

1 What is Planning?

- Key problem facing *agent* is *deciding what to do*.
- We want agents to be *taskable*: give them *goals* to achieve, have them decide for themselves how to achieve them.
- Basic idea is to give an agent:
 - representation of goal to achieve;
 - knowledge about what actions it can perform; and
 - knowledge about state of the world;

and to have it generate a *plan* to achieve the goal.

• Essentially, this is

automatic programming.

cis716-spring2006-parsons-lect15



- Question: How do we represent...

 - actions available to agent;
- We show how all this can be done in first-order logic...



• Each action has:

a *name* which may have arguments;

- a *pre-condition list* list of facts which must be true for action to be executed;
- a delete list

list of facts that are no longer true after action is performed;

– an *add list*

list of facts made true by executing the action.

Each of these may contain variables.

cis716-spring2006-parsons-lect15

• Example 2:

cis716-spring2006-parsons-lect15

The *unstack* action occurs when the robot arm picks an object *x* up from on top of another object *y*.

UnStack(x, y)pre $On(x, y) \land Clear(x) \land ArmEmpty$ del $On(x, y) \land ArmEmpty$ add $Holding(x) \land Clear(y)$

Stack and UnStack are *inverses* of one-another.

• Example 1:

The *stack* action occurs when the robot arm places the object *x* it is holding is placed on top of object *y*.

 $\begin{array}{lll} Stack(x,y) \\ \text{pre} & Clear(y) \wedge Holding(x) \\ \text{del} & Clear(y) \wedge Holding(x) \\ \text{add} & ArmEmpty \wedge On(x,y) \end{array}$

cis716-spring2006-parsons-lect15

• Example 3:

The *pickup* action occurs when the arm picks up an object *x* from the table.

 $\begin{array}{ll} Pickup(x) \\ \text{pre} & Clear(x) \land OnTable(x) \land ArmEmpty \\ \text{del} & OnTable(x) \land ArmEmpty \\ \text{add} & Holding(x) \end{array}$

• Example 4:

The *putdown* action occurs when the arm places the object *x* onto the table.

PutDown(x)preHolding(x)delHolding(x)add $Holding(x) \land ArmEmpty$

cis716-spring2006-parsons-lect15

11

10



- In "real life", plans contain conditionals (IF ... THEN...) and loops (WHILE... DO...), but most simple planners cannot handle such constructs they construct *linear plans*.
- Simplest approach to planning: *means-ends analysis*.
- Involves backward chaining from goal to original state.
- Start by finding an action that has goal as post-condition. Assume this is the *last* action in plan.
- Then figure out what the previous state would have been. Try to find action that has *this* state as post-condition.

15

• *Recurse* until we end up (hopefully!) in original state.

• We need the set of actions: Unstack(A)*Putdown*(*A*) Pickup(B)Stack(B, C)Pickup(A)Stack(A, B)cis716-spring2006-parsons-lect15 14

fur	action <i>plan</i> (d : WorldDesc, g : Goal, p : Plan,	// initial env state // goal to be achieved // plan so far	
1	if $d \models g$ then	<pre>// actions available)</pre>	
	return p		
3.	else		
4.	choose a in A and a state d' such that		
5.	$add(a,d') \models g$ and		
6.			
7.	set $g = pre(a)$		
8.	, ,		
9.	return $plan(d', g)$	(p, p, A)	



• This algorithm not guaranteed to find the plan...

- ... but it is *sound*: If it finds the plan is correct.
- Some problems:
 - completeness;
 - negative goals;
 - maintenance goals;
 - conditionals & loops;
 - exponential search space;
 - logical consequence tests;



The Frame Problem

• A general problem with representing properties of actions:

How do we know exactly what changes as the result of performing an action?

If I pick up a block, does my hair colour stay the same?

• One solution is to write *frame axioms*.

Here is a frame axiom, which states that SP's hair colour is the same in all the situations s' that result from performing Pickup(x) in situation s as it is in s.

 $\forall s, s'. Result(SP, Pickup(x), s) = s' \Rightarrow \\ HCol(SP, s) = HCol(SP, s')$

cis716-spring2006-parsons-lect15

19

cis716-spring2006-parsons-lect15

20

- Stating frame axioms in this way is unfeasible for real problems.
- (Think of all the things that we would have to state in order to cover all the possible frame axioms).
- STRIPS solves this problem by assuming that everything not explicitly stated to have changed remains unchanged.
- The price we pay for this is that we lose the advantages of using logic:
 - Semantics goes out of the window
- However, more recent work has effectively solved the frame problem (using clever second-order approaches).

```
cis716-spring2006-parsons-lect15
```

- Clearly we need to *Stack* B on C at some point, and we also need to *Unstack* A from *C* and *Stack* it on B.
- Which operation goes first?
- Obviously we need to do the *UnStack* first, and the *Stack B* on *C*, but the planner has no way of knowing this.
- It also has no way of "undoing" a partial plan if it leads into a dead end.
- So if it chooses to Stack(A, C) after the *Unstack*, it is sunk.
- This is a big problem with linear planners
- How could we modify our planning algorithm?



- Modify the middle of the algorithm to be:
 - 1. if $d \models g$ then
 - 2. return *p*
 - 3. else

21

23

- 4. choose a in A and a state d' such that
- 5. $add(a, d') \models g$ and
- 6. $del(a, d') \not\models g$
- $\textbf{6a.} \qquad \textit{no_clobber}(add(a,d'), del(a,d'), \textit{rest_of_plan})$

24

- 7. set g = pre(a)
- 8. append a to p
- 9. return plan(d, g, p, A)
- But how can we do this?
- *Partial order planning* provides a solution.

cis716-spring2006-parsons-lect15

cis716-spring2006-parsons-lect15

