

The Role of Predictive Uncertainty and Diversity in Embodied AI and Robot Learning

Ransalu Senanayake

Arizona State University*

Abstract

Uncertainty has long been a critical area of study in robotics, particularly when robots are equipped with analytical models. As we move towards the widespread use of deep neural networks in robots, which have demonstrated remarkable performance in research settings, understanding the nuances of uncertainty becomes crucial for their real-world deployment. This guide offers an overview of the importance of uncertainty and provides methods to quantify and evaluate it from an applications perspective.

1 Why Do We Need (or Not Need) Uncertainty?

We want our robots to *efficiently learn* how to *robustly act* in the unrestrained physical world. A robot’s ability to experience and think through *diverse* possible scenarios—whether in perception or action—and their consequences helps enhance robustness and generalizability. In principle, countless conceivable scenarios can exist. However, learning all possible scenarios or gaining a complete

*Email: ransalu@asu.edu, ransalu@cs.stanford.edu




Figure 1: Two paradigms of diversity. (a) In the *evaluative paradigm*, the machine learning model provides various hypothesis with associated likelihoods based on data it has seen. (b) In the *generative paradigm*, we need to generate hypothetical outcomes.




Figure 2: An example of epistemic uncertainty. (a) A rover builds an elevation map of Mars [1] to make decisions. If we have a distribution of maps instead of a single map, we can have different decision options, for instance to minimize risk, power consumption, etc. (b) The pits behind the boulders are not visible from the rover’s front view. However, if the rover quantifies the *epistemic uncertainty*, then it knows how to make safe decisions. To represent this uncertainty, in its simplest form, we need the mean and variance of elevation [2].

understanding of them is not only impossible but often redundant. Instead, empowering the robots with the ability to discern what is important and what is not facilitates efficient learning and scrutiny of their own decisions. Having a sense of the *likelihood* of these scenarios aids in prioritizing their importance.

Characterizing the likelihood of events and actions about robots and the physical world they operate in inherently involves uncertainty, whether represented as probabilities, sets, or any other form. However, some techniques for handling uncertainty tend to be computationally expensive and sometimes even inaccurate, thereby defeating the purpose of working with uncertainty for efficient learning and enhancing robustness. This issue becomes particularly pronounced as models grow larger, especially with limitations of hardware in embodied agents. Therefore, in any given application, it is crucial to balance the trade-off among accuracy, uncertainty, and computational complexity.

As shown in Figure 1, there are at least two main paradigms where the diversity and uncertainty of predictions prove beneficial: *evaluative paradigm* and *generative paradigm*. In the evaluative paradigm, the robot learns a model that captures its uncertainty about the world. For instance, consider the mapping example illustrated in Figure 2. If the robot cannot observe a particular area of the environment, say, due to occlusion, the model should quantify the uncertainty of that area as high. With this uncertainty, we can generate multiple maps with varying degrees of likelihood. In probabilistic terms, if we have a map that represents mean and variance, finitely many maps can be sampled from that map representation. Given the geography, a 10 *km* deep pit behind the boulder is unlikely. However, the presence of flat ground or even a 2 *m* deep pit behind the boulder is more plausible. Thus, access to uncertainty enables the generation of many such hypotheses. Having access to such diverse hypotheses aids in devising various decision options, which can then be evaluated to make

the optimal decision. When the robot is capable of quantifying the uncertainty of the world, it can make risk-averse or risk-seeking decisions [3], which in turn helps with certifying robots and building trustworthiness.

In the generative paradigm, our objective is to generate diverse worlds, scenarios, or data. Generation can be performed using a machine learning (ML) model, such as text2video [4], or a digit twin, such as a physics-based simulator [5, 6] or virtual reality [7]. The generated cases can either be used to learn a machine learning model [8, 9] or to test an existing model [10, 11]. The former application is particularly popular in robotics, as collecting data from simulators is cost-effective and efficient [12]. Further, simulation is also invaluable in scenarios where factors such as safety [13, 14] and algorithmic fairness [15] is paramount, for example, in autonomous driving [15, 16]. The diversity and uncertainty of simulation also facilitates the learning of robust ML models, for example, through domain randomization, as demonstrated in frameworks such as BayesSim [17]. As the other application of the generative paradigm, we can generate edge cases for identifying failure modes [10] and out-of-distribution scenarios [18, 19, 20].

2 When Do We Need (or Not Need) Uncertainty?

We already discussed that uncertainty helps with making more informed decisions, learning robust models, and testing existing pre-trained models. Uncertainty, also known as ambiguity, stems from the stochasticity of the world. Stochasticity, also known as randomness, is a comfort term we often use when we do not know how to model the reality¹ or we do not care about perfectly modeling the reality. Attempting to deal with all sources of stochasticity is often wasteful in real-time applications such as robotics. Therefore, it is important to understand the potential sources of uncertainty in embodied AI agents.

2.1 The Sources of Uncertainty

As also illustrated in Figure 3, broadly speaking, uncertainty could be due to internal sources or external sources:

1. Physical limitations: Uncertainty can arise from errors in measurement devices, actuators, and human inputs. All measurement devices exhibit systematic, random, and gross errors. These errors can compound, exacerbating the uncertainty. For example, consider an autonomous vehicle that attempts to localize a pedestrian using a pre-computed map. The vehicle’s LIDAR system introduces measurement error when determining the distance to the pedestrian. Additionally, the vehicle’s precise location may be uncertain due to poor GPS signals around high-rise buildings, further increasing the uncertainty of the pedestrian’s location estimation

¹This statement is partially biased towards the philosophy of *determinism* though there are many arguments that supports the philosophy of *indeterminism*.

in the map. As another example, robot actuators, such as stepper motors, may not execute commands with perfect accuracy. This inaccuracy can worsen due to mechanical wear and tear, operation outside specified conditions (such as overloading or extreme temperatures), and calibration issues. Uncertainty can also stem from the way humans abstract their knowledge through models. When humans provide prior knowledge to models, in terms of preferences [21, 22] or Bayesian priors [23], this information may be incomplete and prone to errors.

2. Model limitations: Machine learning models are increasing in size, yet the constraints of limited onboard hardware and the need for real-time inference necessitate the use of smaller models. However, opting for simpler models or quantizing larger models to reduce their size invariably leads to errors and high uncertainty [24].
3. Partial observability: Occlusion [2], environmental factors such as fog or ambient darkness [15], and clutter [25] can introduce uncertainty into a robot’s observations. Employing multiple sensors or sensor modalities can sometimes mitigate this uncertainty [26]. Factors such as human intentions may also be considered partially observable [27, 28]. Partial observations can arise from hardware limitations or a model’s inability to process them, representing more internal sources of uncertainty. Conversely, changes in the operating environment can be viewed as an external source of uncertainty. Partial observability is explicitly addressed in certain decision-making models, such as Partially Observable Markov Decision Processes (POMDPs) [29, 30].
4. Environment dynamics: The environment in which a robot operates changes over space and time. For instance, objects on a tabletop might move and people in a house or street may walk. Such changes invariably result in uncertainty [31, 32, 33].
5. Domain shifts: When a robot encounters situations not covered during the training of its neural networks, the robot becomes more uncertain. For instance, if an autonomous vehicle is trained exclusively with data from Arizona, it may struggle to operate in Boston, where snow is common [10, 18, 15], or in Australia, where it might encounter unfamiliar animals such as kangaroos [34].

2.2 A Few Examples of Uncertainty in Embodied AI

Let us now discuss a few examples of how these various sources of uncertainty affect three robotics applications.

Vision-language-based navigation: With the advancement of multi-modal ML models, the development of mobile robots capable of interacting with and assisting humans is becoming increasingly feasible. Currently, preliminary versions of




Figure 3: Sources of uncertainty.

such robots are already prevalent, serving purposes such as cleaning and providing aid to humans, exemplified by devices such as Amazon Astro and Roomba connected to Alexa. Consider a robot designed to navigate within homes. In order to navigate, it first needs to construct a map of the house. Traditionally, this involves creating an occupancy map, a process that requires exploring uncertain (i.e., unseen) areas of the house. In a house, walls are typically fixed in place, furniture is semi-permanent, and humans and pets are the most dynamic elements. Robots may encounter challenges such as becoming stuck, performing unsafe actions, or facing tasks that are beyond their physical capabilities—for instance, a Roomba cannot open doors, whereas a Spot robot can. Moreover, these robots will need to incorporate large language models (LLMs) and vision-language models (VLMs) to interact with human to understand their unknown intents and behaviors. Further, these large models need to be small enough, by construction or quantization, to fit in limited hardware. However, reducing the model size to accommodate computing constraints compromises model performance and increase in uncertainty of estimates [35].

Manipulation: Many robotics tasks in the future will require manipulation. Robots need to plan how to move the end effector of a robot arm from place A to place B, and then grasp it. Uncertainty in motion planning could be due to unknown or occluded objects along the robot’s path. When grasping an object, objects can be occluded or the object shape can be uncertain [36]. Further, the deformability, type of material, unknown mass and friction, all can contribute to uncertainty. Even if these factors are known, the pose can be uncertain [37, 38], especially for mobile manipulators such as a manipulator on a quadruped. Multiple sensor modalities such as vision and touch helps to reduce the uncertainty. Uncertainty can also arise when the object is dynamic, for instance when picked up an object from a conveyor belt or from another robot or human [39].

Field robotics: Field robots are primarily designed for outdoor operations. They take various forms such as drones, copters, rovers, boats, legged robots with

arms, autonomous underwater vehicles (AUVs), and other specialized configurations. These robots find applications in a range of activities, including surveillance, environmental monitoring, mining, agriculture, and exploration in underwater or space environments. The unstructured nature of these environments introduces significant uncertainty into their operation. Further, in environments like mines, underwater, or space, GPS signals are unavailable, necessitating the estimation of the robot’s location using its trajectory or nearby landmarks through techniques such as Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM) [40]. However, SLAM does not typically account for uncertainties caused by occlusions and domain shifts. As another source of uncertainty, dynamic elements such as moving people and objects can make field robotics tasks challenging, especially in urban environments. Control also becomes particularly difficult in conditions where control commands may not be executed as expected due to air or water turbulence, or slippery surfaces caused by snow.

