3's, twowheeled differential drive robots [16] with maximum linear velocity $v_{max} = 0.22ms^{-1}$, are studied. Robots are equipped with sensors to localise obstacles and robots up to a maximum range of $r_{max} = 4m$. Robot locomotion, sensing and communication processes consume power. The rate of power consumption, ΔP , at any given moment is given by Equation 1.

$$\Delta P = \Delta P_l + \Delta P_r + \Delta P_S \tag{1}$$

Algorithm 1 Global Positioning Foraging (GPF) Algorithm

1: while Running do

- 2: **if** Object Distance $\leq 0.5m$ **then** avoid
- 3: else if Resource collected then Return to base
- 4: **if** Robot at base **then** Deposit resource
- 5: else if Distance to nearest Resource Nest $\leq 0.5m$ then Collect resource
- 6: else if Distance to nearest Resource Nest $\leq r_s$ then Approach nearest resource
- 7: else Randomly Explore

Where $\Delta P_{l,r}$ is the power consumed by left and right motors, respectively, which can vary according to a robot's state, and ΔP_S is the power consumed by sensing and communication processes, taken to be approximately constant during operation. The maximum rate of power consumption per second of simulated time, ΔP_{max} , is described by Equation 2.

$$\Delta P_{max} = \Delta P_{l_{max}} + \Delta P_{r_{max}} + \Delta P_S = \frac{P_0}{300}$$
(2)

Where P_0 is a robot's total power capacity ($P_0 = 1$, unitless), $\Delta P_{l_{max},r_{max}} = \frac{2}{5} \Delta P_{max}$, and $\Delta P_S = \frac{1}{5} \Delta P_{max}$.

Two types of environment are considered. The 'empty' environment consists of the 10m x 10m enclosed arena that is empty apart from 3 resource nests of 1m radius at arena (x,y) coordinates (2,8), (5,8), and (8,8). The 'constrained' environment also contains 3 resource nests at the same positions, but the area between the resource nests and the robot base is separated into 3 equally spaced corridors of 2m width and 5m length. Each environment can be seen in Figure 1A-B.

Two foraging algorithms are considered. The Global Positioning Foraging (GPF) algorithm, described by Algorithm 1, is a basic foraging algorithm in which each robot performs a random walk exploration until a resource nest comes within sensing range, r_S . The robot will then approach the nearest nest, collect a resource, and return to base by the shortest Euclidean path, avoiding any obstacles along the way. The robot has a priori knowledge of the location of the base and of itself in a global coordinate frame but not of the location of resource nests, which must be sensed locally. The Local Positioning Foraging (LPF) algorithm, described by Algorithm 2, is similar, except that robots are not assumed to have access to GPS information. In order to localise, the swarm must form an ad-hoc network. Each robot has a limited localising range, and its status is determined by whether or not there exists a path from a robot to the base that is valid for the variable sensing ranges of each node. A robot is only able to extend a communication chain if it is within the sensing range of the previous node. A robot will not move if it cannot localise.

Fault Modelling

Focus is given to faults occurring by gradual degradation on motor and sensor hardware, e.g. those caused by the build up of dirt and debris [12]. The level of degradation on a robot's left motor, right motor, and sensor hardware is indicated by coefficients d_l , d_r , and d_s , respectively.

Algorithm 2 Local Positioning Foraging (LPF) Algorithm

1: while Running do

- 2: **if** Distance to closest networked node $\leq 3m$ then
- 3: **if** Object Distance $\leq 0.5m$ **then** avoid
- 4: **else if** Resource collected **then** Return to base
 - if Robot at base then Deposit resource
- 6: else if Distance to nearest Resource Nest $\leq 0.5m$ then Collect resource
- 7: **else if** Distance to nearest Resource Nest $\leq r_s$ **then** Approach nearest resource

8: else Random Explore

9: else Wait

5:

The power consumed by motors will be affected by their condition. A robot in perfect conditions (i.e., $d_{l,r} = 1$) is taken to cause its motors to operate at 75% load [17]. The effects of motor degradation on power consumption and output linear velocity are then described by Equation 3 and Equation 4, respectively.

