

Reminder: Last Lecture

What is Planning

Planning and Search

Logical Approach

STRIPS (Classical) Approach

Forward Search

Regression Search

Planning: Outline of lectures

Logical representation

- Situation calculus

STRIPS representation

- States and Actions
- Examples

Simple search methods

- Forward search
- Backward search
- Heuristic search

Planning: Outline (cont)

Partial Order Planning

- Search with grounded values
- Search with variables
- Heuristics

Planning with Graphs

- Planning graphs
- Heuristics
- “Graphplan” methods

Regression planning (“Backwards search”)

Basic Idea:

- Start with the goal condition
- Select an action that achieves some element in goal condition
- Find a state that permits action and gives goal condition
- Apply recursively to the state found
- Use search method of choice

Finding regression state of given state S:

- Select a literal in S, say it is L (and L is either p or $\neg p$)
- Find action A that achieves L
 - has p in add effects if $L=p$
 - has p in del effects if $L= \neg p$
- Regressed state is $(s \setminus L \cup \text{pre}(A))$

Example:

Initial state:

- $\text{loc}(A, \text{table})$
- $\text{loc}(B, C)$
- $\text{loc}(C, \text{table})$
- $\text{clear}(A)$
- $\text{clear}(B)$

Goal condition:

- $\text{loc}(B, A)$
- $\text{loc}(A, C)$

About regression planning

More focused than forward search

- Only examines actions that in some way relate to the goal

Blind regression is impractical

- Blind search is invariably exponential in length of plan

Heuristics more complex than for forward search

- But, some promising techniques based on heuristic regression

Heuristic state space search

Blind search does not work in planning

- Branching factor is way too large
- Without heuristics, even small planning problems are unsolvable

Basic ideas for heuristics in state space search for planning

- Simplify preconditions – ignore some of them
- Simplify effects – ignore some of them

Heuristics from ignoring preconditions

Extreme version: Ignore all preconditions

- Assume every action can be applied in any state
- Find a plan from given state to a goal state
 - Easier problem to solve, but additions and effects still make it nontrivial
- Length of plan is heuristic evaluation of s

Variations

- Assume effects of actions are independent
 - Length of plan then becomes number of literals in goal different from s
- Assume actions of have no delete effects
 - Finding plan then becomes very easy

Heuristics from ignoring effects

Basic idea

- Assume actions have no delete effects
- Solve the simplified planning problem from state s to goal state
- Length of plan is heuristic evaluation of state s

Implementation

- Solving a planning problem to get heuristics
- But, problem is much simpler and easier to solve

Separating subgoals

Basic idea

- Find a plan for each literal in goal condition
- Combine the plans to generate a complete plan

Problem!

- Initial state: $\text{loc}(B, \text{table}), \text{loc}(A, \text{table}), \text{loc}(C, A), \text{clear}(B), \text{clear}(C)$
- Goal: $\text{loc}(A, B), \text{loc}(B, C)$
- Called the Sussman anomaly

Partial Order Planning

Basic Idea

- Want to be able to solve subgoals in parallel
- Often unnecessary to decide subgoal ordering too early
 - General notion: “Least commitment planning”
- POP: Work with plans where actions have not necessarily yet been ordered

Key Issue

- How to reason about state if plan is not fully ordered?

Partial Order Planning

Extra actions for initial and goal states

- Start: All actions must come after this action.
Effects of action are the full initial state specification
- End: All actions must come before this action.
Precondition of action is the goal condition

Partially ordered plan as candidate solution

- Could enforce full ordering, but it is not necessary
- If any ordering of partial order is a legal plan,
then partial order is okay

Partial Order Planning and Search

Candidate partial order plans

- Set of actions in plan (including start and end)
- Ordering constraints
- Causal links to establish preconditions
- Open preconditions

Consistent partial order plan

- No loops in ordering constraints
- No actions violating causal links (threats)
 - Action C threatens causal link for p between A and B if C deletes p and can occur between A and B

Complete plan

- Consistent and no open preconditions
-

Partial Order Planning and Search

Basic idea behind search

- Nodes in search are candidate partial plans (not states)
- Search expansion defined by selecting an open precondition and generating all possible resolutions

Specific method – given candidate plan **P**

- Select an open precondition p for some action A
- For each action B , either in plan or that can be added to plan, and achieves p , generate all consistent candidate plans that have causal link from B to A for p :
 - For any C that can contradict p , add anew candidate plan for each legal ordering of C before B or after A , as long as overall ordering conditions are consistent.

Heuristics for Partial Order Planning

Plan evaluation:

- Simple idea: Count open preconditions
- Better idea: Estimate complexity of completion with plangraph

Open precondition selection:

- Simple idea: Select precondition with fewest resolution options (“cheapest first”)

Plan graphs

Objective

- Get better information about states/plans
 - Simpler methods do not account for interaction between actions and states
 - Example: Sussman anomaly

Basic Idea

- Build a small and cheap structure that can still track interactions
- If it is too simple, cannot track interactions
- If it is too complex, becomes too expensive to calculate and store
- Solution: Limit interaction tracking to “mutual exclusion” (mutex)

Building a plangraph

Initialization

- Start with initial state (or state being evaluated)

Repeat as needed

- Add an action level
 - Action added if preconditions in previous state level and not mutex
 - “No op” actions added for each literal in previous state level
 - Two actions are mutex if any preconditions are mutex
 - Two actions are mutex if their effects/preconditions are inconsistent
- Add a state level
 - Add literal if there is an action that adds literal (includes “no ops”)
 - Two contradictory literals are always mutex (p and $\neg p$)
 - Two literals are mutex if all action pairs to add them are mutex

Stop when level is the same as previous level

- Or, when solution has been found, if search is interleaved
-

About mutexes

Action mutexes:

- Two actions are mutex if effects/preconditions are incompatible
- Two actions are mutex in a given level if their preconditions have any pairwise mutexes
 - This can change between levels

State mutexes:

- Two literals are mutex if they are contradictory
- Two literals are mutex in a given level if no non-mutex actions can achieve both at same time
 - This can change between levels

Mutex properties:

- If a mutex disappears, it does not reappear in later levels

Graphplan

Graphplan

- Method to do planning, using plangraphs
- Revolutionized field of planning

Basic idea

- Add layers until all goal conditions appear without mutexes
- Search for a set of actions that form a legal plan
 - This is where the search problem appears
- If no solution is found, add a layer and repeat
- If adding layer changes nothing and no solution is found, then problem is unsolvable

Various uses for plangraphs

Structure for planning

- Graphplan and many more planners

Heuristics evaluation and pruning

- Can use plangraphs to see what states are unreachable
- Can use plangraphs to evaluate partial plans and states
 - Find depth of layer where goal conditions first all appear without mutex
 - Sum up depths of layers for each conditions
 - etc.

Planning in the “Real World”

Why does STRIPS not suffice?

- Time impacts planning and especially concurrent plans
- Resources are difficult to handle in STRIPS
 - Unary resources, such as equipment (can be done)
 - Multiple resources, such as equipment (hard, but not impossible)
 - Numerical resources, such as fuel (very hard and expensive)
 - etc.
- Numerical calculations are impossible in STRIPS
- Complex conditions and state constraints are very hard in STRIPS
- Uncertainty and sensing is very hard to do in STRIP

But, can still use strips in real world, if we are clever...