3 How Do We Quantify Uncertainty?

In embodied agents, we obtain data and then fit a ML model. Irrespective of the sources discussed in Section 2.1 and how well the model is trained, no model is perfect. Therefore, we need to quantify the uncertainty of the predictions. However, how we can to quantify this uncertainty depends on the type of uncertainty.

3.1 Types of Uncertainties: The Known Unknowns and Unknown Unknowns




Figure 4: Types of uncertainty. Aleatoric uncertainty (known unknowns) is due to the inherent randomness of data whereas epistemic uncertainty (unknown unknowns) is due to lack of data. If we do not have data in a particular region of the input space or if we try to predict the future, the epistemic uncertainty is high.

Uncertainty can be categorized into two types:

1. Aleatoric uncertainty (known unknowns) - This uncertainty is also known as statistical uncertainty. It represents the inherent randomness of a system and cannot be reduced with more data. Aleatoric uncertainty is

widely studies in probabilistic robotics [41] and is less challenging to work with.

2. Epistemic uncertainty (unknown unknowns) - This uncertainty is also known as model uncertainty or systematic uncertainty. Since it stems from the lack of knowledge about the world, the more data we collect, the more we can reduce this uncertainty. Epistemic uncertainty is not straightforward to estimate.

To explain the distinction between the two types of uncertainties more pictorially, consider Figure 4. When we take measurements for a given x , the measurements vary slightly each time. This randomness, depicted by error bars in the plot, is known as aleatoric uncertainty as it is the inherent noise. In regions where we lack data, (x, y) , whether we are interpolating or extrapolating, the epistemic uncertainty is high. The further we are from data, the higher the uncertainty becomes. Estimating aleatoric uncertainty is relatively straightforward, and most frequentist statistical methods address it. However, quantifying epistemic uncertainty involves representing multiple models through a set, an ensemble, or a probability distribution. In deep ensembles [42] and Monte Carlo dropout, it is obvious that there are multiple models because they consider different weight combinations of the neural network. When a probability distribution is introduced over weights of a neural network, as in Bayesian methods, it implicitly creates an infinite number of neural networks where some models are more likely than others.

The term *Bayesian* is typically an overloaded term in robotics. In some classical application areas of robotics such as filtering, the term Bayesian is used whenever the Bayes' theorem is applied. In more learning tasks, a distribution over the parameters of the ML model is introduced and the Bayes' theorem is used to estimate the parameter distribution given data. In some sub-communities of Bayesian statistics, the term Bayesian is used only when an approximate Bayesian inference techniques such as Markov chain Monte Carlo or variational inference is used to solve a complex problem with many priors and hyperpriors. Under such nomenclature, even vanilla Gaussian processes (GPs), which are considered as a Bayesian nonparametric technique in statistical ML, are not Bayesian enough as they do not introduce parameters over the hyperparameters of the GP kernels.

3.2 Measuring Uncertainty: Metrics

Historically, most uncertainty estimates are represented as probabilities though other forms exist. From a *measure theory* perspective, a probability measure μ is a real-valued function defined in a σ -algebra, while satisfying Kolmogrov axioms of 1) non-negativity, 2) unit measure, and 3) countable additivity [43]. In other words, a probability measure assigns a real number in the range $[0, 1]$ to each event in the σ -algebra, such that the measure of the entire sample space is 1. These probabilities can be used to develop metrics to measure uncertainty

in different ways.

Variance: It measures the *uncertainty of a random variable*. A high variance indicates high uncertainty as it represents the dispersion (i.e., how far) from the mean. For a discrete random variable X with outcomes $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\}$, associated probabilities $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N\}$, and mean $\mu = \sum_{n=1}^N p_n x_n$, the variance can be computed as,

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_{n=1}^N p_n (x_n - \mu)^2. \quad (1)$$

Entropy: It measures the *uncertainty of the possible outcomes of a random variable or a system*. As the entropy represents the expected amount of information that is needed to describe the random variable X , it can be computed as,

$$H(X) = - \sum_{n=1}^N p_n \log p_n. \quad (2)$$

Entropy only considers the probability of outcomes rather than outcomes themselves. Entropy is measured in bits for the logarithmic base of 2. The more uncertain it is, the higher the entropy is. In other words, if every outcome is equally probable, then the entropy is high. For instance, for a binary classifier with the probability of the positive class p , the entropy can be computed as $-(p \log p + (1 - p) \log(1 - p))$. This entropy is 0 when the probability is 1 or 0 (i.e., very much certain) while it achieves its highest when the probability is 0.5 (i.e., most uncertain).

Negative Log Probability: The negative log-likelihood (NLL) measures the *correctness of a classifier's prediction compared to the ground truth*. For a softmax output p of the ground truth class, the negative log-likelihood (NLL)² can be computed as $-\log p$. If a ML model outputs high probability to the correct class, then the NLL value will be closer to 0. Conversely, if it outputs a low probability to the correct class, the NLL value will be high. Therefore, the lower the NLL, the better the model is.

The prediction of a ML model can be a probability distribution rather than a scalar. In such cases, NLL can be used to measure the *correctness of a classifier's predictive distribution compared to the ground truth*. If the predictive distribution of a ML model is a Gaussian with mean y_* and standard deviation σ_* , the negative log probability [44] can be computed as,

$$-\log p(y_*|y_t) = \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi\sigma_*^2) + \frac{(y_* - y_t)^2}{2\sigma_*^2} \quad (3)$$

²In classification settings with softmax outputs, the equation of NLL is similar to that of cross entropy.

Summary of Section 3

Types of uncertainty: Aleatoric, epistemic

Representing uncertainty: Probabilities, sets/intervals, polytopes, functions

Assessing uncertainty: Variance, entropy, NLL, Mahalanobis distance, total variation distance, Hellinger distance, α -divergences, Wasserstein distance

Uncertainty quantification methods: Ensembles, MC dropout, Laplace approximation, variational inference, MCMC, conformal prediction, prior/posterior networks, epistemic neural networks

Assessing uncertainty calibration: Entropy, NLL, Brier score, confidence plots, ECE, ACE

Uncertainty calibration methods: Temperature scaling, histogram binning, Platt scaling, isotonic regression, Beta calibration, BBQ

for ground truth value y_t .

Mahalanobis Distance: The Mahalanobis distance measures the *distance between a point and a probability distribution*. It is defined as,

$$\sqrt{(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu})} \quad (4)$$

for a point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from a multivariate distribution with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. When $d = 1$, the distance is $\|x - \mu\|_2 / \sigma$. In regression, the Mahalanobis distance can be used for measuring the distance between the ground truth value and prediction represented by the mean and variance. It is also used in out-of-distribution detection [18].

f -divergences: In probability theory, the *difference between two probability distributions* can be measured by f -divergences. Special cases of these divergences include total variation distance, Hellinger distance, and α -divergences. The total variation distance is simply the half the absolute area difference between the two probability density or mass functions. The Hellinger distance for discrete probability distributions $p = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N\}$ and $q = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_N\}$ is

defined as,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^N (\sqrt{p_n} - \sqrt{q_n})^2}. \quad (5)$$

Squaring this metric and adding 1 gives the Bhattacharyya distance, $\sum_{n=1}^N \sqrt{p_n q_n}$. α -divergences play a significant role in many uncertainty quantification techniques such as variational inference. A special case is KL divergence, defined as,

$$\mathbb{KL}[p||q] = \sum_{n=1}^N p_n \log \left(\frac{p_n}{q_n} \right) \quad (6)$$

Because the smaller the divergence is, the similar the distributions are, as a non-negative metric, $\mathbb{KL}[p||q] = 0$ divergence indicates perfect similarity between the two distributions. Note that $\mathbb{KL}[p||q] \neq \mathbb{KL}[q||p]$.

Wasserstein Distance: In the theory of optimal transport (OT), the Wasserstein distance measures the *difference between two probability distributions*. Defined by the Monge-Kantorovich theorem [45]. Wasserstein distance takes into account the geometry of the space.³ Wasserstein distance can be defined for any metric space. 1-Wasserstein distance, also known as the Earth mover’s distance (EMD), and 2-Wasserstein are more popular. For points x_i in p and x_j in q , the latter is defined as,

$$W_2(p, q) = \min_M \sum_{i,j} M_{i,j} \|x_i - x_j\|_2^2 \quad (7a)$$

subject to the constraints,

$$M \cdot \mathbb{1} = p, \quad (7b)$$

$$M^\top \cdot \mathbb{1} = q, \quad (7c)$$

$$M \geq 0, \quad (7d)$$

for a coupling matrix M . Constrains ensure that the probability of a sample in p match with all other points in q . Intuitively, the OT problem determines the optimal way to move the probability distribution p to another q .

When the distributions are Gaussian or uniform distributions, the 2-Wasserstein distance has a closed form solution.⁴ 1-Wasserstein distance also has a closed-form solution for one dimensional distributions. Whenever such simplifications are not available for the integer program that is expensive to solve, the Sinkhorn

³Wasserstein is proposed in Differential Geometry whereas KL divergence is proposed in Information Theory.

