# Flatland encoding

Week 3

## **Progress**

We have an encoding that produces a correct result for a single agent. Congrats!

### **Comments**



### Positive feedback

With this logic:

```
{ occur(Edge, T) } 1 :- transition(Edge), time(T).
```

if we include an upper limit, we are saying "choose between the action or a wait."

For all possible transitions, pick one and do that. with your approach, you would need a constraint:

```
:- T1, T2.
```

Otherwise, you will end up with all waits. If we rewrite it like this:

```
{ occur(Edge, T) : transition(Edge) } = 1 :- time(T).
```

we can simplify what we have. For every transition, every possible action (wrt this transition) can happen, or you can wait.

### Making improvements

The encoding is long and written in such a manner that is a bit challenging to read the first time through. Take some time to review the structure of the encoding and consider whether there are redundancies that can be removed.

# Next steps for Week 4

• Knowing where the train is between transitions—this isn't a problem for one train, but it will be when we have multiple trains

- Track the trains' positions
- We will have to adjust the actions associated with each time step
- Knowing whether two or more trains will collide
  - Conflict detection
- Alternatives for representing transitions

#### Conflict detection:

#### 1. focus on node conflicts

i. This can be done by determining whether two agents are on the same node at the same time

### 2. focus on swapping conflicts

Housekeeping: Meet next week. In two weeks we will not meet.