Planning

AI lecture (Yoonsuck Choe): Material from Russel and Norvig (3rd ed.)

- 7.2, 7.7: Wumpus world (an example domain)
- 10.4.2: Situation calculus
- 11: Planning

The task of coming up with a sequence of actions that will achieve a goal is called **planning**.

Simple approaches:
- Search-based
- Logic-based

Representation of states and actions become important issues.

Example Domain: Wumpus World

- Want to get to the gold and grab it.
- Want to avoid pits and the “wumpus”.
- Clues: breeze near pits and stench near the wumpus.
- Other sensors: wall (bump), gold (glitter), kill (scream)
- Actions: move, grab, or shoot.

Performance measure
- +1000: picking up gold
- -1000: fall in a pit, or get eaten by the wumpus
- -1: each action taken
- -10: each arrow used
Evolution of Knowledge in WW

- Move from [1,1] to [2,1].
- Based on the sensory data (breeze), we can mark [2,2] and [3,1] as potential pits, but not [1,1] since we came from there and we already know there's no pit there.

Inference in Wumpus World

- Knowledge Base: basic rules of the Wumpus World.
- Additional knowledge is added to the KB: facts you gather as you explore ([x,y] has stench, breeze, etc.)
- We can ask if a certain statement is a logical consequence of the KB: “There is a pit in [1,2]”

KB: basic rules, plus [1,1] and [2,1] explored.
- $\alpha_1 = \text{“There is no pit in [1,2]”}$
- $\alpha_2 = \text{“There is no pit in [2,2]”}$
- Only $\alpha_1$ follows from the KB $KB \models \alpha_1$ iff Model(KB) $\subseteq$ Model($\alpha_1$).
Propositional-logic-based Agent

- Query KB: Is there a Wumpus in [x,y]? Is there a pit in [x,y]?
- Add knowledge to KB (perceptual input): Breeze felt in [x,y], Stench detected in [x,y], etc.
- Decide which action to take (move where, etc.): Move to [x,y], grab gold, etc.

Note: here, there’s only one goal, to grab the gold. Can we specify an arbitrary goal and derive a plan?

Problem: Propositions need to be explicit about location, e.g., Breeze_{x,y}, Stench_{x,y}, ¬Wumpus_{x,y}.

Situation Calculus

Make propositional-logic-based planner scalable.

- Situations: logical terms indicating a state.
  Example: In situation $S_0$ taking action $a$ leads to situation $S_1$:
  $$S_1 = Result(a, S_0).$$

- Fluents: functions and predicates that vary from one situation to the next.
  Example: $¬\text{Holding}(\text{Gold}_1, S_0), \text{Age}(\text{Wumpus})$

Other stuff: Atemporal/eternal predicates $\text{Gold}(\text{Gold}_1)$, empty actions $Result([], s) = s$, sequence of actions ($seq$ followed by $a$) $Result([a|seq], s) = Result(seq, Result(a, s))$.

Situation Calculus: Tasks

- Projection:
  Deduce the outcome of a given sequence of actions

- Planning:
  Find a sequence of actions that achieves a desired effect.
  Example: Wumpus world

  Initial: $At(Agent, [1, 1], S_0) \land At(G_1, [1, 2], S_0), \ldots$
  Goal: $\exists seq At(G_1, [1, 1], Result(seq, S_0))$

Describing Actions in Situation Calculus

Two axioms:

- Possibility axiom: when it is possible to execute an action
  $$Preconditions \rightarrow Poss(a, s)$$

- Effect axiom: What happens when a possible action is taken
  $$Poss(a, s) \rightarrow Changes that result$$
Wumpus World: Axioms

- Possibility axioms: Move, grab, release
  \[ \text{At}(\text{Agent}, x, s) \land \text{Adjacent}(x, y) \rightarrow \text{Poss}(\text{Go}(x, y), s) \]
  \[ \text{Gold}(g) \land \text{At}(\text{Agent}, x, s) \land \text{At}(g, x, s) \rightarrow \text{Poss}(\text{Grab}(g), s) \]
  \[ \text{Holding}(g, s) \rightarrow \text{Poss}(\text{Release}(g), s) \]