⁴OT algorithms are implemented in POT: Python Optimal Transport library [46].

algorithm can be used [47] by introducing an entropic regularization⁵ term,

$$\sum_{i,j} M_{i,j} \|x_i - x_j\|_2^2 - \lambda^{-1} \underbrace{\left(- \sum_{i,j} M_{i,j} \log M_{i,j} \right)}_{\text{entropy}}. \quad (8)$$

3.3 Quantifying Uncertainty: Techniques

Our objective is to quantify uncertainty arising from various sources discussed in Section 2.1. Rather than representing the predictions as a single output, we want diverse outputs to represent the uncertainty. This predictive uncertainty can be represented probabilistically or by other means.⁶

Central to most probability-based uncertainty techniques is the Bayes' theorem given by,

$$\underbrace{q(z)}_{\text{approximate posterior}} \approx \underbrace{p(z|y)}_{\text{posterior}} = \frac{\overbrace{p(y,z)}^{\text{joint dist.}}}{\underbrace{p(y)}_{\text{evidence}}} = \frac{\overbrace{(y|z)}^{\text{likelihood}} \overbrace{p(z)}^{\text{prior}}}{\underbrace{\int p(y|z)p(z)dz}_{\text{evidence}}}. \quad (9)$$

The prior distribution indicates our prior belief. For instance, if a robot tries to estimate where it is in a room, it can have a rough estimate, say, represented as a Gaussian distribution, of its location first. The likelihood is how we attempt to represent our data, i.e., this is data y , given the location z . By multiplying with the likelihood with prior, it accounts for the all potential locations and provides the location estimate given data, $p(z|y)$. To make the posterior a

⁵ λ can be set to a large number depending on the machine precision of the computer. The larger it is, the more accurate it would be but slower the convergence is and more prone to computation errors.

⁶Historically, from the days of Jacob Bernoulli and Thomas Bayes in 1700s, uncertainty estimations were treated in a more Bayesian sense. While the efforts by Pierre-Simon Laplace and Adolphe Quetelet by applying probability in physics and social sciences in 1800s helped to disseminate statistics in various fields and Andrey Kolmogorov's work helped with mathematical formalization of these ideas [48]. With the successful applications of probability in Biometrics and the establishment of journals such as *Biometrika*, frequentists statistics became more popular in early 1900s. Since many methods were inefficient, Arthur P. Dempster and others were focusing on developing alternative techniques [49] to represent beliefs and uncertainty. With the advancement of computers in 1980s, modern Bayesian inference techniques such as MCMC were developed. They became popular especially after the application of Gibbs sampling in image processing [50] and they were the most successful way to train neural networks back then [51]. While MCMC techniques continued to grow, in late 1990s and 2000s Michael I. Jordan and others popularized variational inference techniques as a tractable way to estimate Bayesian posterior probabilities. With the advancement of large neural networks, Bayesian inference techniques have also been struggling. By the time of writing this article, having foundations in probability theory, conformal predictions are gaining their popularity as they are straight forward to use in deep neural networks [52] though they do not provide precise probabilities.

probability distribution, we have to divide this product with the evidence, also known as, marginal likelihood.

In general, the prior can come from domain knowledge, rough estimates, or previous estimates. The latter is specially common in many sequential or iterative robotics estimation problems where the posterior at time t can be used as the prior in the next time step $t+1$. If we do not know anything about the prior, we can chose a non-informative prior. This is typically an uniform distribution, or more commonly in practice, it is an exponential distribution such as a Gaussian distribution with a large standard deviation. If we do not know about the prior, we can also introduce a probability distribution over the parameters of the prior which is called a hyper-prior $p(s)$, resulting in $p(y|z)p(z|s)p(s)$. The integral in the denominator of the Bayes' theorem makes posterior estimates intractable for most choices of the prior and likelihood. The class of priors known as conjugate priors make the posterior estimation problem simpler. The choice of prior is sometimes an art; it should be good enough to to make the posterior tractable but also good enough to represent the reality.

As shown in Figure 5, in most machine learning models, we introduce a prior distribution over the parameters of the model, $p(w)$, and estimate the posterior parameters given data, $p(w|\mathcal{D})$, using Bayes' theorem. Once we know this posterior distribution, the *predictive probability distribution* for a new input y_* can be obtained by integrating over posterior parameter estimates,

$$p(y_*|\mathcal{D}) = \int \underbrace{p(y_*|w)}_{\text{likelih.}} \underbrace{p(w|\mathcal{D})}_{\text{poster.}} dw \quad (10)$$

This predictive distribution can also be imperially approximated by sampling from the posterior distribution, $\{w_k \sim p(w|\mathcal{D})\}_{k=1}^K$, and computing the likelihood values, $\{p(y_*|w_k)\}_{k=1}^K$. The mean and variance can be computed from this set of predictive likelihood values.

Since posterior estimation becomes quickly intractable for complex models, mainly because of the integral in eq. (9), we often have to resort to approximation techniques. Some of these approximation techniques such as variational inference and MCMC are explicit and derived from the first principle whereas some others are somewhat implicit such as MC dropout and ensembles. In what follows, we present a number of popular probabilistic and non-probabilistic techniques to quantify uncertainty in ML models.

Ensembles: A collection of NNs can be independently trained, ideally in parallel for computational efficiency, with different weight initializations or other changes. During test time, the mean and variance can be calculated using the outputs of different NNs. If ensemble was performed on NNs that are adversarially trained on common NN loss functions,⁷ then the predictive uncertainties are more accurate [42, 53].

⁷To be precise, the loss should be a *proper scoring rule*.




Figure 5: We need many models to quantify the epistemic uncertainty. This can be done explicitly by having multiple models as in ensembles or implicitly by introducing probability distributions over the parameters (weights of the neural network) of the ML model.

Monte Carlo Dropout: To calculate uncertainty from MC dropout, the same input is passed through the network multiple times but a certain percentage of neurons are randomly disabled every time.⁸ Since this process implicitly induces a distribution over neural network weights, the multiple outputs represents epistemic uncertainty. This process can also be thought as variational inference [54], however with a rather weak approximate posterior [55].

Laplace Approximation (LA): The posterior is approximated with a unimodal distribution, typically a Gaussian. By using the second order Taylor approximation of the *maximum a posteriori* (MAP) estimate, it places the Gaussian around the mode of the true posterior. Since this is simply a mode matching technique, it is simple and faster but less accurate.

Variational Inference (VI): The objective of variational inference is to learn a parameterized distribution $q(w)$ that matches with the true posterior distribution $p(w|y)$ by minimizing $\mathbb{KL}[q(w)||p(w|y)]$ for model parameters w . Since we do not know the true posterior, we have to derive a lower bound—typically known as the Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO)—that does not depend on the true posterior. By doing so, we convert the inference problem into an optimization problem. For instance, if the parameters of the approximate posterior follows a normal distribution, $w \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma)$, the algorithm finds the best μ, σ that overlaps with p . Typically, estimating w is computationally expensive because a model has many parameters. Therefore, we factorize the approximate posterior as $q(w) = \prod_i q_i(w_i)$ and estimate each distribution separately. This is called mean-field approximation [56].

Even with mean-field approximation, when we have large datasets, using the entire dataset to update parameters is computationally infeasible. By using

⁸Dropout and MC dropout have two different objectives and work differently. The former runs in training time and works as a regularizer. The latter runs at inference time and acts as an uncertainty estimator.




Figure 6: Approximate Bayesian inference techniques. The Laplace approximation aligns with the peak. Variational inference (VI) typically aligns with one of the modes of the distribution. In contrast, expectation propagation (EP) considers the average over all modes, resulting in a more dispersed distribution. Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) can theoretically obtain the exact distribution if finitely many samples are taken.

small batches of data, we can perform Stochastic Variational Inference (SVI). This becomes specially attractive for perception tasks in robotics where the offline datasets are large or we obtain data online in batches [33, 2]. All these methods require deriving the ELBO which can be mathematically taxing. Black-box variational inference (BBVI) alleviates this. Rather than obtaining an analytical form it uses automatic differentiation.⁹ This allows learning complex distributions required for real-world robotics tasks [57]. We also often see amortized variational inference in variational autoencoders (VAEs) in which a neural network is used to estimate the parameters of the variational distribution. However, the objective in VAEs is not obtaining outputs with uncertainty. As a separate note, when the p and q terms of the divergence term of VI are swapped,¹⁰ $\mathbb{KL}[p(w|y)||q(w)]$, we call this Expectation Propagation (EP).

Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC): In VI, we assume a particular distribution for the posterior. Although this assumption makes computations tractable and faster, it also limits the representation power of the posterior distribution. For instance, if a unimodal Gaussian is used for q , then it will not appropriately cover the true bimodal distribution p . Instead of assuming a parametric distribution, we can represent a distribution using samples¹¹. Stein variational inference maintains a set of particles to represent the distribution—thus a nonparametric technique—and perform variational inference using them [58].

⁹Read more about Probabilistic Programming Languages (PPL) such as Pyro, Edward (now part of TensorFlow Probability), Stan, WebPPL, and Turing.jl.

¹⁰Note that KL is not a symmetric metric.

¹¹An infinite amount of samples represent the true distribution.

In Monte Carlo (MC) techniques, we often assume a proposal distribution q that we know of and can query. The proposal is used merely to guide sampling and needs not to match with the true distribution, although it should, ideally, encapsulate the true distribution. In rejection sampling, one of the MC techniques, we evaluate the probability density of proposal distribution q and true distribution p at a sampled position i . If $k \times q[i] < p[i]$ for some k , then we reject the i^{th} sample, otherwise keep it. The collection of kept samples represent a distribution. In rejection sampling, samples are drawn independently. This uninformed sampling technique quickly becomes inefficient as it results in a lot of samples being rejected, especially when we try to estimate multimodal or high-dimensional distributions. Therefore, in techniques such as Metropolis or Metropolis-Hastings [59], we sample in such a way that the next sampling step depends on the previous sample—from a Markov chain. Gibbs sampling [50] samples from one or a few dimensions at a time, making it an efficient variation on Metropolis-Hasting (MH) algorithm for high-dimensional distributions. Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) allows larger jumps in MH, which results in a few samples to represent a complex distribution. No-U-Turn Sampler (NUTS) automatically fine-tunes hyperparameters in HMC [60].¹²

Langevin Monte Carlo (LMC) such as Metropolis-adjusted Langevin Algorithm (MALA) [61], takes only a single leapfrog step in HMC. Therefore, although HMC is more suitable for high-dimensional spaces, LMC is the simpler to implement and easier to use. Since traditional MCMC algorithms fall short when it comes to large datasets as the entire dataset is used to update, in Stochastic Gradient Langevin Dynamics (SGLD), parameters are updated using SGD with minibatches [62].

