

Automating the Probing Process

Kenneth M. Dawson-Howe* and Tomos G. Williams **

Department of Computer Science, Trinity College, Dublin

Abstract. This paper presents a new approach to the detection of anti-personnel landmines which is based on the physical detection of landmines using a sharpened probe in a fashion similar to that employed by human deminers. The axial force applied to the probe is sensed as the probe is driven into the ground (at 30 degrees to the horizontal in order to avoid initiating the landmine), and the force information together with absolute position information is used to determine the presence of buried objects. The concept is demonstrated using a lab based prototype system which located several anti-personnel mines in a small test area.

1 Introduction

While remote sensing has the potential to develop a comprehensive solution to the general landmine detection problem, the current most reliable method remains manual probing from a prone or squatting position [1]. The probe used is generally just a sharpened ‘stick’ such as a bayonet which is inserted into the ground at an angle no greater than 40 degrees to the horizontal [1] at 2cm intervals until some resistance is encountered.

A more advanced ‘extended probe’ was being developed under the American ‘Humanitarian Demining Development Programme’ [2]. This probe allowed the deminer to remain two metres from the ground which is being probed, provided some protection in the form of a blast shield, and had a vibrator tip microphone in order to discriminate between different materials. According to the project manager of the American program, work on this device has been stopped as the Canadian National Defence are reportedly developing a more reliable system which bases it’s classification of object type on the returned energy from an ultrasonic pulse which is sent down the probe once it is in contact with an object. (Unfortunately no formal references are available for the information detailed in this paragraph).

The proposal of this paper is that the process of probing the ground could and should be performed by tele-operated or autonomous robots. In effect these robots should emulate the work of human deminers and depending on conditions, this could involve using a combination of a metal detector and a probe or just a probe on its own. However it is worth noting that such robots are not limited to following exactly the same procedure that is followed by human deminers. For example a robot could carry a number of independent probes in order to speed up the probing task. In addition a robot will not suffer from deminer fatigue and more importantly would reduce the number of human casualties due to demining operations.

2 Demonstrator System

In order to demonstrate the feasibility of automatic probing a demonstrator system was constructed. This system was not intended to deal with all of the issues involved with automatic probing in a real minefield, but rather was intended to demonstrate the concept and to investigate the difficulties associated with the task.

The system consists of an XY table (i.e. two orthogonal linear stages; to allow probing to be performed over a limited test area), an electrically driven linear actuator (to drive the probe into the ground), a force sensor (to sense resistance to the probe), an angle bracket (to allow the probe to be mounted at an angle of 30 degrees to the horizontal), and a sharpened steel rod (i.e. the probe). The system is shown in Figure 1 (see [3] for full details).

* Kenneth.Dawson-Howe@cs.tcd.ie

** Tom.Williams@cs.tcd.ie




Fig. 1.: The demonstrator system. The X and Y stages allow the probe to be positioned in any position over a test area. The probe is connected to a force sensor which is connected to a linear actuator which is connected to the XY table using a 30 degree angle bracket.

The two linear stages of the XY table have ranges of motion of 900mm and 600mm respectively, and for practical reasons, the test area was limited to a 500mm square. The actuator has a 190mm stroke length (i.e. limiting the maximum insertion depth of the probe to 190mm), and this in turn limits the vertical depth of probing to 95mm (due to the probing angle of 30 degrees). Please note that this is off-the-shelf hardware and is not a limitation on the maximum depth that can be probed automatically.

Inserting the probe into the ground gives feedback on both force (from the force sensor) and position (from an optical encoder mounted on the motor of the linear actuator). The force required to insert the probe into the ground at a constant speed increases roughly proportional to the depth of insertion. However when an obstacle is encountered the force required increases, and if it exceeds a pre-selected threshold, which was set to 15 Newtons during our tests, then insertion is stopped and the depth of insertion is recorded.

Prior to development of the demonstrator system we performed tests using a custom made manual probe [4, 5] (which provided force information) in a number of different terrains and found that a roughly linear relationship held between the depth of insertion and the force required to insert the probe at a constant speed although the ratio between the two varied considerably. This indicated that the technique should work in varying terrains although the force required to insert the probe into the ground in some terrains could be significant.


3 Probing tests

Three anti-personnel mines (an SB-33, a PMN, and a PMD-6) and one rock were buried in the test area in relatively loose soil (see Figure 2 (a)). The test area was then probed using a simple search strategy of inserting the probe every 30mm, and if an obstacle was encountered the probing was then done every 10mm in order to obtain a better idea of the shape of the object (See Figure 2 (b)). Probing was done everywhere in the test area although in reality **probing would cease if a suspect object was located** in order to minimise the risk of initiating a mine by probing on the top surface.


