

UNIVERSITÄT ZU LÜBECK

Automated Planning and Acting – Refinement Methods

Institute of Information Systems

Mattis Hartwig



Content

1. Planning and Acting with Deterministic Models

Conventional AI planning

2. Planning and Acting with Refinement Methods

Abstract activities \rightarrow collections of less-abstract activities

- 3. Planning and Acting with Temporal Models Reasoning about time constraints
- 4. Planning and Acting with Nondeterministic Models

Actions with multiple possible outcomes

 Standard Decision Making Utility theory Markov decision process (MDP) Planning and Acting with Probabilistic Models Actions with multiple possible outcomes, with

probabilities 7. Advanced Decision Making

Hidden goals Partially observable MDP (POMDP) Decentralised POMDP

- 8. Human-aware Planning Planning with a human in the loop
- 9. Causal Planning Causality & Intervention Implications for Causal Planning



Motivation

UNIVERSITÄT ZU LÜBECK

- Hierarchically organized deliberation
 - At high levels, abstract actions
 - At lower levels, more detail
- Refine abstract actions into ways of carrying out those actions
 - How?



UNIVERSITÄT ZU LÜBECK

Opening a Door

- Many different methods, depending on what kind of door
 - Sliding or hinged?
 - Hinge on left or right?
 - Open toward or away?
 - Knob, lever, push bar
 - Pull handle, push plate
 - Something else?





Assumptions

- Removes/weakens assumptions from classical planning
- Characteristics
 - Dynamic environment
 - Imperfect information
 - Overlapping actions
 - Nondeterminism
 - Hierarchy
 - Discrete and continuous variables

State-variable Representation (Recap)

- Objects:
 - $Robots = \{rbt\}$
 - *Containers* = $\{c1, c2, c3, ...\}$
 - Locations = {loc0, loc1, loc2, ...}
- State variables: syntactic terms to which we can assign values
 - $loc(r) \in Locations$
 - $load(r) \in Containers \cup \{nil\}$
 - $pos(c) \in Locations \cup Robots \cup \{unknown\}$
 - $view(r, l) \in \{T, F\}$
 - whether robot r has looked at location l
 - r can only see what is at its current location
- State: assign a value to each state variable
 - $\{loc(rbt) = loc0, pos(c1) = loc2, pos(c3) = loc4, pos(c2) = unknown, ... \}$











State-variable Representation: Extensions



- Range $\mathcal{R}(x)$
 - Can be finite, infinite, continuous, discontinuous, vectors, matrices, other data structures
- Assignment statement $x \leftarrow expr$
 - Expression that returns a ground value in $\mathcal{R}(x)$ and has no side-effects on the current state
- Tests (e.g., preconditions)
 - Simple: $x = v, x \neq v, x > v, x < v$
 - Compound: conjunction, disjunction, or negation of simple tests









Commands

- Command: primitive function that the execution platform can perform
 - take(r, o, l):
 robot r takes object o at location l
 - put(r, o, l):
 r puts o at location l
 - perceive(r, l):
 robot r perceives what objects are at l
 - r can only perceive what is at its current location
- Event: occurrence detected by execution platform
 - event-name(args)
 - Exogenous changes in the environment to which the actor may have to react
 - E.g., emergency signal, arrival of transportation vehicle





- \mathcal{M} : library of methods
- *ξ*: current state (abstraction)

Tasks and Methods

- Task: an activity for the actor to perform
 - Could be an abstract action of a plan
- For each task, a set of refinement methods
 - Operational models:
 - Tell *how* to perform the task
 - Do not predict *what* it will do





 $method-name(arg_1, ..., arg_k)$ task: task-identifier pre: test body: a program

- assignment statements
- control constructs: if-then-else, while, ...
- tasks (can extend to include events, goals)
- commands to the execution platform

Example: "open door" task

- What kind:
 - Hinged on left
 - Opens toward us
 - Lever handle
- → Refinement method









Rae (Refinement Acting Engine)