Conformal Prediction (CP): Similar to MC dropout, conformal prediction is a post-hoc uncertainty estimation technique as it estimates the uncertainty of a pre-trained model using a calibration dataset and a quantile value. Conformal prediction aims at representing uncertainty with sets (or intervals). For image classification, it predicts possible set of classes (e.g., {cat, tiger}). The more complicated the image is or the poorer the model is, it adds more element into the set as any outcome becomes possible (e.g., {cat, tiger, jaguar, lion}). In regression tasks, the uncertainty is represented as an interval. Given the simplicity, conformal predictions are also well-suited for generative models such as large-language models [63]. They are model-agnostic and provide theoretical guarantees. They have many applications in robotics as well [64, 65, 64, 66, 67]. CP, in its vanilla form, assumes *exchangeability* [68], making it less straightforward to apply in certain time-dependent tasks such as robot control, though new treatments exists [69]. Angelopoulos and Bates [52] provide an excellent introduction for practitioners.

¹²These techniques are implemented in Pyro and Stan probabilistic programming language packages.

Direct uncertainty estimation: Techniques such as Prior Networks (PNs) [70] and Posterior Networks (PostNets) [71] try to estimate the probability estimates directly while trying to maintain the properties of a predictive distribution (i.e., higher uncertainty away from data). Especially, since the PostNets use normalizing flow density estimators, they can represent complex probability distributions. These techniques are inspired from the ideas of evidential deep learning [72, 73]¹³ and have been used in applications such as autonomous driving [74]. As another line of work, Epistemic Neural Networks (ENNs), presented as a generalized representation of other epistemic models such as Bayesian neural networks and ensembles, models the epistemic uncertainty using a small additional network called Epinet [75].

Other methods and representations: There are many other work on using alternative techniques for representing and estimating uncertainty and diversity. In work such as deep kernel learning (DKL) [76], Gaussian processes are used to estimate the uncertainty. However, rather than using a standard kernel, a deep neural network is used to capture nonlinear patterns in data. Kernel learning techniques have proven to be useful in many domains [77, 78, 79] and they are useful in robotics problems where using large neural networks is prohibitive. As another popular technique, particle filtering, also known as sequential Monte Carlo (SMC), is one of the most commonly used methods that helps with maintaining diverse solutions in robotics [41]. All these are standard Bayesian techniques that were not discussed under previous methods. In addition to them, various Covariance Matrix Adaptation (CMA) techniques have been used in robot control to maintain diverse solutions [80, 81]. Belief functions [82] in DST, probability box (p-box) [83, 84] in engineering analysis, fuzzy sets [85, 86] all deal with alternative uncertainty specifications and have applications to robotics [74, 87, 88, 84].

3.4 Calibration: Are Our Uncertainties Correct?

How do we know if the probabilities estimated by various techniques discussed in Section 3.3 are indeed accurate? Incorrect probabilities can lead to incorrect beliefs about safety. While various visualizations and metrics (see Section 3.2) such as accuracy vs. confidence plots, NLL, entropy, average discrepancy between class probability and ground truth (i.e., Brier score), etc. can be used to assess the correctness of uncertainty [89].

Considering the robustness and flexibility, Expected Calibration Error (ECE) [90] can be considered as the most popular method to assess calibration. In ECE, N predictions are arranged into M bins each with size $1/M$ according to predicted label confidences. If average accuracy and average confidence within each bin is similar, then the model is well-calibrated. This notion can be formulated

¹³They are based on Dempster–Shafer Theory (DST).




Figure 7: Uncertainty in object detection in autonomous driving. Uncertainty can be associated with the detected object class or bounding boxes.

as,

$$\text{ECE} = \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{|B_m|}{N} \left| \underbrace{\frac{1}{|B_m|} \sum_{i \in B_m} \mathbb{1}(\hat{y}_i = y_i)}_{\text{acc}(B_m)} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{|B_m|} \sum_{i \in B_m} \hat{p}_i}_{\text{conf}(B_m)} \right| \quad (11)$$

where y_i , \hat{y}_i and \hat{p}_i are the ground truth label, predicted label, and predicted label confidence, respectively, for sample i in bin B_m . The lower the ECE, the better calibrated the model is. Adaptive Calibration Error (ACE) [91] has been proposed as an improvement to ECE. Ovadia et al. [89] conducted a study on the quality of uncertainty on out-of-distribution samples for various epistemic uncertainty estimation techniques. They concluded that the quality of uncertainty lowers with data shift and deep ensembles and stochastic variational inference techniques are more promising.

If a model is miss-calibrated, it needs to be calibrated. Temperature scaling and histogram binning are simple post-hoc calibration techniques. The former is parametric and the latter is nonparametric. Temperature scaling of probabilities, $\text{softmax}(\text{logits}/T)$, has a single parameter T that can be tuned to minimize the ECE based on a validation dataset. A more generalized version of temperature scaling is Platt scaling, where a logistic regression model is fitted [92]. Isotonic regression involves fitting a piece-wise-constant nonparametric model. Bayesian Binning into Quantiles (BBQ) [93] is another calibration technique.¹⁴

4 How Do We Leverage Uncertainty?

Traditionally, robotics systems are designed to be modular for reasons such as interpretability and ease of designing and debugging. Nowadays, especially in research settings, the robots are also trained in an end-to-end fashion. Either way, our objective is to control the robot to achieve our objective¹⁵ by observing limited amount of uncertain data.

4.1 Uncertainty in Perceiving and Representing the World

In order for the robot to get an idea about the world, it performs various tasks.

Mapping the environment: One of the most basic requirement for a robot to act in its environment is a map. Occupancy grid maps are one of the commonly used metric mapping technique in mobile robotics [94, 95]. Considering their assumptions about discretization and inability to quantify epistemic uncertainty due to occlusions, Gaussian process-based occupancy mapping techniques were introduced [96, 2]. However, considering their prohibitive computational complexity on robotic hardware, especially when the robot gathers more and more data, Bayesian Hilbert mapping (BHM)—a scalable technique that uses variational inference to estimate a distribution of maps—has been proposed [33]. These techniques can estimate both aleatoric and epistemic and uncertainty (e.g., uncertainty due to lack of data or unseen areas). There are also techniques to only estimate the aleatoric uncertainty (e.g., sensor noise) by maximizing the maximum likelihood of a Bernoulli distribution [97] or Gaussian mixture [98]. When the occupancy is represented as a deep neural network, DST has been used to quantify uncertainty [74, 99]. More recently, variational inference [100] and post-hoc Laplace approximations [101] have been used to represent uncertainty in Neural radiance fields (NeRF). A single layer NeRF functions as a BHM with random Fourier features. There have been applications of environment uncertainty quantification techniques for modeling table top objects for manipulation [102], tactile localization and mapping [103], mapping dynamic environments [99, 104, 31, 105], etc.

Localization and tracking: The exact location of a robot or an external agent with respect to an origin in the environment it is in is difficult to determine because of sensor limitations (e.g., low GPS signal levels), limited landmarks, occlusions, dynamics, etc. Particle filters, a sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) estimation technique, and various Kalman filters such as Extended Kalman filters (EKF), Unscented Kalman filters (UKF) have been widely used to estimate the location of the robot [106, 41]. They have also been used for object tracking—determining the position over time. All these techniques focus only on aleatoric uncertainty. Also, in addition to these MC technique, variational inference has been used for localization [107, 108]. There are also tracking techniques that use uncertainty in deep neural networks [109, 110].

Object detection and pose estimation: An embodied agent typically needs to identify various objects around it to act intelligently. An object in a scene is represented by a bounding box—origin, width and height—and the associated object class. Therefore, quantifying uncertainty of object detection requires, computing the uncertainty of the bounding box parameters and assigned class, for instance using MC dropout [111]. Feng et al. [112] survey various probabilis-

¹⁴`net:cal` - Uncertainty Calibration Python library implements a number of these techniques.

¹⁵Our objective itself can also be uncertain.

tic object detection techniques. More recently, conformal prediction has been used as a post-hoc uncertainty estimation technique for object detection [113]. For most robotics tasks, merely detecting objects is not sufficient, the pose of the object needs to be estimated [114]. Estimating the poses typically requires estimating the (x, y, z) position and (roll, pitch, yaw) orientation, making it an estimation problem in \mathbb{R}^6 . Ensemble techniques [115] as well as directional statistics have been used in pose estimation. In particular, probability distributions such as the von Mises-Fisher [116, 117] and Bingham [118, 119] can represent uncertainty.

Semantic segmentation: Semantic segmentation is often useful in robotics tasks for delineating the foreground from background, determining the road for driving AVs, etc. Semantic uncertainty can be related to the entire class (e.g., the entire sky is identified as a river) or the class boundaries (e.g., a few pixels in the border between road and trees are incorrectly assigned). Especially, the latter case is unavoidable. Most loss functions and evaluation metrics used in semantic segmentation focus on the pixel-level semantic assignment of the entire image rather than the semantic boundaries. However, for safety critical tasks such as AVs, knowing the exact road boundaries is important. There is very high epistemic and aleatoric uncertainty in these boundaries due to ML model limitations, occlusions, etc. Similar to the mapping techniques discussed earlier in this subsection, semantic uncertainty has been quantified using relevance vector machines [120], MC dropout [121], etc.

Imagination and future prediction: The human ability to imagine helps us understand potential risks and efficient decisions. The action of “pretend play” in toddlers is considered to help with cognition, language, social, and emotional development [122]. Similarly, training robots in diverse simulations and through domain randomization help learn robust models [17]. The progress in generative AI has greatly simplified and improved the process of imagination. One special case of imagination is predicting future outcomes, which indeed is highly uncertain. Similar to humans’ tendency to anticipate the future before making-decisions, robots can predict the future state of any of the tasks discussed thus far. As examples, Gaussian processes [123], filtering [105, 31], and convolutional LSTMs [99, 124] have been used to predict how the occupancy changes in space and time for the next few time steps. The somewhat similar problem of video prediction is also useful in robotics, for instance in manipulation [125, 126]. Most state estimation and object tracking techniques can naively be extended for predicting the future location. There are also various trajectory prediction algorithms which have proven to be useful, for instance, in autonomous driving [127, 128].