The data shown in Figure 2 (b) are the depths to which the probe was inserted prior to encountering an obstacle (or reaching the end of the possible range of travel). As the probe was inserted at an angle of 30 degrees it is necessary to transform this data somewhat in order to visualise the objects in 3-D; see Figure 3.

In Figure 3 (a) the four objects are clearly visible. The SB-33 is in the lower corner, the rectangular PMD-6 in the upper Y, lower X corner, the circular PMD in the upper corner and the rock in the upper X, lower Y corner. A number of smaller peaks are also visible where the probe encountered smaller stones. These, however, do not distract from the four larger objects which dominate the data.

A close up of probe data on and around the SB-33 mine, Figure 3 (b), provides evidence of the size and dimensions of the buried object. It appears to be of irregular shape of approximately 100mm across and



(a)



(b)

Fig. 2: Three anti-personnel mines (an SB-33, a PMN, and a PMD-6) and one rock were buried in the test area in relatively loose soil (a), and the test area was then probed the results of which are shown in (b). Note that the grey levels shown are equal to the depths (in mm) to which the probe was inserted prior to encountering an obstacle (i.e. the darker the grey level the closer the obstacle was to the surface) and also that probing was done at an angle of 30 degrees to the horizontal in a direction parallel to the X axis.

90mm in depth. It's irregularity is magnified by the presence of noise in the data caused by smaller stones being lodged between the mine body and probe tip while measurements were being taken.

The rectangular outline of the PMD-6 can be seen in the magnified data in figure 3 (c) with the top edge set at an angle to the probing direction. The data points of the top surface of the mine are of lower depth than the leading edge which is caused by the probe tip sliding along the surface of the mine before the reaction force eventually reaching the threshold to terminate the probing. This is the situation where there is a discrepancy between the measure and actual position of the probe tip due to lack of rigidity in the probe. This results in subsequent probes of the top side appearing lower than the leading edge due to the probe sliding along the surface.

Figure 3 (d) illustrates the data for the PMN mine where its circular outline of diameter 110mm can be clearly recognised. It is also possible to identify one of the covering plugs of the openings at the side edge of the mine. The depression in the top surface is again caused by the probe tip sliding along the object.

4 Conclusions from testing

1. The data from the tests obviously indicated the presence of the three landmines and the rock, although many other obstacles were found which were not intentionally buried. These were mainly small stones and can be seen in the test results (Figure 2 (b)) as small groups of points where the probe recorded an obstacle.
2. Some of the smaller obstacles appear beside the larger ones and on occasion were pushed up against the larger obstacles. This demonstrates that caution must be taken when using a classification mechanism based on a vibrator tip or the returned energy from an ultrasonic pulse along the probe, as a stone may be beside the real obstacle. It also introduces a degree of 'noise' into the depth data which may to attempt to classify the obstacles.
3. The recorded inserted depth (for a specified position) suffered from an additional source of 'noise' due to a certain amount of play in the probe (i.e. the tip of the probe could be moved by up to 15 mm in any direction if a lateral force was encountered). This was particularly noticeable when the probe encountered a surface at an oblique angle (such as the curved side of the PMN mine), or when the probe




Fig. 3.: The probing data from Figure 2 (b) is shown in a Cartesian frame of reference (a), along with more detailed 3-D views of the SB-33 (c), the PMD-6 (b) and the PMN (d). Note that all of these 3-D views are taken roughly from the direction of probing (i.e. almost parallel to the X axis).

just passed the side of an obstacle. The deflection could be significantly reduced in a device designed to be more rigid. Alternatively the lateral forces and deflection could be measured and used when analysing the shape of an obstacle.

These lateral forces were noted in the earlier tests with the manual probe [4, 5] where it was suggested that they could potentially be used to provide extra information about the shape of a buried object.

