COS 470/570: Artificial Intelligence

Planning

Spring 2019



What is Planning?

Overview

- What is Planning?
- Example

Theorem proving

Means-Ends Analysis

- Find a way to achieve the goal using *operators*
 - Consider efficiency of planning and effectiveness and efficiency of execution
- Different from state space search
 - Do not need complete representations of states
 - Can look at more about goal than distance to goal: e.g., subgoals
 - Can handle *nearly-decomposable subproblems*

Example

Overview

• What is Planning?

• Example

Theorem proving

Means-Ends Analysis

STRIPS

How to use state space search to get a robot to return a book to the library and buy milk?



Example

Overview

• What is Planning?

• Example

Theorem proving

Means-Ends Analysis

- How to use state space search to get a robot to return a book to the library and buy milk?
- How would you decide to return a book to the library and buy milk?

Overview

Theorem proving

- Overview
- Situation Calculus
- Example: MAB
- Axioms
- Proof tree
- Finding the Plan

Means-Ends Analysis

STRIPS

Theorem proving



Copyright © 2014 UMaine School of Computing and Information Science – 5 / 26

Planning Using Theorem Proving

Overview

Theorem proving

- Overview
- Situation Calculus
- Example: MAB
- Axioms
- Proof tree
- Finding the Plan

Means-Ends Analysis

STRIPS

• Idea:

- Create set of axioms describing plan creation
- Ask theorem prover to prove there is a plan
- Proof should <u>be</u> the plan
- Problem: Predicate calculus is atemporal

Situation Calculus

Overview

- Theorem proving
- Overview
- Situation Calculus
- Example: MAB
- Axioms
- Proof tree
- Finding the Plan

Means-Ends Analysis

STRIPS

- Need to add temporal information to predicate calculus
- Problem: very difficult to do!
- Early solution [McCarthy & Hayes]: add a situation argument to the end of all predicates ⇒ situation calculus
- E.g.:

inClass(Joe, S1) means "Joe is in class in situation 1"

Situation Calculus

Overview

- Theorem proving
- Overview
- Situation Calculus
- Example: MAB
- Axioms
- Proof tree
- Finding the Plan

Means-Ends Analysis

STRIPS

- Situations: not linked to particular time
 - A situation *labels* a state of the world occurring at some time
 - Situation calculus: idea that actions transform one situation into another:

$$inClass(Joe, S1) \xrightarrow{go(Joe, Home, S1)} at(Joe, Home, S2)$$

• Actions are *functions* that yield new situations



Overview

- Theorem proving
- Overview
- Situation Calculus
- Example: MAB
- Axioms
- Proof tree
- Finding the Plan

Means-Ends Analysis

STRIPS

- Simple "monkey and bananas" (MAB) problem
- Initial state: $\neg OnBox(S_0) \land \neg HaveBananas(S_0)$
- Goal state: HaveBananas(s)
- Operators: (s' means state after s; \rightsquigarrow indicates effects)

 $PushBox(x,s) \leadsto At(Box,x,s')$ $ClimbBox(s) \leadsto OnBox(s')$ $Grasp(s) \leadsto HaveBananas(s')$

Axioms:

Overview

Theorem proving

- Overview
- Situation Calculus
- Example: MAB
- Axioms
- Proof tree
- Finding the Plan

Means-Ends Analysis

STRIPS

1. If the monkey is not on the box, then in the state after which it pushes the box, the box will be where the monkey pushed it.

 $\forall x, s \neg OnBox(s) \rightarrow At(Box, x, PushBox(x, s))$

 $CNF : OnBox(s_1) \lor At(Box, x_1, PushBox(x_1, s_1))$

2. The monkey will be on the box in any state resulting from climbing on the box.

 $\forall s \ OnBox(ClimbBox(s))$

 $CNF: OnBox(ClimbBox(s_2))$

Overview

- Theorem proving
- Overview
- Situation Calculus
- Example: MAB
- Axioms
- Proof tree
- Finding the Plan

Means-Ends Analysis

STRIPS

- Axioms (cont'd):
 - 3. If the monkey is on the box and the box is at the goal in a state, then in the state resulting from applying "grasp", the monkey will have the bananas.

 $\forall s \ OnBox(s) \land At(Box, Goal, s) \rightarrow HaveBananas(Grasp(s))$

 $CNF : \neg OnBox(s_3) \lor \neg At(Box, Goal, s_3)$

 $\lor HaveBananas(Grasp(s_3))$

4. (Frame axiom:) The box doesn't move when the monkey climbs on it. $\forall x, s \ At(Box, x, s) \rightarrow At(Box, x, ClimbBox(s))$ $CNF : \neg At(Box, x_2, s_4) \lor At(Box, x_2, ClimbBox(s_4))$

Overview

• Overview

Axioms

STRIPS

Proof tree

Theorem proving

• Situation Calculus

• Example: MAB

• Finding the Plan

Means-Ends Analysis

• Axioms (cont'd):

5. Initial state:

 $\neg OnBox(S_0)$ CNF: $\neg OnBox(S_0)$

6. Thing to be proved:

 $\exists s \; Have Bananas(s)$

 $CNF: \neg HaveBananas(s)$



MAB Example: Proof Tree



Finding the Plan

Overview

- Theorem proving
- Overview
- Situation Calculus
- Example: MAB
- Axioms
- Proof tree
- Finding the Plan
- Means-Ends Analysis
- STRIPS