Agent modeling and human-AI alignment: When robots interact with human or other robots, it is important for them to decipher the intents for successful coexistence. As a simple example, in social navigation or autonomous driving, the robot needs to guess if a human it observes would cross its path [28].

Physical interactions [27, 129], facial expressions, and emotions can also have uncertainty. When language is used to communicate, there can be uncertainties due to delay, lack of clarity, insufficient amount of information contained in the message, etc. Uncertainty exists not just in factual information but also in other aspects of language such as prosody. Rhetorical flourish devised into modern LLMs such as GPT3.5¹⁶ tend to provide overconfident answers. If embodied AI agents are using outputs from LLMs, their inability to express uncertainty should be taken into account. In some cases, we try to learn the various aspects of the agent such as preferences from human demonstrations, typically as a reward function [130, 131]. There are also attempts to learn the distribution over rewards in Bayesian inverse reinforcement learning [132, 133]. A unifying framework for imitation learning paradigms can be found in [134].

Detecting out-of-distribution (OOD) samples: Uncertainty also helps with assessing for which inputs the model might under-perform. If the predictive epistemic uncertainty is high for a particular input, then the model is not robust in the vicinity of that input. Uncertainty has been used for OOD detection in autonomous driving [18], mobile robotics [135], spacecraft pose estimation [136], manipulation [137], etc. Since the environments that robots operate are always subject to change, uncertainty is crucial for domain generalization and adaptation.

4.2 Uncertainty in Planning and Control

Our objective is to see how decision-making is affected by various sources of uncertainty.

Uncertainty propagation from perception into decision-making: Uncertainty of the world can be modeled as discussed in Section 4.1. If a robotic system has distinct modules for perception and decision-making, as in most classical robotic setups, then the uncertainty in perception can be propagated into the decision-making modules. Our objective is to calculate the output $y = (f_{\text{perc}} \circ f_{\text{deci}})(x)$ for an input x with a perception function, $f_{\text{perc}} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$, which is then sequentially fed into a decision function, $f_{\text{deci}} : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. As a simple example, consider an object detection module for the perception function and a motion planner for the decision function. If the object detector is giving multiple bounding boxes with associated uncertainties, how can the decision-making module leverage all those bounding boxes? In general, if the predictive uncertainty of perception is represented as samples, as in MCMC techniques or Ensembles, each output can be run through the decision-making module. This will result in a decision distribution—multiple decisions, each with its own probability. If uncertainty is instead represented as an interval, as in conformal

¹⁶We believe overconfident and persuasive answers are not an inherent limitation of LLMs; rather, it should be how the agent was trained using reinforcement learning with human feedback (RLHF).

prediction, the two endpoints of the interval can be run separately to understand the limits of decisions.

When the output of the perception function is a probability distribution¹⁷ p_{perc} , the input to the decision function is also a probability distribution. Hence, the output of the decision-making module can be computed as,

$$y = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p_{\text{perc}}(z) f_{\text{deci}}(z) dz \approx \sum_{z_n \sim p_{\text{perc}}} f(z_n) \quad (12)$$

where $\{z_n\}_{n=1}^N$ are samples taken from the output probability distribution of the perception module. If the probabilities are represented as a probability density function (PDF) and the integral is tractable, then the propagation becomes easier. Otherwise, we have to resort to a numerical integration technique. By sampling from the predictive probability distribution of perception and then evaluating the decision function on those samples, as shown in eq. (12), is a straightforward simplification. If the decision-making module is also setup to compute uncertainty, then y is also a probability distribution.

The use of uncertainty in exploration for better world representations:

In section 4.1, we discussed the importance of building a map of the environment. The objective of uncertainty quantification for mapping is understanding which areas of the environment we do not know about. This information can be used by the robot for exploration—to gather more information about the environment. Some applications of such exploration include a robot mapping an indoor environment, environmental monitoring using a drone [138], or subterranean or extraterrestrial navigation [139, 140]. For this purpose, probabilistic frontiers [141], Bayesian optimization (BO) with Gaussian processes [138], Partially Observable Markov Decision Process (POMDP) solvers [142], and reinforcement learning (RL) [143] have been used. Frontiers and BO are categorized under myopic exploration strategies as they are generally one-step look-ahead planners.

Uncertainty in learning a policy: Uncertainty is widely studied in planning and scheduling [144, 145] as well as robot motion planning [146]. A robot takes a sequence of decisions to control itself. This process can be modeled as a Markov decision process. If observations are not fully observable, we consider partially observable decision-making processes (POMDPs). POMDPs are widely used in manipulation [147], autonomous driving [148], aerospace control [29], etc. Kochenderfer [29], Kochenderfer et al. [149] list various solvers¹⁸ for POMDPs or belief space planning [151]. Note that the typical POMDPs do not take into account the epistemic uncertainty; estimating the epistemic uncertainty requires maintaining a distribution over the MDP which is intractable.

We typically use stochastic policies as the outcomes of our actions are not certain. This randomness also help with exploring different possibilities rather

¹⁷Say, the output of a map is the mean and standard deviation values of a normal distribution.

¹⁸Various solvers are implemented in POMDPs.jl [150]




Figure 8: Uncertainty in deep RL. Green, orange, and red show environments with increasing difficulty. Four desiderata for the desired behavior of uncertainty is discussed in [152].

than getting stuck in a local optimum. When the model of the environment dynamics is unknown or too complex to model, we have to resort to *model-free reinforcement learning (RL)*. Therefore, it implicitly handles a limited aspects of uncertainty of the environment.

Aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty can help improve deep RL in various ways. Following Charpentier et al. [152], as illustrated in Figure 8, we discuss four desiderata for the desired behavior of uncertainty in deep RL. As the number of training steps increases, the agent’s epistemic uncertainty should decrease as the agent collects more information about the environment (desideratum 1). Simultaneously, agent should collect more rewards with an epistemic strategy compared to an aleatoric strategy¹⁹ (desideratum 2). In the real-world, the environment we train our robots is not the same as we deploy. It sometimes tend to have little (e.g., orange environment in Figure 8) or even completely different perturbations (red environment in Figure 8). As we increase the complexity of perturbations, the epistemic uncertainty should be higher (desideratum 3) as the agent does not know about these new environments. Simultaneously, the rewards it collects should go lower (desideratum 4). A comparative analysis on the effect of deep RL algorithms is provided in [152]. The paper empirically and theoretically concluded that compared to an ϵ -greedy or aleatoric strategy,

¹⁹Aleatoric and epistemic strategies involve sampling from aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty distributions, respectively, to select actions.

sampling using an epistemic strategy receives higher rewards and maintains high generalization performance in OOD domains. This characterization of aleatoric and epistemic uncertainty in deep RL helps with generalization, sample efficiency, and knowing where the policy will not work.

Uncertainty is also studied in control theory. Bayesian nonparametric techniques such as Gaussian processes [153] and set-based techniques such as conformal prediction [154] have gained popularity for control tasks because they can provide theoretical guarantees, data efficient, and simple to use. Other set-based techniques such as backward reachability has also helped with reliability and safety [155, 156]. When uncertainty in parameters or unmeasured disturbances exist, Robust Model Predictive Control (Robust MPC) strategies help to maintain the stability of the system [157]. Uncertainty in Robust MPC is typically handled as bounded sets such as polytopes or ellipsoids. Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR) also has been used in robot robust control [158], trajectory optimization [159], and motion planning [160] to address risks and uncertainties.

5 Conclusions

We discussed how uncertainty and diversity are crucial in evaluative and generative paradigms of embodied AI. We highlighted that most classic robotics tasks focus primarily on aleatoric uncertainty. Although quantifying epistemic uncertainty is less straightforward, doing so can enhance robustness, data efficiency, and the capacity for imagination in embodied AI agents.

References

- [1] Martian boulders. <https://www.pinterest.com/pin/i-really-like-these-big-martian-boulders-that-the-curiosity-rover-just-saw-22-182044009910822852/>. Accessed: 2024-04-15.
- [2] Ransalu Senanayake and Fabio Ramos. Bayesian hilbert maps for dynamic continuous occupancy mapping. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 458–471, 2017.
- [3] Haruki Nishimura, Jean Mercat, Blake Wulfe, Rowan Thomas McAllister, and Adrien Gaidon. Rap: Risk-aware prediction for robust planning. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 381–392. PMLR, 2023.
- [4] Tim Brooks, Bill Peebles, Connor Homes, Will DePue, Yufei Guo, Li Jing, David Schnurr, Joe Taylor, Troy Luhman, Eric Luhman, Clarence Wing Yin Ng, Ricky Wang, and Aditya Ramesh. Video generation models as world simulators. <https://openai.com/research/video-generation-models-as-world-simulators>, 2024. Accessed: 2024-04-15.
- [5] Chengshu Li, Fei Xia, Roberto Martín-Martín, Michael Lingelbach, Sanjana Srivastava, Bokui Shen, Kent Vainio, Cem Gokmen, Gokul Dharan, Tanish Jain, et al. igibson 2.0: Object-centric simulation for robot learning of everyday household tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.03272*, 2021.