- Based on OpenPRS
 - Programming language, open-source robotics software
 - Deployed in many applications
- Input
 - External tasks, events, current state ξ , library of methods \mathcal{M}
- Output
 - Commands to execution platform
- Perform multiple tasks / events in parallel
 - Purely reactive, no lookahead
- For each task/event, a refinement stack
 - current path in Rae's search tree for the task / event
- Agenda
 - = {all current refinement stacks}





RAE



loop:

- if new external tasks/events then
 - Add them to Agenda
- for each stack in Agenda
 - Progress it
 - Remove it if it's finished



Rae (\mathcal{M}) Aqenda $\leftarrow \emptyset$

<pre>Stack element(\u03c4, m, i, tried)</pre>	
τ	task
т	instance of a method in ${\mathcal M}$
i	instruction pointer to
	step in body of <i>m</i>
tried	method instances already tried

Progress (subroutine) – Just a Decision Tree







- Objects:
 - $Robots = \{rbt\}$
 - *Containers* = $\{c1, c2, c3, ...\}$
 - Locations = {loc0, loc1, loc2, ...}
- State variables: syntactic terms to which we can assign values
 - $loc(r) \in Locations$
 - $load(r) \in Containers \cup \{nil\}$
 - $pos(c) \in Locations \cup Robots \cup \{unknown\}$
 - $view(r, l) \in \{T, F\}$
 - whether robot r has looked at location l
 - r can only see what is at its current location
- Commands to the execution platform:
 - take(r, o, l): robot r takes object o at location l
 - put(r, o, l): r puts o at location l
 - perceive(r, l): robot r perceives what objects are at loc. l
 - move-to(r, l): robot r moves to location l





















m-fetch(*r,c*) task: fetch(*r*,*c*) pre: body: if pos(*c*) = unknown then search(*r*,*c*) else if loc(r) = pos(c) then take(*r,c*,pos(*c*)) else do move-to(*r*, pos(*c*)) take(r,c,pos(c)) m-search(*r*,*c*) search(*r,c*) task: pos(c) = unknownpre: body: if $\exists I$ (view(r,I) = F) then move-to(*r*,*l*) perceive(/) if pos(c) = l then take(r,c,l) else search(*r*,*c*) else fail















...

. . .



m-fetch(*r*,*c*) task: fetch(r,c) pre: body: if pos(c) = unknown then search(*r,c*) else if loc(r) = pos(c) then take(*r*,*c*,pos(*c*)) else do move-to(*r*, pos(*c*)) take(r,c,pos(c)) m-search(*r*,*c*) search(*r,c*) task: pos(c) = unknownpre: body: if $\exists I$ (view(r,I) = F) then move-to(r,l) perceive(*I*) if pos(c) = l then take(r,c,l) else search(*r*,*c*) else fail

Seite 19



...

. . .















m-fetch(*r*,*c*) task: fetch(r,c) pre: body: if pos(c) = unknown then search(*r*,*c*) else if loc(r) = pos(c) then take(*r*,*c*,pos(*c*)) else do move-to(*r*, pos(*c*)) take(r,c,pos(c)) m search(r,c) search(*r*,*c*) task: pos(c) = unknownpre: body: if $\exists I$ (view(r,I) = F) then move-to(*r*,*l*) perceive(/) if pos(c) = l then take(*r,c,l*) else search(*r*,*c*) else fail





If other candidates for *search(r1,c2)*, try them.

Retry (subroutine)



Another decision tree



Retry(stack) $(\tau, m, i, tried) \leftarrow pop(stack)$ $tried \leftarrow tried \cup \{m\}$ Candidates \leftarrow Instances $(\mathcal{M}, \tau, \xi) \setminus tried$ if Candidates $\neq \emptyset$ then arbitrarily choose $m' \in Candidates$ $stack \leftarrow push((\tau, m, nil, \emptyset), stack)$ else do if $stack \neq \emptyset$ then Retry(stack) else do output("failed to accomplish" τ) Agenda \leftarrow Agenda \setminus stack



Quiz

When an agent has the task "going shopping to buy ingredients for a meal" what is probably no a refinement of that task?

