

Informatics 2D – Reasoning and Agents

Semester 2, 2011-12

Alex Lascarides
 alex@inf.ed.ac.uk



Lecture 17 – State-Space Search and Partial-Order Planning
 1st March 2012
 adapted from slides by Michael Rovatsos

Where are we?

Last time ...

- ▶ we defined the planning problem
- ▶ discussed problem with using search and logic in planning
- ▶ introduced representation languages for planning
- ▶ looked at blocks world example


Today ...

- ▶ **State-space search and partial-order planning**

Planning with state-space search

- ▶ Most straightforward way to think of planning process:
search the space of states using action schemata
- ▶ Since actions are defined both in terms of preconditions and effects we can search in both directions
- ▶ Two methods:
 1. **forward state-space search:** Start in initial state; consider action sequences until goal state is reached.
 2. **backward state-space search:** Start from goal state; consider action sequences until initial state is reached

Planning with state-space search



Forward state-space search

- ▶ Also called **progression** planning
- ▶ Formulation of planning problem:
 - ▶ Initial state of search is initial state of planning problem (=set of positive literals)
 - ▶ Applicable actions are those whose preconditions are satisfied
 - ▶ Single successor function works for all planning problems (consequence of action representation)
 - ▶ Goal test = checking whether state satisfies goal of planning problem
 - ▶ Step cost usually 1, but different costs can be allowed

Forward state-space search

- ▶ Search space is finite in the absence of function symbols
- ▶ Any complete graph search algorithm (like A^*) will be a complete graph planning algorithm
- ▶ Forward search does not solve problem of irrelevant actions (all actions considered from each state)
- ▶ Efficiency depends largely on quality of heuristics
- ▶ Example:
 - ▶ Air cargo problem, 10 airports with 5 planes each, 20 pieces of cargo
 - ▶ Task: move all 20 pieces of cargo at airport A to airport B
 - ▶ Each of 50 planes can fly to 9 airports, each of 200 packages can be unloaded or loaded (individually)
 - ▶ Assuming an average of about 1000 actions at every airport, we have 1000^{41} nodes in the search tree (although solution trivial!)

Backward state-space search

- ▶ In normal search, backward approach hard because goal described by a set of constraints (rather than being listed explicitly)
- ▶ Problem of how to generate predecessors, but planning representations allow us to consider only **relevant** actions
- ▶ Exclusion of irrelevant actions decreases branching factor
- ▶ In example, only about 20 actions working backward from goal
- ▶ **Regression planning** = computing the states from which applying a given action leads to the goal
- ▶ Must ensure that actions are **consistent**, i.e. they don't undo any desired literals

Air cargo domain example

- ▶ Goal can be described as

$$At(C_1, B) \wedge At(C_2, B) \wedge \dots \wedge At(C_{20}, B)$$

- ▶ To achieve $At(C_1, B)$ there is only one action, $Unload(C_1, p, B)$ (p unspecified)
- ▶ Can do this action only if its preconditions are satisfied.
- ▶ So the predecessor to the goal state must include $In(C_1, p) \wedge At(p, B)$, and should not include $At(C_1, B)$ (otherwise irrelevant action)
- ▶ Full predecessor:

$$In(C_1, p) \wedge At(p, B) \wedge \dots \wedge At(C_{20}, B)$$

- ▶ $Load(C_1, p)$ would be inconsistent (negates $At(C_1, B)$)

Backward state-space search

- ▶ General process of constructing predecessors for backward search given goal description G , relevant and consistent action A :
 - ▶ Any positive effects of A that appear in G are deleted
 - ▶ Each precondition of A is added unless it already appears
- ▶ Any standard search algorithm can be used, terminates when predecessor description is satisfied by initial (planning) state
- ▶ First-order case may require additional substitutions which must be applied to actions leading from state to goal