- [6] Andrew Szot, Alexander Clegg, Eric Undersander, Erik Wijmans, Yili Zhao, John Turner, Noah Maestre, Mustafa Mukadam, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Oleksandr Maksymets, et al. Habitat 2.0: Training home assistants to rearrange their habitat. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:251–266, 2021.
- [7] Markku Suomalainen, Alexandra Q Nilles, and Steven M LaValle. Virtual reality for robots. In *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 11458–11465. IEEE, 2020.
- [8] Andrey Kurenkov, Joseph Taglic, Rohun Kulkarni, Marcus Dominguez-Kuhne, Animesh Garg, Roberto Martín-Martín, and Silvio Savarese. Visuomotor mechanical search: Learning to retrieve target objects in clutter. In *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 8408–8414. IEEE, 2020.
- [9] Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*, 2023.
- [10] Harrison Delecki, Masha Itkina, Bernard Lange, Ransalu Senanayake, and Mykel Kochenderfer. How do we fail? stress testing perception in autonomous vehicles. In *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2022.
- [11] Som Sagar, Aditya Taparia, and Ransalu Senanayake. Failures are fated, but can be faded: Characterizing and mitigating unwanted behaviors in large-scale vision and language models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024.
- [12] Viktor Makoviychuk, Lukasz Wawrzyniak, Yunrong Guo, Michelle Lu, Kier Storey, Miles Macklin, David Hoeller, Nikita Rudin, Arthur Allshire, Ankur Handa, et al. Isaac gym: High performance gpu-based physics simulation for robot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.10470*, 2021.
- [13] Ye-Ji Mun, Zhe Huang, Haonan Chen, Yilong Niu, Haoyuan You, D Livingston McPherson, and Katherine Driggs-Campbell. User-friendly safety monitoring system for manufacturing cobots. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01886*, 2023.
- [14] Yueyuan Li, Wei Yuan, Songan Zhang, Weihao Yan, Qiyuan Shen, Chunxiang Wang, and Ming Yang. Choose your simulator wisely: A review on open-source simulators for autonomous driving. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2024.
- [15] Bimsara Pathiraja, Caleb Liu, and Ransalu Senanayake. Fairness in autonomous driving: Towards understanding confounding factors in object detection under challenging weather. *arXiv*, 2024. Available at arXiv.
- [16] Alexey Dosovitskiy, German Ros, Felipe Codevilla, Antonio Lopez, and Vladlen Koltun. Carla: An open urban driving simulator. In *Conference on robot learning*, pages 1–16. PMLR, 2017.
- [17] Fabio Ramos, Rafael Carvalhaes Possas, and Dieter Fox. Bayessim: adaptive domain randomization via probabilistic inference for robotics simulators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.01728*, 2019.

- [18] Julia Nitsch, Masha Itkina, Ransalu Senanayake, Juan Nieto, Max Schmidt, Roland Siegwart, Mykel J Kochenderfer, and Cesar Cadena. Out-of-distribution detection for automotive perception. In *2021 IEEE International Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*, pages 2938–2943. IEEE, 2021.
- [19] Rowan McAllister, Gregory Kahn, Jeff Clune, and Sergey Levine. Robustness to out-of-distribution inputs via task-aware generative uncertainty. In *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 2083–2089. IEEE, 2019.
- [20] Alec Farid, Sushant Veer, and Anirudha Majumdar. Task-driven out-of-distribution detection with statistical guarantees for robot learning. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 970–980. PMLR, 2022.
- [21] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- [22] Erdem Biyik, Nicolas Huynh, Mykel J Kochenderfer, and Dorsa Sadigh. Active preference-based gaussian process regression for reward learning and optimization. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*.
- [23] Andrew Gelman, John B Carlin, Hal S Stern, and Donald B Rubin. *Bayesian data analysis*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 1995.
- [24] Víctor Mayoral-Vilches, Jason Jabbour, Yu-Shun Hsiao, Zishen Wan, Alejandra Martínez-Fariña, Martino Crespo-Alvarez, Matthew Stewart, Juan Manuel Reina-Munoz, Prateek Nagras, Gaurav Vikhe, et al. Robotperf: An open-source, vendor-agnostic, benchmarking suite for evaluating robotics computing system performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.09212*, 2023.
- [25] Michael Laskey, Jonathan Lee, Caleb Chuck, David Gealy, Wesley Hsieh, Florian T Pokorny, Anca D Dragan, and Ken Goldberg. Robot grasping in clutter: Using a hierarchy of supervisors for learning from demonstrations. In *2016 IEEE international conference on automation science and engineering (CASE)*, pages 827–834. IEEE, 2016.
- [26] James Manyika and Hugh Durrant-Whyte. *Data fusion and sensor management: a decentralized information-theoretic approach*. Prentice Hall PTR, 1995.
- [27] Kelvin Xu, Ellis Ratner, Anca Dragan, Sergey Levine, and Chelsea Finn. Learning a prior over intent via meta-inverse reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6952–6962. PMLR, 2019.
- [28] Yuanfu Luo, Panpan Cai, Aniket Bera, David Hsu, Wee Sun Lee, and Dinesh Manocha. Porca: Modeling and planning for autonomous driving among many pedestrians. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 3(4):3418–3425, 2018.
- [29] Mykel J Kochenderfer. *Decision making under uncertainty: theory and application*. MIT press, 2015.

- [30] Leslie Pack Kaelbling, Michael L Littman, and Anthony R Cassandra. Planning and acting in partially observable stochastic domains. *Artificial intelligence*, 101 (1-2):99–134, 1998.
- [31] Masha Itkina, Katherine Driggs-Campbell, and Mykel J Kochenderfer. Dynamic environment prediction in urban scenes using recurrent representation learning. In *2019 IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*, pages 2052–2059. IEEE, 2019.
- [32] Tomáš Vintr, Zhi Yan, Tom Duckett, and Tomáš Krajník. Spatio-temporal representation for long-term anticipation of human presence in service robotics. In *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 2620–2626. IEEE, 2019.
- [33] Ransalu Senanayake, Simon O’Callaghan, and Fabio Ramos. Learning highly dynamic environments with stochastic variational inference. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 2532–2539. IEEE, 2017.
- [34] Dani Deahl. Volvo’s self-driving cars are having trouble recognizing kangaroos. <https://www.theverge.com/2017/7/3/15914120/volvo-self-driving-car-kangaroo-australia>, 2017. Accessed: March-15-2024.
- [35] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- [36] Miao Li, Kaiyu Hang, Danica Kragic, and Aude Billard. Dexterous grasping under shape uncertainty. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 75:352–364, 2016.
- [37] Freek Stulp, Evangelos Theodorou, Jonas Buchli, and Stefan Schaal. Learning to grasp under uncertainty. In *2011 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 5703–5708. IEEE, 2011.
- [38] Kaijen Hsiao, Leslie Pack Kaelbling, and Tomás Lozano-Pérez. Robust grasping under object pose uncertainty. *Autonomous Robots*, 31:253–268, 2011.
- [39] Michael Bowman, Songpo Li, and Xiaoli Zhang. Intent-uncertainty-aware grasp planning for robust robot assistance in telemanipulation. In *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 409–415. IEEE, 2019.
- [40] Simultaneous localization and mapping: part i. *IEEE robotics & automation magazine*, 13(2):99–110, 2006.
- [41] Sebastian Thrun. Probabilistic robotics. *Communications of the ACM*, 45(3): 52–57, 2002.
- [42] Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Alexander Pritzel, and Charles Blundell. Simple and scalable predictive uncertainty estimation using deep ensembles. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [43] Roger L Berger and George Casella. *Statistical inference*. Duxbury, 2001.

- [44] Matthias Seeger. Gaussian processes for machine learning. *International journal of neural systems*, 14(02):69–106, 2004.
- [45] Cédric Villani et al. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer, 2009.
- [46] Rémi Flamary, Nicolas Courty, Alexandre Gramfort, Mokhtar Z Alaya, Aurélie Boisbunon, Stanislas Chambon, Laetitia Chapel, Adrien Corenflos, Kilian Fartas, Nemo Fournier, et al. Pot: Python optimal transport. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(78):1–8, 2021.
- [47] M Cuturi. Lightspeed computation of optimal transportation distances. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 26(2):2292–2300, 2013.
- [48] Andreĭ Nikolaevich Kolmogorov and Albert T Bharucha-Reid. *Foundations of the theory of probability: Second English Edition*. Courier Dover Publications, 2018.
- [49] Peter Walley. *Statistical reasoning with imprecise probabilities*. 1991.
- [50] Stuart Geman and Donald Geman. Stochastic relaxation, gibbs distributions, and the bayesian restoration of images. *IEEE Transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, (6):721–741, 1984.
- [51] Radford M Neal. *Bayesian learning for neural networks*, volume 118. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [52] Anastasios N Angelopoulos and Stephen Bates. A gentle introduction to conformal prediction and distribution-free uncertainty quantification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.07511*, 2021.
- [53] Siddhartha Jain, Ge Liu, Jonas Mueller, and David Gifford. Maximizing overall diversity for improved uncertainty estimates in deep ensembles. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 4264–4271, 2020.
- [54] Yarin Gal and Zoubin Ghahramani. Dropout as a bayesian approximation: Representing model uncertainty in deep learning. In *international conference on machine learning*, pages 1050–1059. PMLR, 2016.
- [55] Loic Le Folgoc, Vasileios Baltatzis, Sujal Desai, Anand Devaraj, Sam Ellis, Octavio E Martinez Manzanera, Arjun Nair, Huaqi Qiu, Julia Schnabel, and Ben Glocker. Is mc dropout bayesian? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04286*, 2021.
- [56] Christopher M Bishop. *Pattern recognition and machine learning*. *Springer google schola*, 2:645–678, 2006.
- [57] Ransalu Senanayake, Anthony Tompkins, and Fabio Ramos. Automorphing kernels for nonstationarity in mapping unstructured environments. In *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, pages 443–455, 2018.
- [58] Qiang Liu and Dilin Wang. Stein variational gradient descent: A general purpose bayesian inference algorithm. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.