- a) Finding the way for the shopping mall
- b) Doing movements
- c) Perceiving items
- d) Preparing the meal

Extensions to RAE



- Events
 - External inputs that are handled together with task (e.g. an emergency)
 - Are handled on the outer RAE loop and can also result in methods handling the event
- Goals
 - Special kind of tasks where the progress to achieve a specific goal condition is monitored
- Concurrent subtasks
 - Refinement stack for each one
- Controlling the progress of tasks
 - E.g. Pausing tasks under specific conditions
- For a task τ , which candidate to try first?
 - Refinement planning

Refinement Planning





Motivation

- When dealing with an event or task, Rae may need to make either/or choices
 - Agenda: tasks $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n$
 - Several tasks/events, how to prioritize?
 - Candidates for $\tau_1: m_1, m_2, ...$
 - Several candidate methods or commands, which one to try first?
- Rae immediately executes commands
 - Bad choices may be costly or irreversible

Refinement Planning



- Basic idea:
 - Go step by step through Rae, but do not send commands to execution platform
 - For each command, use a descriptive action model to predict the next state
 - Tells what, not how
 - Whenever we need to choose a method
 - Try various possible choices, explore consequences, choose best
- Generalization of HTN (Hierarchical Task Network) planning
 - HTN planning: body of a method is a list of tasks
 - Here: body of method is the same program Rae uses
 - Use it to *generate* a list of tasks



Refinement Planning: Example

- Suppose we learn in advance that the sensor isn't available
 - Planner infers that *m-search(r1,c2)* will fail
 - If another method is available, use it
 - Otherwise, planner will infer that the actor can't do search(r1,c2)





Descriptive Action Models

- Predict the outcome of performing a command
 - Preconditions-and-effects representation
- Command
 - take(r, o, l):
 robot r takes object o at location l
 - put(r, o, l):
 r puts o at location l
 - perceive(r, l):
 robot r perceives what objects are at location l
 - Can only perceive what is at its current location
 - If we knew this in advance, perception would not be necessary



Action model

```
take(r,o,l)
```

```
pre: cargo(r) = nil, loc(r) = l, loc(o) = l
```

```
eff: cargo(r) \leftarrow o, loc(o) \leftarrow r
```

```
put(r,o,l)
```

```
pre: loc(r) = l, loc(o) = r
```

```
eff: cargo(r) \leftarrow nil, loc(o) \leftarrow l
```

perceive(*r,1*) ?

Limitation



- Most environments are inherently nondeterministic
 - Deterministic action models will not always make the right prediction





- Why use them?
 - Deterministic models ⇒ much simpler planning algorithms
 - Use when errors are infrequent and do not have severe consequences
 - Actor can fix the errors online

SeRPE (Sequential Refinement Planning Engine)



• SeRPE inputs

 $\mathcal{M} = \{ \text{methods} \}$ $\mathcal{A} = \{ \text{action models} \}$ s = initial state $\tau = \text{task or goal}$

- Which candidate method for τ ?
 - SeRPE:
 - Nondeterministic choice
 - Backtracking point
 - How to implement?
 - Hierarchical adaptation of backtracking, A*, GBFS, ...
 - RAE
 - Arbitrary choice
 - No search, purely reactive

```
SeRPE (𝓜,𝔄,𝔄,
Candidates ← Instances (𝓜,𝔅,<)
if Candidates = Ø then
    return failure
nondeterministically choose m ∈ Candidates
return Progress-to-finish (𝓜,𝔄,𝔅,𝔅,𝔅,𝔅,𝔅)
```

Rae ($\mathcal M$)

```
Agenda ← Ø
loop
until the input of external tasks and
        events is empty do
    read τ in the input stream
    Candidates ← Instances (𝔅,τ,ξ)
    if Candidates = Ø then
        output ("failed to address" τ)
    else do
        arbitrarily choose m ∈ Candidates
        Agenda ← Agenda U {((τ,m,nil,Ø))}
for each stack ∈ Agenda do
    Progress(stack)
    if stack = Ø then
        Agenda ← Agenda \ {stack}
```