$$\Delta P_{l,r} = \frac{\Delta P_{l_{max},r_{max}}}{1 + e^{-10((1-d_{l,r})+0.11)}}$$
(3)

$$v_{l,r} = \frac{v_{max}}{1 + e^{-5(2d_{l,r} - 1)}} \tag{4}$$



Fig. 2: Plots of Equation 3 and Equation 4 (left) and Equation 5 (right)

Where values of constants are set to give the intersection of $v_{l,r}$ and $\Delta P_{l,r}$ as shown in the left plot of Figure 2. This intersection reflects that, as the value $d_{l,r}$ increases, motors can initially draw more power to achieve v_{max} but, eventually, the mechanical power required will become greater than that which can be supplied. At this point, degradation will begin to reduce a robots maximum achievable velocity.

The level of degradation affecting a robot's sensor is given by coefficient d_S . Since sensor output is not governed by corrective feedback loops in this case, ΔP_S does not vary with d_S . Degradation resulting in higher levels of signal attenuation will affect robot sensing range, *r*. This is modelled according to the inverse square law (Equation 5) and shown in the right plot of Figure 2.

$$r = r_{max} \sqrt{d_s} \tag{5}$$

Fault Detection

The artificial antibody population dynamics (AAPD) model is used to detect degradation in robots. For brevity, only key information pertaining to the AAPD model implementation used in this work is provided. For a comprehensive description of the AAPD model and additional context, readers are directed to the author's recent work [18]. The AAPD model is distributed and, so far, the only swarm fault detection model that has been tested on the type of gradual degradation faults examined in this work.

Each robot's motors and sensors generate 'artificial antibodies' during operation, consisting of relevant data sampled at 6Hz. Each artificial antibody is defined by 30 data points collected over 5 seconds of simulated time and is added to repertoire X_M , relating to motor hardware, or X_S , relating to sensor hardware.

Artificial antibodies relating to motor hardware are 3dimensional, consisting of linear velocity, v, angular velocity, ω , and rate of power consumption, ΔP . Each dimension is normalised to a value between 0 and 1. Artificial antibodies relating to robot sensors are 1-dimensional, consisting of a specifically created variable, γ , which indicates the closest distance at which a given robot R_1 can localise neighbour R_2 , but where R_2 is simultaneously unable to localise R_1 . In this way, the value of γ generally increases as a robot's sensing range, r, decreases. A new artificial antibody is only added to repertoire X_M or X_S if it does not already contain a similar artificial antibody. The similarity, m, between artificial antibodies, p_i and p_j , is given by summing the residuals as the two arrays are convolved over one another. This is described by Equation 6

$$m(p_i, p_j) = \frac{1}{dim} \sum_{dim} \frac{1}{|\kappa|} \sum_{\in \kappa} G[s - \sum_{n=1}^{\eta} [p_i(n) - p_j(n)]]$$
(6)

Where κ is the set of all possible points of convolution between p_i and p_j such that $\kappa = 1 : g : \tau$, where g is a variable to determine the resolution of convolution, $\tau = ||p_i| - |p_j|| + k + 1$, and k determines the permissible index offset between p_i and p_j during convolution. n is the index of data points stored in $p_{i,j}$, and η is the total number of overlaying data points at a given point of convolution. G is a function such that G(x) =0 for x < 0, which allows variable s to act as a threshold such that an artificial antibody pair with residuals above the threshold are considered not to match at all. *dim* refers to the number of dimensions of an artificial antibody.

The AAPD computes on the repertoires $X_{M,S}$ of each robot after every 50 seconds of simulated time, or after 10 new artificial antibodies have been produced (irrespective of whether they are actually added to the repertoires). This 50 seconds worth of data is stored in variable array W by each robot. Then, for each member of repertoire $X_{M,S}$, the rate of change of a population score is calculated according to Equation 7.

$$\dot{x}_{i} = c[m(p_{i}, W_{0}) \cdot (1 + k_{3}max(m(p_{i}, \mathbf{\tilde{Y}}))) - k_{1} \sum_{j=1}^{N} m(p_{i}, W_{j})] - k_{2}$$
(7)

Where x_i is the population of the *i*th member of a robot's $X_{M,S}$. W_0 is a robot's own 50 second behavioural array, and W_j is the equivalent window for the *j*th robot in the swarm. Y is a repertoire containing artificial antibodies that have previously been detected as faulty, where the function of Y is to allow the AAPD model to detect familiar artificial antibodies more quickly on subsequent encounters. k_{1-3} are tuning parameters. A population is considered faulty if $x_i > 1$.