- [59] W Keith Hastings. Monte carlo sampling methods using markov chains and their applications. 1970.
- [60] Bob Carpenter, Andrew Gelman, Matthew D Hoffman, Daniel Lee, Ben Goodrich, Michael Betancourt, Marcus A Brubaker, Jiqiang Guo, Peter Li, and Allen Riddell. Stan: A probabilistic programming language. *Journal of statistical software*, 76, 2017.
- [61] Gareth O Roberts and Richard L Tweedie. Exponential convergence of langevin distributions and their discrete approximations. *Bernoulli*, pages 341–363, 1996.
- [62] Max Welling and Yee W Teh. Bayesian learning via stochastic gradient langevin dynamics. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on machine learning (ICML)*, pages 681–688. Citeseer, 2011.
- [63] Christopher Mohri and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Language models with conformal factuality guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10978*, 2024.
- [64] Jiankai Sun, Yiqi Jiang, Jianing Qiu, Parth Nobel, Mykel J Kochenderfer, and Mac Schwager. Conformal prediction for uncertainty-aware planning with diffusion dynamics model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [65] Allen Z Ren, Anushri Dixit, Alexandra Bodrova, Sumeet Singh, Stephen Tu, Noah Brown, Peng Xu, Leila Takayama, Fei Xia, Jake Varley, et al. Robots that ask for help: Uncertainty alignment for large language model planners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01928*, 2023.
- [66] Jun Wang, Guocheng He, and Yiannis Kantaros. Safe task planning for language-instructed multi-robot systems using conformal prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15368*, 2024.
- [67] John Waczak, Adam Aker, Lakitha OH Wijeratne, Shawhin Talebi, Ashen Fernando, Prabuddha MH Dewage, Mazhar Iqbal, Matthew Lary, David Schaefer, and David J Lary. Characterizing water composition with an autonomous robotic team employing comprehensive in situ sensing, hyperspectral imaging, machine learning, and conformal prediction. *Remote Sensing*, 16(6):996, 2024.
- [68] Glenn Shafer and Vladimir Vovk. A tutorial on conformal prediction. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(3), 2008.
- [69] Rina Foygel Barber, Emmanuel J Candes, Aaditya Ramdas, and Ryan J Tibshirani. Conformal prediction beyond exchangeability. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(2):816–845, 2023.
- [70] Andrey Malinin and Mark Gales. Predictive uncertainty estimation via prior networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [71] Bertrand Charpentier, Daniel Zügner, and Stephan Günnemann. Posterior network: Uncertainty estimation without ood samples via density-based pseudo-counts. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1356–1367, 2020.

- [72] Murat Sensoy, Lance Kaplan, and Melih Kandemir. Evidential deep learning to quantify classification uncertainty. In S. Bengio, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, K. Grauman, N. Cesa-Bianchi, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- [73] Alexander Amini, Wilko Schwarting, Ava Soleimany, and Daniela Rus. Deep evidential regression. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 14927–14937, 2020.
- [74] Masha Itkina. *Uncertainty-aware Spatiotemporal Perception for Autonomous Vehicles*. Ph.d. dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 2022.
- [75] Ian Osband, Zheng Wen, Seyed Mohammad Asghari, Vikranth Dwaracherla, Morteza Ibrahimi, Xiuyuan Lu, and Benjamin Van Roy. Epistemic neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [76] Andrew Gordon Wilson, Zhiting Hu, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Eric P Xing. Deep kernel learning. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 370–378. PMLR, 2016.
- [77] Andrew Wilson and Hannes Nickisch. Kernel interpolation for scalable structured gaussian processes (kiss-gp). In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1775–1784. PMLR, 2015.
- [78] Anthony Tompkins, Ransalu Senanayake, Philippe Morere, and Fabio Ramos. Black box quantiles for kernel learning. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1427–1437. PMLR, 2019.
- [79] Kelvin Hsu and Fabio Ramos. Bayesian learning of conditional kernel mean embeddings for automatic likelihood-free inference. In *The 22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2631–2640. PMLR, 2019.
- [80] Bryon Tjanaka, Matthew C Fontaine, David H Lee, Yulun Zhang, Nivedit Reddy Balam, Nathaniel Dennler, Sujay S Garlanka, Nikitas Dimitri Klapsis, and Stefanos Nikolaidis. pyribs: A bare-bones python library for quality diversity optimization. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*, pages 220–229, 2023.
- [81] Dylan M Asmar, Ransalu Senanayake, Shawn Manuel, and Mykel J Kochenderfer. Model predictive optimized path integral strategies. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 3182–3188. IEEE, 2023.
- [82] Glenn Shafer. Perspectives on the theory and practice of belief functions. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 4(5-6):323–362, 1990.
- [83] Scott Ferson, Lev Ginzburg, and Resit Akçakaya. Whereof one cannot speak: when input distributions are unknown.
- [84] Matthias GR Faes, Marco Daub, Stefano Marelli, Edoardo Patelli, and Michael Beer. Engineering analysis with probability boxes: A review on computational methods. *Structural Safety*, 93:102092, 2021.

- [85] Lotfi Asker Zadeh. Fuzzy sets. *Information and control*, 8(3):338–353, 1965.
- [86] Dyuman Aditya, Kaustuv Mukherji, Srikar Balasubramanian, Abhiraj Chaudhary, and Paulo Shakarian. Pyreason: software for open world temporal logic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13482*, 2023.
- [87] Kazuo Tanaka and Hua O Wang. *Fuzzy control systems design and analysis: a linear matrix inequality approach*. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
- [88] RM Namal Bandara and Sujeetha Gaspe. Fuzzy logic controller design for an unmanned aerial vehicle. In *2016 IEEE International Conference on Information and Automation for Sustainability (ICIAfS)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2016.
- [89] Yaniv Ovadia, Emily Fertig, Jie Ren, Zachary Nado, David Sculley, Sebastian Nowozin, Joshua Dillon, Balaji Lakshminarayanan, and Jasper Snoek. Can you trust your model’s uncertainty? evaluating predictive uncertainty under dataset shift. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [90] Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017.
- [91] Jeremy Nixon, Michael W Dusenberry, Linchuan Zhang, Ghassen Jerfel, and Dustin Tran. Measuring calibration in deep learning. In *CVPR workshops*, volume 2, 2019.
- [92] John Platt et al. Probabilistic outputs for support vector machines and comparisons to regularized likelihood methods. *Advances in large margin classifiers*, 10(3):61–74, 1999.
- [93] Mahdi Pakdaman Naeini, Gregory Cooper, and Milos Hauskrecht. Obtaining well calibrated probabilities using bayesian binning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 29, 2015.
- [94] Alberto Elfes. Using occupancy grids for mobile robot perception and navigation. *Computer*, 22(6):46–57, 1989.
- [95] Xiaoyu Tian, Tao Jiang, Longfei Yun, Yue Wang, Yilun Wang, and Hang Zhao. Occ3d: A large-scale 3d occupancy prediction benchmark for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14365*, 2023.
- [96] Simon T O’Callaghan and Fabio T Ramos. Gaussian process occupancy maps. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 31(1):42–62, 2012.
- [97] Fabio Ramos and Lionel Ott. Hilbert maps: Scalable continuous occupancy mapping with stochastic gradient descent. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 35(14):1717–1730, 2016.
- [98] Kshitij Goel and Wennie Tabib. Incremental multimodal surface mapping via self-organizing gaussian mixture models. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 8(12):8358–8365, 2023.

- [99] Maneekwan Toyungyernsub, Masha Itkina, Ransalu Senanayake, and Mykel J Kochenderfer. Double-prong convlstm for spatiotemporal occupancy prediction in dynamic environments. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 13931–13937. IEEE, 2021.
- [100] Jianxiong Shen, Adria Ruiz, Antonio Agudo, and Francesc Moreno-Noguer. Stochastic neural radiance fields: Quantifying uncertainty in implicit 3d representations. In *2021 International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV)*, pages 972–981. IEEE, 2021.
- [101] Lily Goli, Cody Reading, Silvia Sellán, Alec Jacobson, and Andrea Tagliasacchi. Bayes’ rays: Uncertainty quantification for neural radiance fields. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03185*, 2023.
- [102] Herbert Wright, Weiming Zhi, Matthew Johnson-Roberson, and Tucker Hermans. V-prism: Probabilistic mapping of unknown tabletop scenes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08106*, 2024.
- [103] Shengxin Jia, Lionel Zhang, and Veronica J Santos. Autonomous tactile localization and mapping of objects buried in granular materials. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7(4):9953–9960, 2022.
- [104] Youngjae Min, Do-Un Kim, and Han-Lim Choi. Kernel-based 3-d dynamic occupancy mapping with particle tracking. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 5268–5274. IEEE, 2021.
- [105] Vitor Guizilini, Ransalu Senanayake, and Fabio Ramos. Dynamic hilbert maps: Real-time occupancy predictions in changing environments. In *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 4091–4097. IEEE, 2019.
- [106] Hugh Durrant-Whyte et al. Introduction to estimation and the kalman filter. *Australian Centre for Field Robotics*, 28(3):65–94, 2001.
- [107] Atanas Mirchev, Baris Kayalibay, Maximilian Soelch, Patrick van der Smagt, and Justin Bayer. Approximate bayesian inference in spatial environments. *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2019.
- [108] Atanas Mirchev, Baris Kayalibay, Patrick van der Smagt, and Justin Bayer. Variational state-space models for localisation and dense 3d mapping in 6 dof. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10178*, 2020.
- [109] Dawei Zhang, Yanwei Fu, and Zhonglong Zheng. Uast: Uncertainty-aware siamese tracking. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 26161–26175. PMLR, 2022.
- [110] Lijun Zhou, Antoine Ledent, Qintao Hu, Ting Liu, Jianlin Zhang, and Marius Kloft. Model uncertainty guides visual object tracking. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 3581–3589, 2021.
- [111] Mihaela Stoycheva. Uncertainty estimation in deep neural object detectors for autonomous driving, 2021.