SeRPE (Sequential Refinement Planning Engine)



- SeRPE
 - One external task
 - Simulate progressing it all the way to the end
- Rae
 - Several external tasks
 - Each time through loop, progress each one by one step

```
SeRPE (𝓜,𝔄,𝔄,<,<)
Candidates ← Instances (𝓜,𝔅,<)
if Candidates = ∅ then
    return failure
    nondeterministically choose m ∈ Candidates
    return Progress-to-finish (𝓜,𝔄,𝔄,𝔅,𝔅,𝔅,𝔅)</pre>
```

Rae ($\mathcal M$)

```
Agenda \leftarrow \emptyset

loop

until the input of external tasks and

events is empty do

read \tau in the input stream

Candidates \leftarrow Instances (\mathcal{M}, \tau, \xi)

if Candidates = \emptyset then

output ("failed to address" \tau)

else do

arbitrarily choose m \in Candidates

Agenda \leftarrow Agenda \cup \{\langle (\tau, m, nil, \emptyset) \rangle\}

for each stack \in Agenda do

Progress (stack)

if stack = \emptyset then

Agenda \leftarrow Agenda \setminus \{stack\}
```

Progress-to-finish



- Like Rae progress with a loop around it
 - Simulates the commands



```
Progress-to-finish (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, s, \tau, m)
     i \leftarrow nil; \pi \leftarrow \langle \rangle
     100p
          if \tau is a goal and s \models \tau then
               return \pi
          if i is the last step of m then
               if \tau is a goal and s \not\models \tau then
                     return failure
               return \pi
          i \leftarrow \text{nextstep}(m, i)
          case type(m[i])
               assignment:
                     update s according to m[i]
               command:
                     a \leftarrow \text{descriptive model of } m[i] \text{ in } \mathcal{A}
                     if s ⊨ pre(a) then
                          s \leftarrow \gamma(s, a); \pi \leftarrow \pi.a
                     else
                          return failure
               task or goal:
                    \pi' \leftarrow \text{SeRPE}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, s, m[i])
                     if \pi' = failure then
                          return failure
                     s \leftarrow \gamma(s, \pi'); \pi \leftarrow \pi. \pi'
```

Progress-to-finish



Progress-to-finish $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, s, \tau, m)$ $i \leftarrow nil; \pi \leftarrow \langle \rangle$ loop **if** τ is a goal and $s \models \tau$ **then** return π if *i* is the last step of *m* then **if** τ is a goal and $s \not\models \tau$ **then** return failure return π $i \leftarrow \text{nextstep}(m, i)$ case type(m[i]) assignment: update *s* according to *m*[*i*] command: $a \leftarrow \text{descriptive model of } m[i] \text{ in } \mathcal{A}$ **if** $s \models pre(a)$ **then** $s \leftarrow \gamma(s, a); \pi \leftarrow \pi.a$ else return failure task or goal: $\pi' \leftarrow \text{SeRPE}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, s, m[i])$ **if** π' = failure **then** return failure $s \leftarrow \gamma(s, \pi'); \pi \leftarrow \pi. \pi'$

• Inputs

. . .

- *M* = {methods}, *A* = {action models}
 , s = initial state, τ = task or goal, m = chosen method
- Simulate Rae's goal monitoring
- If *m*[*i*] is a command
 - Use action model to predict outcome
- If current step is a task
- Call SeRPE recursively
- Recursion stack ≈ Rae's refinement stack
- For failures, no Retry (Rae)
 - A failure means SeRPE could not find a solution
 - Implementation: hierarchical adaptations of backtracking, A*, GBFS,



Heuristics For SeRPE

- *Ad hoc* approaches:
 - Domain-specific estimates
 - Statistical data on how well each method works
 - Try methods (or actions) in the order that they appear in \mathcal{M} (or \mathcal{A})
- Ideally, would want to implement using heuristic search (e.g., GBFS)
 - What heuristic function? Open problem