Model parameters are user selected based on a SRS (N = 10) performing the GPF foraging algorithm in the open environment as training data, where each robot is initialised with random independent probabilities between 1-15% that $d_{l,r,S}$ will decrease by 0.01 per second of simulated time.

The AAPD model operates on X_M and X_S separately, and uses Equation 6 to compute Equation 7 or determine whether to add a new artificial antibody to $X_{M,Y}$ using different parameter values given below in Table I.

The AAPD model is provided with repertoire \mathbf{Y}_M of 101 known artificial antibodies from \mathbf{X}_M and \mathbf{Y}_S of 93 known artificial antibodies from \mathbf{X}_M , each compiled over 10 experimental replicates.

The AAPD model operates on repertoire X_S at all times. However, since a minimum of 5 robots are required for reliable AAPD performance [18], the AAPD model will only operate on X_M of a robot performing the LPF algorithm if it and at least 4 other robots are free to move simultaneously.

Fault Resolution

A predictive fault resolution, T_1 , is compared with a reactive fault resolution, T_2 .

 T_1 : Faulty robots return themselves to the robot base where they are either replaced or redeployed, having been assumed to receive any necessary maintenance work. Resources carried back to the base are counted towards performance. T_1 relies on the ability to detect a fault while the afflicted robot is still sufficiently operational to make the return journey to base – i.e. before the fault has chance to manifest as failure. If the robot fails to return to base, it becomes stranded and no replacement is deployed.

 T_2 : Faulty robots are shutdown. If the robot was not within the base area at the time of detection, it becomes an inanimate object and any resource it was carrying is not counted towards performance. A robot that is detected as faulty while in the base is considered to be reachable and is therefore collected and removed, along with any resource it was carrying. In each case a replacement is spawned at the robot base. This is the basic resolution that satisfies the vulnerability of a SRS to partial failures [3], and which has been implemented in previous research [8] [10].

III. EXPERIMENTS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A baseline performance is established in terms of resources collected in 15 minutes of simulated time, for swarms of size

Process	Computation	S	g	k	k_1	k_2	k_3
Adding to X	Equation 6	1.5	1	10	-	-	-
$X_M:W$ matching	Equation 6	4	5	0	-	-	-
$X_M: Y_M$ matching	Equation 6	1.5	1	10	-	-	-
X_M population dynamics	Equation 7	-	-	-	0.24	0.3	1.2
$X_S:W$ matching	Equation 6	5	5	0	-	-	-
$X_S:Y_S$ matching	Equation 6	3.3	1	10	-	-	-
X_S population dynamics	Equation 7	-	-	-	0.18	0.3	1.2

TABLE I: The parameter selections for Equation 7 and Equation 6 used by different stages of the AAPD model [18].

N = 5, 10, and 20 robots performing the GPF-algorithm and the LPF-algorithm in empty and constrained environments, as well as the effects of faults on individual robot and overall performance in each of these scenarios where unchecked sensor and motor faults afflict sub-populations of 20%, 40%, and 60% of the swarm size. Afflicted robots are given a 33% probability of $d_{l,r,S}$ decrementing by 0.01 per second of simulated time, meaning that failures have typically fully manifested after 5 minutes of simulated time. 10 experimental replicates are performed from which median average performances are drawn. Results are displayed in Table II.

Table II shows that, where all robots are normally operational, a constrained environment results in fewer resources being collected in the same time in each case. The ideal swarm size varies according to the scenario. The LPF-algorithm requires a greater number of robots to function. N = 5 is generally insufficient, as robots are stretched to the limits of their communication range, becoming stuck, while N = 10gives reduced performance compared with the GPF-algorithm in the constrained environment. Otherwise, however, the LPF and GPF algorithms are shown to perform competitively.