4. Classification of the object must be based only on the leading edge of the depth data, as it is not feasible to probe the top of the mine unless an extremely low force is used or the device is capable of withstanding an explosion or is cheap enough for the loss of the device to be acceptable. It does seem that some classification should be possible especially if the depth data is accompanied by an indication of the object substance (i.e. wood, stone, or plastic), but this could result in a reasonably high false positive rate. A balance could be taken between the level of false positives and the risk to the probing device. If an object is determined not to be a landmine then the probing can continue over the top of the object. The additional data provide by continuing the probing would then allow for a more reliable classification (although if it was a landmine, probing on top would be likely to initiate the mine).
5. It was clear from the tests that probing the ground can disturb the objects which are buried. For example in one test an SB-33 mine was disturbed from the horizontal position by the probe as the probe hit the very bottom of the side of the mine (which was buried at a very shallow deep in loose soil) so that it ended almost in a vertical orientation; see Figure 4. Although the mine itself was not visible, the disturbance

of the soil around it was visible. This suggests the need for visually monitoring the area being probed or for a method of preventing such disturbances.




Fig. 4: Probing can disturb buried objects, particularly if the object is not buried deeply. (a) shows the scene before probe insertion, and (b) shows the effect of disturbing the position of an SB-33 anti-personnel mine (look to the right of the probe) although not finding an obstacle.

5 Future issues

It must be recognised that the demonstrator system does not even begin to address a number of issues which are of importance to a real demining system:

- Determination of the absolute position and orientation of the mobile platform in order to allow a complete map of the probed area to be built up.
- Action to be taken when a potential anti-personnel mine is detected (e.g. marking mines with a paint marking system, or destroying mines in situ).
- Control of the mobile platform(s) (i.e. autonomous or remote co-ordinated control).
- Classification of the buried objects.

In addition many configurations can be conceived for a probing robot; such as the simple device shown in Figure 5, a robot equipped with an array of independent probes (to speed up the probing task), a robot with a flexible arm equipped with a metal detector, a probe, and perhaps even a chemical detector. Other tools could be added to these devices to mark possible mines (e.g. with a paint marking system) and to remove or destroy the mines. Other designs have been considered by the University of Alberta [6].

6 Discussion

Evidence of the wide spread trauma and suffering caused by landmines all over the world provides ample justification and motivation for the application of humanitarian demining. The concept of probing robots have the potential of providing increased deminer safety, a better clearance rate and improved clearance efficiency. The tests conducted thus far using a lab based demonstrator system have provided results which indicate that there is significant potential in the concept of force sensed automated probing. There is however significant work to be done to develop a system which is both reliable enough and robust enough to be used in the field.

7 Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the SMART II (Semi-autonomous Monitoring and Robotics Technology) TMR research network (E.U. contract FMRX-CT96-0052). Also, the authors would like to express their thanks in particular to Commandant Jim Burke and Captain Aidan Dempsey of the Irish Defence Forces for their assistance with this research work.




Fig. 5.: Simple design for a probing robot. The probe is driven into the ground using a linear actuator, which is moved along a single axis linear stage in order to probe along a ‘scan line’. This linear stage in turn is mounted on a mobile platform, providing motion in the direction orthogonal to the linear stage.

References

1. A. Craib, “Standards for Humanitarian Mine Clearance Operations”, Pre-conference paper at the International Conference on Mine Clearance Technology, Working Group II, Copenhagen, Denmark, 2-4 July 1996 (See also <http://www.un.org/Depts/dha/mct/>).
2. H. Hambric, “New Approaches to Mine Detection”, Pre-conference paper at the International Conference on Mine Clearance Technology, Working Group IX, Copenhagen, Denmark, 2-4 July 1996 (See also <http://www.demining.brtrc.com/>).
3. T. Williams & K. Dawson-Howe, “Automated Force Sensed Probing for Buried Landmine Detection”, Technical Report, Dept. of Computer Science, Trinity College, Dublin 2, August 1997, (Available at <http://www.cs.tcd.ie/kdawson/xyrep.ps.gz>).
4. K. Dawson-Howe & T. Williams, “Autonomous Probing Robots for the detection of abandoned landmines”, Proceeding of the 5th Symposium on Intelligent Robotic Systems, Stockholm, Sweden, 8-11th July 1997, pp.51-58. (Available at <http://www.cs.tcd.ie/kdawson/sirs97.ps.gz>).
5. T. Williams & K. Dawson-Howe, “Hand-Held Force Probing Experiment”, Technical Report, Dept. of Computer Science, Trinity College, Dublin 2, May 1997, (Available at <http://www.cs.tcd.ie/kdawson/manrep.ps.gz>).
6. D. Skaley, J. Hemsing, & K. Fyfe “A Mechanical Means of Land Mine Detection”, Technical Report, Dept. of Mechanical, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada T6G 2G8, 12 November 1996, (See also <http://faramir.mece.ualberta.ca/landmine.html>).