Interleaving

- Want to move c_1 to p_2 , using this plan
 - ⟨load(r₁, c₁, c₂, p₁, d₁), move(r₁, d₁, d₂), unload(r₁, c₁, p₃, nil, d₂))
- ... and move c_3 to p_1 using this plan:
 - $\langle load(r_2, c_3, nil, p_2, d_2), move(r_2, d_2, d_3), move(r_2, d_3, d_1), unload(r_2, c_3, c_2, p_1, d_1) \rangle$
- For it to work, must interleave the plans
 - ⟨load(r₂, c₃, nil, p₂, d₂), move(r₂, d₂, d₃), load(r₁, c₁, c₂, p₁, d₁), move(r₁, d₁, d₂), unload(r₁, c₁, p₃, nil, d₂), move(r₂, d₃, d₁), unload(r₂, c₃, c₂, p₁, d₁)⟩



- *load*(*r*, *c*, *c*', *p*, *d*)
 - pre: at(p,d), cargo(r) = nil, loc(r) = d, pos(c) = c', top(p) = c
 - eff: $cargo(r) \leftarrow c$, $pile(c) \leftarrow nil$, $pos(c) \leftarrow r$, $top(p) \leftarrow c'$
- unload(r, c, c', p, d)
 - pre: at(p,d), pos(c) = r, loc(r) = d, top(p) = c'
 - eff: $cargo(r) \leftarrow nil, pile(c) \leftarrow p, pos(c) \leftarrow c', top(p) \leftarrow c$
- move(r, d, d')
 - pre: adj(d, d'), loc(r) = d, occupied(d') = F
 - eff: loc(r) = d', occupied(d) = F, occupied(d') = T



Interleaved Refinement Tree (IRT) Procedure



- SeRPE doesn't allow the 'concurrent' programming construct
- Partial fix: extend SeRPE to interleave plans for different tasks
- Details: Section 3.3.2



Acting and Refinement Planning



- Hierarchical acting with refinement planning
 - REAP: a RAE-like actor uses SeRPE-like planning at all levels
- Non-hierarchical actor with refinement planning
 - Refine-Lookahead
 - Refine-Lazy-Lookahead
 - Refine-Concurrent-Lookahead
 - Essentially the same as
 - Run-Lookahead
 - Run-Lazy-Lookahead
 - Run-Concurrent-Lookahead
 - But they call SeRPE instead of a classical planner
 - Lookahead same as before
 - Receding horizon, sampling, subgoaling

Using Planning in Acting



- Lookahead: modified version of SeRPE
 - Searches part of the search space, returns a partial plan
- Useful when unpredictable things are likely to happen
 - Always re-plans immediately
- Potential problem:
 - May pause repeatedly while waiting for Lookahead to return
 - What if *s* changes during the wait?

Refine-Lookahead $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, \tau)$ while $(s \leftarrow abstraction of$ $observed state \xi \notin \tau do$ $\pi \leftarrow SeRPE-Lookahead (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, s, \tau)$ if π = failure then return failure $a \leftarrow pop-first-action (\pi)$ perform a



Using Planning in Acting



UNIVERSITÄT ZU LÜBECK

- Call Lookahead, execute the plan as far as possible, do not call Lookahead again unless necessary
- Simulate does a simulation of the plan
 - Can be more detailed than SeRPE's action models
 - e.g., physics-based simulation
- Potential problem: may wait too long to re-plan
 - Might not notice problems until it's too late
 - Might miss opportunities to replace π with a better plan

Refine-Lazy-Lookahead $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, \tau)$ $s \leftarrow abstraction of$ $observed state \xi$ while $s \not\models \tau$ do $\pi \leftarrow SeRPE-Lookahead (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, s, \tau)$ if $\pi = failure$ then return failure while $\pi \neq \langle \rangle$ and $s \not\models \tau$ and $Simulate(\Sigma, s, \tau, \pi)$ \neq failure do $a \leftarrow pop-first-action(\pi)$ perform a $s \leftarrow abstraction of$ $observed state \xi$