Table II shows that, in open environments, motor failures can severely impede the afflicted robot while having little to no impact on others - demonstrating characteristic SRS robustness. The impact of sensor failure during the GPF-algorithm is minor, since the sensing range must drop to near-zero before the afflicted robot becomes unable to avoid collisions or come across the resource nests by chance. However, when environments are constrained or robots must maintain links to a fixed point, faulty robots begin to have a more pronounced effect on non-faulty robots. In particular, robots that become stuck in corridors can obstruct other robots from passing (as shown in Figure 1D). Robots performing the LPF-algorithm with one or more chained dependents can also cause their dependents to become temporarily or permanently stranded when their sensor range drops too low. The circumstances of robot failure can also have net positive effects. For example, robots failing outside the corridors of the constrained environment reduce traffic in constrained points, allowing the rest of the swarm to make quicker progress. Overall, it can be seen that the swarm demonstrates its expected robust to failures in individual robots except in cases where the number of functioning robots is brought below a required threshold, or where other robots in the swarm are dependent on a failed robot (both cases are known caveats [2] [4]).

Reactive Vs. Predictive Resolution

In the following experiments, $d_{l,r,S}$ are each given random independent probabilities between 1-15% of decreasing by 0.01 per second, reflecting that each robot has its own MTBF. In order to establish the ideal point of fault detection, a robot is automatically detected as faulty when any value $d_{l,r,S}$ drops below threshold d_0 . The differences in performance where faulty robots are resolved via the predictive maintenance (T_1^*) and reactive shutdown (T_2^*) approaches are then observed for varying d_0 . The use of asterisks is to differentiate these experiments, which use an ideal fault detection mechanism, from subsequent experiments using the AAPD model. Results are displayed in Figure 3.

Figure 3 shows that the value of d_0 has a pronounced effect on performance. For any combination of algorithm and environment, a consistent trend can be observed between d_0 and performance according to whether the system implements T_1^* or T_2^* . In the case of T_1^* , there is a defined optimum region, typically in the range $0.6 < d_0 < 0.8$. For $d_0 < 0.6$, the time that robots spend operating with degraded capabilities reduces performance and can increase the difficulty in making the return journey to the base, and thus the length of interruption to foraging activity. For $d_0 < 0.8$, the increased frequency of detected faults means that robots similarly have their foraging activity interrupted for a higher proportion of experimental time. In the case of T_2^* , there is a less defined optimum, with median performance tending to plateau for $0.3 < d_0 < 0.6$, and then decreasing for $d_0 > 0.6$. The reason for this is that the robots that are abandoned become obstacles in the arena and obstruct the normally functioning swarm. In the constrained environment, this can result in the complete prevention of foraging, as the corridors quickly become obstructed. This effect is not seen to the same degree in Table II, since faulty robots are not replaced, and is a direct consequence of T_2 . Disruption can also be observed in the open environment because of the tendency of failed robots to form clusters. A failed robot acts as an obstacle to a normally operating robot, which must avoid it upon encounter or, if the robot has already identified a goal on the other side of the obstacle, must navigate around it. The process of navigating the obstacle increases the amount of time the operational robot spends in proximity to the failed robot, and therefore the likelihood that it, too, will fail in close proximity - increasing the size of the obstacle and thereby making it subsequently harder to navigate. This creates a feedback loop in which each failed robot contributes to a decrease in the reliability of SRS performance, even when it is replaced with a functioning robot and even in the scenarios in which the SRS is expected to