- [112] Di Feng, Ali Harakeh, Steven L Waslander, and Klaus Dietmayer. A review and comparative study on probabilistic object detection in autonomous driving. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(8):9961–9980, 2021.
- [113] Florence De Grancey, Jean-Luc Adam, Lucian Alecu, Sébastien Gerchinovitz, Franck Mamalet, and David Vigouroux. Object detection with probabilistic guarantees: A conformal prediction approach. In *International Conference on Computer Safety, Reliability, and Security*, pages 316–329. Springer, 2022.
- [114] Yu Xiang, Tanner Schmidt, Venkatraman Narayanan, and Dieter Fox. Posecnn: A convolutional neural network for 6d object pose estimation in cluttered scenes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00199*, 2017.
- [115] Kira Wursthorn, Markus Hillemann, and Markus Ulrich. Uncertainty quantification with deep ensembles for 6d object pose estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07741*, 2024.
- [116] Sergey Prokudin, Peter Gehler, and Sebastian Nowozin. Deep directional statistics: Pose estimation with uncertainty quantification. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 534–551, 2018.
- [117] Weiming Zhi, Ransalu Senanayake, Lionel Ott, and Fabio Ramos. Spatiotemporal learning of directional uncertainty in urban environments with kernel recurrent mixture density networks. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 4(4): 4306–4313, 2019.
- [118] Brian Okorn, Mengyun Xu, Martial Hebert, and David Held. Learning orientation distributions for object pose estimation. In *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 10580–10587. IEEE, 2020.
- [119] Igor Gilitschenski, Roshni Sahoo, Wilko Schwarting, Alexander Amini, Sertac Karaman, and Daniela Rus. Deep orientation uncertainty learning based on a bingham loss. In *International conference on learning representations*, 2019.
- [120] Lu Gan, Maani Ghaffari Jadidi, Steven A Parkison, and Ryan M Eustice. Sparse bayesian inference for dense semantic mapping. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.07973*, 2017.
- [121] Jishnu Mukhoti and Yarin Gal. Evaluating bayesian deep learning methods for semantic segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.12709*, 2018.
- [122] Salim Hashmi, Ross E Vanderwert, Hope A Price, and Sarah A Gerson. Exploring the benefits of doll play through neuroscience. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 14:560176, 2020.
- [123] Ransalu Senanayake, Lionel Ott, Simon O’Callaghan, and Fabio T Ramos. Spatio-temporal hilbert maps for continuous occupancy representation in dynamic environments. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 29, 2016.

- [124] Khushdeep Singh Mann, Abhishek Tomy, Anshul Paigwar, Alessandro Renzaglia, and Christian Laugier. Predicting future occupancy grids in dynamic environment with spatio-temporal learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.03212*, 2022.
- [125] Chelsea Finn, Ian Goodfellow, and Sergey Levine. Unsupervised learning for physical interaction through video prediction. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- [126] Dinesh Jayaraman, Frederik Ebert, Alexei A Efros, and Sergey Levine. Time-agnostic prediction: Predicting predictable video frames. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.07784*, 2018.
- [127] Tim Salzmann, Boris Ivanovic, Punarjay Chakravarty, and Marco Pavone. Trajectron++: Dynamically-feasible trajectory forecasting with heterogeneous data. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XVIII 16*, pages 683–700. Springer, 2020.
- [128] Alexandre Alahi, Kratarth Goel, Vignesh Ramanathan, Alexandre Robicquet, Li Fei-Fei, and Silvio Savarese. Social lstm: Human trajectory prediction in crowded spaces. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 961–971, 2016.
- [129] Anca D Dragan, Kenton CT Lee, and Siddhartha S Srinivasa. Legibility and predictability of robot motion. In *2013 8th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*, pages 301–308. IEEE, 2013.
- [130] Erdem Biyik, Nicolas Huynh, Mykel J Kochenderfer, and Dorsa Sadigh. Active preference-based gaussian process regression for reward learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.02575*, 2020.
- [131] Daniel Shin, Anca D Dragan, and Daniel S Brown. Benchmarks and algorithms for offline preference-based reward learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.01392*, 2023.
- [132] Aishwarya Mandyam, Didong Li, Diana Cai, Andrew Jones, and Barbara E Engelhardt. Kernel density bayesian inverse reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.06827*, 2023.
- [133] Deepak Ramachandran and Eyal Amir. Bayesian inverse reinforcement learning. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 7, pages 2586–2591, 2007.
- [134] Raunak Bhattacharyya, Blake Wulfe, Derek J Phillips, Alex Kuefler, Jeremy Morton, Ransalu Senanayake, and Mykel J Kochenderfer. Modeling human driving behavior through generative adversarial imitation learning. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 24(3):2874–2887, 2022.
- [135] Michael Yuhas and Arvind Easwaran. Demo abstract: Real-time out-of-distribution detection on a mobile robot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11520*, 2022.
- [136] Matt Foutter, Rohan Sinha, Somrita Banerjee, and Marco Pavone. Self-supervised model generalization using out-of-distribution detection. In *First Workshop on Out-of-Distribution Generalization in Robotics at CoRL 2023*, 2023.

- [137] Alec Farid, Sushant Veer, and Anirudha Majumdar. Task-driven out-of-distribution detection with statistical guarantees for robot learning. 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 970–980, 08–11 Nov 2022.
- [138] Roman Marchant and Fabio Ramos. Bayesian optimisation for intelligent environmental monitoring. In *2012 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems*, pages 2242–2249. IEEE, 2012.
- [139] Sung-Kyun Kim, Amanda Bouman, Gautam Salhotra, David D Fan, Kyohei Otsu, Joel Burdick, and Ali-akbar Agha-mohammadi. Plgrim: Hierarchical value learning for large-scale exploration in unknown environments. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, volume 31, pages 652–662, 2021.
- [140] Oriana Peltzer, Kim-Sung-Kyun Senanayake Ransalu Bouman, Amanda, Joshua Ott, Sobue-Mamoru-Kochenderfer Mykel J. Delecki, Harrison, Mac Schwager, Joel Burdick, and Ali-akbar Agha-mohammadi. Fig-op: Exploring large-scale unknown environments on a fixed time budget. In *IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2022.
- [141] Brian Yamauchi. A frontier-based approach for autonomous exploration. In *Proceedings 1997 IEEE International Symposium on Computational Intelligence in Robotics and Automation CIRA'97. 'Towards New Computational Principles for Robotics and Automation'*, pages 146–151. IEEE, 1997.
- [142] Philippe Morere, Roman Marchant, and Fabio Ramos. Sequential bayesian optimization as a pomdp for environment monitoring with uavs. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 6381–6388. IEEE, 2017.
- [143] Luíza Caetano Garaffa, Maik Basso, Andréa Aparecida Konzen, and Edison Pignaton de Freitas. Reinforcement learning for mobile robotics exploration: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 34(8): 3796–3810, 2021.
- [144] Rune M Jensen, Manuela M Veloso, and Randal E Bryant. Fault tolerant planning: Moving toward probabilistic uncertainty models in symbolic non-deterministic planning.
- [145] Keiko Nagami and Mac Schwager. State estimation and belief space planning under epistemic uncertainty for learning-based perception systems. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2024.
- [146] Tin Lai, Philippe Morere, Fabio Ramos, and Gilad Francis. Bayesian local sampling-based planning. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 5(2):1954–1961, 2020.
- [147] Aidan Curtis, Leslie Kaelbling, and Siddarth Jain. Task-directed exploration in continuous pomdps for robotic manipulation of articulated objects. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 3721–3728. IEEE, 2023.

- [148] Liam A Kruse, Esen Yel, Ransalu Senanayake, and Mykel J Kochenderfer. Uncertainty-aware online merge planning with learned driver behavior. In *2022 IEEE 25th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, pages 1202–1207. IEEE, 2022.
- [149] Mykel J Kochenderfer, Tim A Wheeler, and Kyle H Wray. *Algorithms for decision making*. MIT press, 2022.
- [150] Maxim Egorov, Zachary N. Sunberg, Edward Balaban, Tim A. Wheeler, Jayesh K. Gupta, and Mykel J. Kochenderfer. POMDPs.jl: A framework for sequential decision making under uncertainty. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(26):1–5, 2017.
- [151] Robert Platt Jr, Russ Tedrake, Leslie Pack Kaelbling, and Tomas Lozano-Perez. Belief space planning assuming maximum likelihood observations. In *Robotics: Science and Systems*, volume 2, 2010.
- [152] Bertrand Charpentier, Ransalu Senanayake, Mykel Kochenderfer, and Stephan Günnemann. Disentangling epistemic and aleatoric uncertainty in reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.01558*, 2022.
- [153] Anayo K Akametalu, Jaime F Fisac, Jeremy H Gillula, Shahab Kaynama, Melanie N Zeilinger, and Claire J Tomlin. Reachability-based safe learning with gaussian processes. In *53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 1424–1431. IEEE, 2014.
- [154] Lars Lindemann, Matthew Cleaveland, Gihyun Shim, and George J Pappas. Safe planning in dynamic environments using conformal prediction. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2023.
- [155] Somil Bansal, Mo Chen, Sylvia Herbert, and Claire J Tomlin. Hamilton-jacobi reachability: A brief overview and recent advances. In *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 2242–2253. IEEE, 2017.
- [156] Sylvia L Herbert, Mo Chen, SooJean Han, Somil Bansal, Jaime F Fisac, and Claire J Tomlin. Fastrack: A modular framework for fast and guaranteed safe motion planning. In *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 1517–1522. IEEE, 2017.
- [157] Alberto Bemporad and Manfred Morari. Robust model predictive control: A survey. In *Robustness in identification and control*, pages 207–226. Springer, 2007.
- [158] Joseph A Vincent, Aaron O Feldman, and Mac Schwager. Guarantees on robot system performance using stochastic simulation rollouts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10874*, 2023.
- [159] Thomas Lew, Riccardo Bonalli, and Marco Pavone. Risk-averse trajectory optimization via sample average approximation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2023.
- [160] Astghik Hakobyan, Gyeong Chan Kim, and Insoon Yang. Risk-aware motion planning and control using cvar-constrained optimization. *IEEE Robotics and Automation letters*, 4(4):3924–3931, 2019.