- Trace back up through the variables, find that the plan is: PushBox, ClimbBox, Grasp
 - Use *Green's Trick*: Add extra literal to thing to be proven to automatically build plan from bindings:
 - \circ E.g., $\neg HaveBananas(s) \lor Answer(s)$
 - Stop when the extra literal is all that's left, not when nil is reached
 - Answer will be:

 $Answer(Grasp(ClimbBox(PushBox(Goal, S_0))))$

Overview

Theorem proving

Means-Ends Analysis

- Overview
- Example of MEA
- GPS

STRIPS

Means-Ends Analysis



Copyright © 2014 UMaine School of Computing and Information Science - 15 / 26

Means-Ends Analysis

Overview

- Theorem proving
- Means-Ends Analysis
- Overview
- Example of MEA
- GPS

STRIPS

- How to choose operators?
 - One of the best ways: means-ends analysis (MEA)
 - MEA came from psychological protocol studies (Simon, Newell)
- Basic idea:

- Identify differences between current state and goal state
- Select an operator that can *reduce* the largest difference
- If there are still differences, repeat probably differences between:
 - state after operator applied and goal
 - initial state and state necessary for operator to be applied

Example of MEA

- Problem: Go from here to Kapa'a, Kahuai, Hawaii
- Major difference: I'm here, I want to be there
- Operators: Many, only some of which can reduce the difference



Overview

Theorem proving

Means-Ends Analysis

- Overview
- Example of MEA
- GPS

STRIPS



Copyright \bigcirc 2014 UMaine School of Computing and Information Science – 17 / 26





Overview	 Example of MEA Problem: Go from here to Kapa'a, Kahuai, Hawaii Major difference: I'm here, I want to be there Operators: Many, only some of which can reduce the 	difference
Means-Ends Analysis	Here	Kapa'a
OverviewExample of MEAGPS	Fly(Atlanta,Honolulu)	Kapa'a
STRIPS	Fly(Bangor,Atlanta)	Kapa'a





rtificial

ntelligence



rtificial

ntelligence







Artificial ntelligence



tificial

ntelligence

General Problem Solver

Overview

Theorem proving

- Means-Ends Analysis
- Overview
- Example of MEA
- GPS

- MEA first embodied in the *General Problem Solver* (GPS) [Newell & Simon, 1963]
- Difference table
- Three (meta) operators: Transform(state,state), Reduce(difference), and Apply(operator)
- Heuristics: e.g., pick hardest difference first, don't generate same goal twice, ensure each goal easier than previous

General Problem Solver

Overview

- Theorem proving
- Means-Ends Analysis
- Overview
- Example of MEA
- GPS

- Solved:
 - Toy problems: water jug, missionaries and cannibals, towers of Hanoi, monkey and bananas
 - Theorem proving using predicate calculus
 - Symbolic integration
 - Parsed simple sentences
 - Letter series completion
- So, was it intelligent?
- Benefits , shortcomings?

Overview

Theorem proving

Means-Ends Analysis

STRIPS

- Overview
- STRIPS formalism
- STRIPS Operators
- Example
- The Sussman Anomaly



STRIPS

Overview

Theorem proving

Means-Ends Analysis

- Overview
- STRIPS formalism
- STRIPS Operators
- Example
- The Sussman Anomaly

- Stanford Research Institute Planning System [Fikes, 1971]
- Based on MEA
 - *Regression planner* work from goal to initial state deciding what must be true to apply an operator to achieve the state that considering
- See if goal is achieved
- If cannot prove, apply operator that will achieve goal

STRIPS

Overview

• Overview

• Example

Anomaly

The Sussman

Theorem proving

Means-Ends Analysis

STRIPS formalism
STRIPS Operators

- Select operator
 - Identify *differences* between current state and goal
 - Find operator that can reduce the most important one
 - No difference table!
 - To apply operator, make new goals of the operator's preconditions
 - Plan is the list of operators that must be applied to complete the proof

Formalism for STRIPS

Overview

Theorem proving

Means-Ends Analysis

- Overview
- STRIPS formalism
- STRIPS Operators
- Example
- The Sussman Anomaly

- Predicate calculus used to represent the world
 - conjunction of positive literals
 - ground clauses for states and goals
 - variables allowed in operators (variables are assumed to be universally quantified)
- Check to see if goal is achieved using RTP

STRIPS Operators

Overview

Theorem proving

Means-Ends Analysis

- STRIPS
- Overview
- STRIPS formalism
- STRIPS Operators
- Example
- The Sussman Anomaly

- Action name of action with variable parameters
- Preconditions what must be true for the operator to be successful
- Add-list clauses that become true when the operator is applied
- Delete-list clauses that are no longer true once the operator is applied
 - sometime combined and called "effects"
 - remove delete-list before adding add-list
 - STRIPS Assumption these are the only things that change in the world

A Simple Example from the Blocks World

Overview

STRIPS

Overview

ExampleThe Sussman

Anomaly

Theorem proving

Means-Ends Analysis

STRIPS formalismSTRIPS Operators

- Operators
 - Unstack(a,b)
 - preconditions: Armempty() On(a,b) Clear(a)
 - add list: Holding(a)
 Clear(b)
 - Stack(a,b)
 - PickUp(a)
 - PutDown(a)



On(C,A) & OnTable(A) & OnTable(B)

On(A,B) & OnTable(B)

Artificial ntelligence

Copyright © 2014 UMaine School of Computing and Information Science - 25 / 26

The Sussman Anomaly

Overview

Theorem proving

Means-Ends Analysis

STRIPS

- Overview
- STRIPS formalism
- STRIPS Operators
- Example
- The Sussman Anomaly



• The Goal Stack?