	Open Environment										Constrained Environment													
	GPF LPF								GPF LPF															
	N = 5 $N = 10$		N =	N = 20		N = 5		N = 10		N = 20		N = 5		N = 10		N = 20		N = 5		N = 10		N = 20		
Fault*%	R	R^*	R	<i>R</i> *	R	R^*	R	R^*	R	R^*	R	R^*	R	R^*	R	<i>R</i> *	R	R^*	R	R*	R	R*	R	<i>R</i> *
None	10	-	10	-	8	-	2	-	10	-	8	-	6	-	6	-	5	-	0	-	4	-	5	-
M, 20%	11	1	10	1	9	1	3	1	10	1	9	1	7	1	6	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	5	0
M, 40%	12	1	9	1	10	1	1	1	10	1	9	1	8	1	8	1	6	1	0	0	1	0	5	1
M, 60%	12	1	11	1	9	1	1	1	9	1	9	1	7	1	7	1	5	1	0	0	1	1	4	1
S, 20%	11	7.5	11	6.5	9	5.5	1	1	9	5	9	6	7	6	7	5	5	3	0	0	2	0	4	3
S, 40%	12	7	11	7	9	6	2	1	8	5	9	5	7	6	5	4	5	4	0	0	0	2	3	2
S, 60%	12	9	11	6	9	5	2	2	5	5	8	5	7	6	7	5	6	3	0	0	0	0.5	2	1

TABLE II: The median number of resources collected per robot in 15 minutes of simulated time in each combination of algorithm, environment, and swarm size. Performances of normal and faulty robots are given separately, where between 0-60% of the swarm suffers from motor or sensor faults, denoted 'M' or 'S', respectively. Normal and faulty robots are denoted 'R' and 'R*, respectively.



Fig. 3: The median resources collected in 15 minutes of simulated time in each combination of algorithm, environment, and swarm size. A comparison is shown for predictive (T_1^*) and reactive (T_2^*) fault resolutions, shown in columns A and B, respectively. Asterisks indicate that fault resolutions are initiated after an assumed ideal fault detection mechanism that can detect faults where $d_{l,r,S} < d_0$. Column C plots the median values of T_1^* (solid) and T_2^* (dotted) taken from the boxplots in columns A-B for ease of comparison.

exhibit greatest robustness.

It was expected that the additional time taken to implement T_1^* would put it at a disadvantage to T_2^* in scenarios where the SRS was expected to be most robust to failure (e.g. open environments, GPF algorithm). However, Figure 3 reveals that, in addition to several scenarios in which T_1^* outperforms T_2^* , there are almost no scenarios in which T_1^* cannot at least give a competitive performance with T_2^* . It should also be noted that, where T_1^* and T_2^* are competitive, T_1^* offers an innate advantage over T_2^* in its potential to repair and reuse hardware resources

rather than simply abandoning them. This result is significant as it underscores the value of a predictive approach to fault tolerance in SRS for the first time, and challenges the utility of reactive approaches in scenarios where robots cannot be physically retrieved. The only notable exception to this trend is in the case of N = 5 robots performing the LPF algorithm in the open environment. This comes from the fact that 5 robots is too few to effectively implement the LPF algorithm- (as shown in Table II), resulting in the robots becoming stretched to their limits and stuck. The replacement of a robot allows it to benefit from the existing network coverage provided by the remaining robots, often meaning it is able to collect resources successfully for a period until it, too, becomes stuck. This highlights the need for intelligent path planning of the return to base journey in scenarios where the relative positioning of robots is critical.

The final set of experiments deploys the AAPD model as a means of detecting faulty robots. Unlike the previous set of experiments, in which faults are automatically detected when $d_{l,r,S} < d_0$, the AAPD model operates on the behavioural signatures produced by the SRS in order to detect faults.

Figure 4 plots the δ values of the AAPD model when deployed on a N = 10 robots performing the GPF algorithm in the open environment, as was used to train the model parameters. Each robot is initialised with a random probability between 1-15% that $d_{l,r}$ and d_s will decrease by 0.01 per second of simulated time. The value δ indicates the value d_S of a given robot at the moment the AAPD model detects a sensor fault or the value of $d_{l,r}$, whichever is lowest, at the moment the AAPD model detects a motor fault. In the case of motor faults, the AAPD detects faulty robots with a median $\delta = 0.63$, within the optimum range for d_0 highlighted in Figure 3, albeit with a larger than desirable interquartile range. In the case of sensor faults, the AAPD detects faulty robots with a median $\delta = 0.52$. This is lower than desired, but sensor faults are harder to detect reliably since it is not always possible to detect drops in range according to the γ value produced. Sensor faults are also generally less disruptive than motor faults (see Table II), and so the lower than ideal δ is not expected to be as punishing on performance.