Planning stage Acting stage



Using Planning in Acting



- Objective:
 - Balance trade-offs between Refine-Lookahead and Refine-Lazy-Lookahead
 - More up-to-date plans than Refine-Lazy-Lookahead, but without waiting for Lookahead to return

```
Refine-Concurrent-Lookahead (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, \tau)
     \pi \leftarrow \langle \rangle
     s \leftarrow abstraction of observed state \xi
     // threads 1 and 2 run concurrently
thread 1:
     loop
          \pi \leftarrow \text{SeRPE-Lookahead}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}, s, \tau)
thread 2:
     loop
          if s \not\models \tau then
               return success
          else if \pi = failure then
               return failure
          else if \pi \neq \langle \rangle and s \not\models \tau and
                    Simulate (\Sigma, s, \tau, \pi) \neq failure then
               a \leftarrow \text{pop-first-action}(\pi)
               perform a
               s \leftarrow abstraction of observed state \xi
```

```
Planning stage
Acting stage
```

Caveats

- Start in state s_0 , want to accomplish task τ
 - Refinement method *m*:
 - task: τ
 - pre: *s*₀
 - body: *a*₁, *a*₂, *a*₃
- Actor uses Run-Lookahead
 - Lookahead = SeRPE, returns $\langle a_1, a_2, a_3 \rangle$
 - Actor performs a_1 , calls Lookahead again
 - No applicable method for τ in s_1 , SeRPE returns failure
- Fixes
 - When writing refinement methods, make them general enough to work in different states
 - In some cases, Lookahead might be able to fall back on classical planning until it finds something that matches a method
 - Keep snapshot of SeRPE's search tree at s_1 , resume there next time





Caveats

- Start in state s_0 , want to accomplish task τ
 - Refinement method *m*:
 - task: τ
 - pre: *s*₀
 - body: a_1, a_2, a_3
- Actor uses Run-Lazy-Lookahead
 - Lookahead = SeRPE with receding horizon, returns $\langle a_1, a_2 \rangle$
 - Actor performs them, calls Lookahead again
 - No applicable method for τ in s_2 , SeRPE returns failure
- Can use the same fixes on previous slide, with one modification
 - Keep snapshot of SeRPE's search tree at the horizon, resume next time it is called





Seite 45

Caveats

- Start in state s_0 , want to accomplish task τ
 - Refinement method *m*:
 - task: τ
 - pre: *s*₀
 - body: a_1, a_2, a_3
- Actor uses Run-Lazy-Lookahead
 - Lookahead = SeRPE, returns $\langle a_1, a_2, a_3 \rangle$
 - While acting, unexpected event
 - Actor calls Lookahead again
 - No applicable method for τ in s_4 , SeRPE returns failure
- Can use most of the fixes on last two slides, with this modification
 - Keep snapshot of SeRPE's search tree after each action
 - Restart it immediately after a_1 , using s_4 as current state
 - Also: make recovery methods for unexpected states
 - E.g., fix flat tire, get back on the road







Summary

- Acting and planning
 - Lookahead: search part of the search space, return a partial solution
 - Refine-Lookahead, Refine-Lazy-Lookahead, Refine-Concurrent-Lookahead
 - Like Run-Lookahead, Run-Lazy-Lookahead, Run-Concurrent-Lookahead, but call SeRPE
 - Caveats
 - Current state may not be what we expect
 - Possible ways to handle that

Content

- Planning and Acting with Deterministic Models Conventional AI planning
- 2. Planning and Acting with Refinement Methods

Abstract activities \rightarrow collections of less-abstract activities

- 3. Planning and Acting with Temporal Models Reasoning about time constraints
- 4. Planning and Acting with Nondeterministic Models

Actions with multiple possible outcomes

 Standard Decision Making Utility theory Markov decision process (MDP) Planning and Acting with Probabilistic Models Actions with multiple possible outcomes, with

Actions with multiple possible outcomes, with probabilities

- 7. Advanced Decision Making Hidden goals Partially observable MDP (POMDP) Decentralised POMDP
- 8. Human-aware Planning Planning with a human in the loop
- 9. Causal Planning Causality & Intervention Implications for Causal Planning