- Effect axioms: Move, Grab, Release
  \[ \text{Poss}(\text{Go}(x, y), s) \rightarrow \text{At}(\text{Agent}, y, \text{Result}(\text{Go}(x, y), s)) \]
  \[ \text{Poss}(\text{Grab}(g), s) \rightarrow \text{Holding}(g, \text{Result}(\text{Grab}(g), s)) \]
  \[ \text{Poss}(\text{Release}(g), s) \rightarrow \neg \text{Holding}(g, \text{Result}(\text{Release}(g), s)) \]

Frame Problem

- Representing all things that stay the same: Frame problem.
- In the previous slide, we cannot deduce if the following can be proven \((G_1)\) represents a particular lump of gold:
  \[ \text{At}(G_1, [1, 1], \text{Result}([\text{Go}([1, 1], [1, 2]), \text{Grab}(G_1), \text{Go}([1, 2], [1, 1])], S_0) \]
- It is because the effect axioms say only what should change, but not what does not change when actions are taken.
- Initial solution: Frame axioms
  \[ \text{At}(o, x, s) \land (o \neq \text{Agent}) \land \neg \text{Holding}(o, s) \rightarrow \text{At}(o, x, \text{Result}(\text{Go}(y, z), s)) \]

This says moving does not affect the gold when it is not held.
Problem is that you need \(O(AF)\) such axioms for all \((action, fluent)\) pair \((A: \text{num of actions}, F: \text{num of fluent predicates})\).

Two Frame Problems

- Representational frame problem:
  Explained in the previous slide
- Inferential frame problem:
  To project results of a \(t\)-step sequence of actions in time \(O(Et)\) rather than \(O(Ft)\) or \(O(AEt)\).
  \(E\) is the number of effects, typically much less than \(F\), the number of fluent predicates.

Solving the Representational Frame Problem

- Consider how each fluent predicate evolves over time:
  Successor-state axioms \(Action\) is possible \(\rightarrow\)
  \(\text{Fluent is true in result state } \leftrightarrow \text{Action's effect made it true } \lor \text{It was true before and action left it alone})\).
- Example:
  \[ \text{Poss}(a, s) \rightarrow \]
  \[ (\text{At}(\text{Agent}, y, \text{Result}(a, s)) \leftrightarrow a = \text{Go}(x, y) \lor (\text{At}(\text{Agent}, y, s) \land a \neq \text{Go}(y, z))) \]
- Remaining issues: implicit effect (moving while holding something moves that something as well) – ramification problem. Can solve by using a more general successor-state axiom.
Solving the Inferential Frame Problem

- Given a $t$-step plan $p (S_t = Result(p, S_0))$, decide which fluents are true in $S_t$.
- We need to consider each of the $F$ frame axiom of each time step $t$.
- Axioms have an average size of $AE/F$, we have an $O(AEt)$ inferential work. Most of the work is done copying unchanged fluents from time step to time step.
- Solutions: use fluent calculus rather than situation calculus, or make the process more efficient.

Other Formalisms

- Event calculus: Fluents hold at different time points, not situations. Reasoning is done over time.
- Other constructs: generalized events (spatiotemporal), process, intervals, etc.
- Formal theory of belief: propositional attitude, reification, etc.

Truth Maintenance Systems

New facts inferred from the KB can turn out to be incorrect.

- Let’s say $P$ was derived in the KB and later it was found that $\neg P$.
- Adding $\neg P$ to the KB will invalidate the entire KB, so $P$ should be removed ($Retract(KB, P)$).
- Care needs to be taken since other facts in the KB may have been derived from $P$, etc.
- Truth maintenance systems are designed to handle these complications.
Planning Approaches

- State-space search: forward or backward.
- Heuristic search: subgoal independence assumption.
- Partial-order planning: utilize problem decomposition. Can place two actions into a plan without specifying the order. Several different total order plans can be constructed from partial order plans.