Fig. 4: The values of δ for detections of motor and sensor faults made in 15 minutes of simulated time by the AAPD on N = 10 robots performing the GPF algorithm in the open environment.

Figure 5 plots a comparison of the performances of resolutions T_1 and T_2 for SRS of sizes N = 5, 10, and 20 robots performing the GPF and LPF foraging algorithms in open and constrained environments. Each robot is initialised with random independent probabilities between 1-15% that $d_{l,r}$ and d_s will decrease by 0.01 per second of simulated

	Op	en En	vironmen	t	Constrained Environment							
	GP	F	LP	F	Gl	PF	LPF					
	T_2	T_2^*	T_2	T_2^*	T_2	T_2^*	T_2	T_2^*				
N = 5	+64	-6	-60	-78	+76	-16	-	-				
N = 10	+110	-3	+109	-1	+65	-1	+950	+50				
N = 20	+137	+6	+209	+3	+96	+20	+100	+16				

TABLE III: The proportional difference (as a percentage) in median performance achieved by T_1 when compared to T_2 and T_2^* , taken from Figure 5.

time. The AAPD model is used to detect faults in robots. Also included is the performance for T_2^* with the optimum d_0 value taken from Figure 3. This is done to compare the performance of predictive resolution T_1 using the AAPD model with the theoretic optimum performance for reactive approach T_2^* .

Figure 5 shows that, where the AAPD model is used to detect faults, predictive resolution T_1 substantially outperforms reactive resolution T_2 in all cases with the exception of N = 5 robots performing the LPF foraging algorithm, which is discussed earlier. This is expected, since the AAPD model typically detects faults with δ values that Figure 3 reveals to be suboptimal when implementing T_2^* . The performance of T_2 could, in theory, be improved by retraining the AAPD model to tolerate faults at lower values of δ . However, Figure 5 also shows that implementing T_1 with the AAPD model gives a generally competitive performance against T_2^* – typically to within a few percent, but as low as -16% and as high as +50%. This result further validates the adoption of predictive approaches to fault tolerance in SRS. For ease of reading the proportional difference in median performances, plotted in Figure 5 of T_1 against T_2 and T_2^* , are given in Table III.

IV. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper highlights that the study of faults arising from gradual sensor and actuator degradation in robots has been absent from fault tolerant swarm literature until now, despite being a very common cause of real world failure. A variety of generalisable swarm foraging scenarios, in which every robot has a variable MTBF, demonstrate that motor and sensor failures can cause large reductions in swarm foraging performance for certain combinations of behaviour, environment, and swarm size. Where previous research has highlighted the vulnerability of robot swarms to partial failures in individuals, this study underscores the vulnerabilities associated with allowing robots to reach a point of failure if they are obstructive and cannot be physically removed from an environment.

As an autonomous solution, a predictive approach to swarm fault tolerance is proposed in which faults are detected with enough time to allow the at-risk robot to autonomously return itself to a safe area to receive maintenance or be replaced. The ability of at-risk robots to autonomously return themselves to a safe location is critical, since robots are not typically able to repair themselves or others in the field, and thus faults must be detected before their manifestation as complete failures. The prevention of failures in swarm robots is paradoxical to traditionally held views that robot swarms should be robust to the loss of individuals. However, results show that detecting



Fig. 5: The median resources collected in 15 minutes of simulated time in each combination of algorithm, environment, and swarm size. A comparison is shown for predictive (T_1) and reactive (T_2) fault resolutions initiated after using the AAPD model to detect faults, as well as the highest performing instance of reactive fault resolution (T_2^*) taken from Figure 3.

faults with enough time for the robot to remove itself from harms way results in competitive or improved performance when compared to allowing robots to fail in the field in nearly all cases tested. This is verified with a theoretic ideal fault detection mechanism, as well as with the novel AAPD model. In addition to the empirical evidence in support of predictive fault tolerance in swarms, it comes with an innate real-world advantage insofar that it allows for the conservation of hardware resources by repairing and reusing robots instead of simply abandoning them. Overall, the results show that a predictive approach to fault tolerance allows a swarm to sustain its own autonomy for longer periods of time, and potentially allows the swarm to operate in environments where susceptibility to failures could have made it otherwise unsuitable. This represents a departure from traditional approaches to swarm fault tolerance, and is therefore an important contribution to the literature that highlights new areas for exploration in future research.