Heuristics for state-space search


- ▶ Two possibilities:
 1. Divide and Conquer (**subgoal decomposition**)
 2. Derive a **Relaxed Problem**
- ▶ Subgoal decomposition is ...
 - ▶ optimistic (admissible) if negative interactions exist (e.g. subplan deletes goal achieved by other subplan)
 - ▶ pessimistic (inadmissible) if positive interactions exist (e.g. subplans contain redundant actions)
- ▶ Relaxations:
 - ▶ drop all preconditions (all actions always applicable, combined with subgoal independence makes prediction even easier)
 - ▶ remove all negative effects (and count minimum number of actions so that union satisfies goals)
 - ▶ empty delete lists approach (involves running a simple planning problem to compute heuristic value)

Partial-order planning


- ▶ State-space search planning algorithms consider **totally ordered** sequences of actions
- ▶ Better not to commit ourselves to complete chronological ordering of tasks (**least commitment strategy**)
- ▶ **Basic idea:**
 1. Add actions to a plan without specifying which comes first unless necessary
 2. Combine 'independent' subsequences afterwards
- ▶ Partial-order solution will correspond to one or several **linearisations** of partial-order plan
- ▶ Search in **plan space** rather than state spaces (because your search is over ordering constraints on actions, as well as transitions among states).

Example: Put your socks and shoes on

Partial-Order Plan:



Total-Order Plans:



Partial-order planning (POP) as a search problem

Define POP as search problem over plans consisting of:

- ▶ **Actions**; initial plan contains dummy actions *Start* (no preconditions, effect=initial state) and *Finish* (no effects, precondition=goal literals)
- ▶ **Ordering constraints** on actions $A < B$ (A must occur before B); contradictory constraints prohibited
- ▶ **Causal links** between actions $A \xrightarrow{p} B$ express A achieves p for B (p precondition of B , effect of A , must remain true between A and B); inserting action C with effect $\neg p$ ($A < C$ and $C < B$) would lead to **conflict**
- ▶ **Open preconditions**: set of conditions not yet achieved by the plan (planners try to make open precondition set empty without introducing contradictions)

The POP algorithm

- ▶ Final plan for socks and shoes example (without trivial ordering constraints):
 Actions: $\{RightSock, RightShoe, LeftSock, LeftShoe, Start, Finish\}$
 Orderings: $\{RightSock < RightShoe, LeftSock < LeftShoe\}$
 Links: $\{RightSock \xrightarrow{RightSockOn} RightShoe,$
 $LeftSock \xrightarrow{LeftSockOn} LeftShoe,$
 $RightShoe \xrightarrow{RightShoeOn} Finish,$
 $LeftShoe \xrightarrow{LeftShoeOn} Finish\}$
 Open preconditions: $\{\}$
- ▶ **Consistent plan** = plan without cycles in orderings and conflicts with links
- ▶ **Solution** = consistent plan without open preconditions
- ▶ Every linearisation of a partial-order solution is a total-order solution (implications for execution!)

The POP algorithm

- ▶ Initial plan:
 Actions: $\{Start, Finish\}$, Orderings: $\{Start < Finish\}$,
 Links: $\{\}$, Open preconditions: Preconditions of *Finish*
- ▶ Pick p from open preconditions on some action B , generate a consistent successor plan for every A that achieves p
- ▶ Ensuring consistency:
 1. Add $A \xrightarrow{p} B$ and $A < B$ to plan. If A new, add A and $Start < A$ and $A < Finish$ to plan
 2. Resolve conflicts between the new link and all actions and between A (if new) and all links as follows:
 If conflict between $A \xrightarrow{p} B$ and C , add $B < C$ or $C < A$
- ▶ Goal test: check whether there are open preconditions (only consistent plans are generated)

Partial-order planning example (1)