A key takeaway from the results is the importance of detecting faults at the right moment so that robots are not allowed to reach states where their autonomy is put at risk, while also ensuring that operation is not needlessly interrupted. It is critically important that a robot detected as faulty is able to reach a safe location, and in real world scenarios this will influence the ideal point of detection – e.g. the greater the distance to the nearest safe location, the lower the level of tolerable degradation can be. Other influencing factors include the spatial limitations imposed by the environment and other robots in some scenarios. Future work will therefore focus on improving the reliability of fault detection to within an optimal range of degradation, as well as incorporating intelligent online path planning into fault resolution in order to achieve robust closed-loop FDDR.

References

- M. Schranz, M. Umlauft, M. Sende, and W. Elmenreich, "Swarm robotic behaviors and current applications," *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, vol. 7, p. 36, 2020.
- [2] E. Şahin, "Swarm robotics: From sources of inspiration to domains of application," in *Swarm Robotics*, pp. 10–20, Springer, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005.

- [3] A. F. T. Winfield and J. Nembrini, "Safety in numbers: fault-tolerance in robot swarms," *International Journal of Modelling, Identification and Control*, vol. 1, pp. 30–37, 2006.
- [4] J. D. Bjerknes and A. F. T. Winfield, "On fault tolerance and scalability of swarm robotic systems," in *Distributed Autonomous Robotic Systems*, pp. 431–444, Springer, 2013.
- [5] A. G. Millard, *Exogenous Fault Detection in Swarm Robotic Systems*. PhD thesis, University of York, 2016.
- [6] J. O'Keeffe, D. Tarapore, A. G. Millard, and J. Timmis, "Adaptive online fault diagnosis in autonomous robot swarms," *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, vol. 5, p. 131, 2018.
- [7] D. Tarapore, J. Timmis, and A. L. Christensen, "Fault detection in a swarm of physical robots based on behavioral outlier detection," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 1516–1522, 2019.
- [8] A. Khadidos, R. M. Crowder, and P. H. Chappell, "Exogenous Fault Detection and Recovery for Swarm Robotics," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 2405–2410, 2015.
- [9] O. O. Oladiran, Fault Recovery in Swarm Robotics Systems using Learning Algorithms. PhD thesis, University of York, 2019.
- [10] V. Strobel, A. Pacheco, and M. Dorigo, "Robot swarms neutralize harmful byzantine robots using a blockchain-based token economy," *Science Robotics*, vol. 8, no. 79, p. eabm4636, 2023.
- [11] D. M. Bossens and D. Tarapore, "Rapidly adapting robot swarms with swarm map-based bayesian optimisation," in 2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA), pp. 9848–9854, IEEE, 2021.
- [12] J. Carlson and R. Murphy, "Reliability analysis of mobile robots," in 2003 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (Cat. No.03CH37422), vol. 1, pp. 274–281 vol.1, 2003.
- [13] M. A. K. Malik, "Reliable preventive maintenance scheduling," AIIE transactions, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 221–228, 1979.
- [14] T. Zonta, C. A. Da Costa, R. da Rosa Righi, M. J. de Lima, E. S. da Trindade, and G. P. Li, "Predictive maintenance in the industry 4.0: A systematic literature review," *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, vol. 150, p. 106889, 2020.
- [15] L. Bayındır, "A review of swarm robotics tasks," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 172, pp. 292–321, 2016.
- [16] Robotis, "Turtlebot3 Overview." https://emanual.robotis.com/docs/en/ platform/turtlebot3/overview/, 2023. [Online; accessed 13-September-2023].
- [17] L. Ranges, "Determining electric motor load and efficiency."
- [18] J. O'Keeffe, "Detecting and diagnosing faults in autonomous robot swarms with an artificial antibody population model," arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19942, 2024.