$Init(At(Flat, Axle) \wedge At(Spare, Trunk))$. $Goal(At(Spare, Axle))$.
 $Action(Remove(Spare, Trunk))$,
 PRECOND: $At(Spare, Trunk)$
 EFFECT: $\neg At(Spare, Trunk) \wedge At(Spare, Ground)$
 $Action(Remove(Flat, Axle))$,
 PRECOND: $At(Flat, Axle)$
 EFFECT: $\neg At(Flat, Axle) \wedge At(Flat, Ground)$
 $Action(PutOn(Spare, Axle))$,
 PRECOND: $At(Spare, Ground) \wedge \neg At(Flat, Axle)$
 EFFECT: $\neg At(Spare, Ground) \wedge At(Spare, Axle)$
 $Action(LeaveOvernight)$, PRECOND:
 EFFECT: $\neg At(Spare, Ground) \wedge \neg At(Spare, Axle) \wedge \neg At(Spare, Trunk)$
 $\wedge \neg At(Flat, Ground) \wedge \neg At(Flat, Axle)$


Partial-order planning example (2)

- ▶ Pick (only) open precondition $At(Spare, Axle)$ of *Finish*
 Only applicable action = $PutOn(Spare, Axle)$
- ▶ Pick $At(Spare, Ground)$ from $PutOn(Spare, Axle)$
 Only applicable action = $Remove(Spare, Trunk)$
- ▶ Situation after two steps:



Partial-order planning example (3)

- ▶ Pick $\neg At(Flat, Axle)$ precondition of $PutOn(Spare, Axle)$
 Choose $LeaveOvernight$, effect $\neg At(Spare, Ground)$
- ▶ Conflict with link
 $Remove(Spare, Trunk) \xrightarrow{At(Spare, Ground)} PutOn(Spare, Axle)$
- ▶ Resolve by adding $LeaveOvernight \prec Remove(Spare, Trunk)$
 Why is this the only solution?



Partial-order planning example (4)

- ▶ Remaining open precondition $At(Spare, Trunk)$, but conflict between *Start* and $\neg At(Spare, Trunk)$ effect of $LeaveOvernight$
- ▶ No ordering before *Start* possible or after $Remove(Spare, Trunk)$ possible
- ▶ No successor state, backtrack to previous state and remove $LeaveOvernight$, resulting in this situation:



Partial-order planning example (5)

- ▶ Now choose $Remove(Flat, Axle)$ instead of $LeaveOvernight$
- ▶ Next, choose $At(Spare, Trunk)$ precondition of $Remove(Spare, Trunk)$
 Choose *Start* to achieve this
- ▶ Pick $At(Flat, Axle)$ precondition of $Remove(Flat, Axle)$, choose *Start* to achieve it
- ▶ Final, complete, consistent plan:



Dealing with unbound variables

- ▶ In first-order case, unbound variables may occur during planning process
- ▶ Example:
 $Action(Move(b, x, y),$
 $PRECOND: On(b, x) \wedge Clear(b) \wedge Clear(y)$
 $EFFECT: On(b, y) \wedge Clear(x) \wedge \neg On(b, x) \wedge \neg Clear(y))$
 achieves $On(A, B)$ under substitution $\{b/A, y/B\}$
- ▶ Applying this substitution yields
 $Action(Move(A, x, B),$
 $PRECOND: On(A, x) \wedge Clear(A) \wedge Clear(B)$
 $EFFECT: On(A, B) \wedge Clear(x) \wedge \neg On(A, x) \wedge \neg Clear(B))$
 and x is still unbound (another side of the least commitment approach)

Dealing with unbound variables

- ▶ Also has an effect on links, e.g. in example above $Move(A, x, B) \xrightarrow{On(A, B)} Finish$ would be added
- ▶ If another action has effect $\neg On(A, z)$ then this is only a conflict if $z = B$
- ▶ Solution: insert **inequality constraints** (in example: $z \neq B$) and check these constraints whenever applying substitutions
- ▶ Remark on heuristics: Even harder than in total-order planning, e.g. adapt most-constrained-variable approach from CSPs

Summary

- ▶ State-space search approaches (forward/backward)
- ▶ Heuristics for state-space search planning
- ▶ Partial-order planning
- ▶ The POP algorithms
- ▶ POP as search in planning space
- ▶ POP example
- ▶ POP with unbound variables
- ▶ Next time: **Planning and Acting in the Real World I**