# Theory of Activities

May 22, 2018

# 1 The Physical Domain

The domain has four rooms located side by side (library, kitchen, of fice1 and of fice2) and connected. The robot  $rob_1$ , can move from one room to the next. A secure room can be locked or unlocked. The robot cannot move to or from a locked room; it can unlock a locked room. The domain objects can be located in any of the rooms. The robot can pickup an object if is in the same location as the object, it can put\_down an object that it is holding and it can only hold one object at a time. There are two exogenous actions, one that can change the location of any object, and one that can lock a secure room. The agent may not be aware of these exogenous action when they happen. We are also going to define three different defined fluents, two of which we will be using as possible goals.

#### 1.1 AL

Sorts:

```
secure\_room = \{library\}.
room = secure\_room + \{kitchen, office_1, office_2\}.
robot = \{rob_1\}.
book = \{book_1, book_2\}.
object = book.
thing = object + robot.
```

Static relations:

```
next\_to(office_1, office_2).
```

```
next\_to(kitchen, office_1).
next\_to(library, kitchen).
```

Inertial fluents:

```
inertial\_fluent = loc(thing, room) + in\_hand(robot, object) + locked(secure\_room).
```

Possible goals:

$$possible\_goal = tidy\_all(room) + tidy\_book(book, room).$$

Defined fluents:

```
defined\_fluent = possible\_goal + missing\_book(room).
```

Robot actions:

```
move(robot, room).
pickup(robot, object).
put_down(robot, object).
unlock(robot, secure_room).
```

Exogenous actions:

```
exo\_move(object, room).
exo\_lock(secure\_room).
```

Causal Laws:

```
\begin{array}{cccc} move(R,L) & \mathbf{causes} & loc(R,L) \\ pickup(R,O) & \mathbf{causes} & in\_hand(R,O). \\ put\_down(R,O) & \mathbf{causes} & \neg in\_hand(R,O). \\ unlock(R,L) & \mathbf{causes} & \neg locked(L). \\ exo\_lock(L) & \mathbf{causes} & locked(L). \\ exo\_move(O,L) & \mathbf{causes} & loc(O,L). \end{array}
```

State Constraints:

```
next\_to(L1, L2) if next\_to(L2, L1).
```

```
\neg loc(T, L2) if loc(T, L1), L1 \neq L2.

loc(O, L) if loc(R, L), in\_hand(R, O).

\neg in\_hand(R, O1) if in\_hand(R, O2), O1 \neq O2.
```

**Executability Conditions:** 

```
impossible move(R,L) if loc(R,L).

impossible move(R,L2) if loc(R,L1), \neg next\_to(L1,L2).

impossible move(R,L2) if loc(R,L1), locked(L1).

impossible move(R,L) if locked(L).

impossible unlock(R,L) if \neg locked(L).

impossible unlock(R,L) if loc(R,L2), \neg next\_to(L2,L1), L2 \neq L1.

impossible put\_down(R,O) if \neg in\_hand(R,O).

impossible pickup(R,O1) if loc(R,L1), loc(O,L2), L1 \neq L2.

impossible pickup(R,O) if loc(R,L1), loc(O,L2), L1 \neq L2.

impossible exo\_move(O,L) if locked(L).

impossible exo\_move(O,L) if locked(L).

impossible exo\_move(O,L) if locked(L).

impossible exo\_move(O,L) if locked(L).

impossible exo\_move(O,L) if locked(L).
```

## 1.2 The Theory of Activities

In our ToA domain of our agent will also have a list of possible goals and one of them will be selected. The agent will need to specify one or more activities that would achieve the selected goal. He may have a list or different existing activities. If there are existing activities that achieve the goal, the agent will choose and return one of those activites. If the agent cannot find a successfull existing activity, he will be inconsistent.

An *activity* will be represented by a duple consisting on *name* and *plan*. A *name* is a unique identifier used to refer to the *activity*, and a plan is a sequence of agent actions, which will lead to the realisation of the *goal*.

We limit the names of activities to a collection of integers  $(1 \dots max\_name)$ , the length of plans to a maximum length  $(1 \dots max\_len)$ . The fluents of the physical environment that may serve as a *goal* are those of the sort  $possible\_goal$ .

In order to create the Action Language for the new domain, we will 1-adapt and 2-extend the original Action Language for the physical domain. We will adapt it by

re-defining the sort  $inertial\_fulent$  as  $physical\_inertial\_fluens$ ,  $defined\_fluents$  as  $physical\_defined\_fluents$ , and the sort  $agent\_action$  as  $physical\_agent\_action$ . We will define the following new sorts:

- A sort  $activity\_name = 1, ..., max\_name$  to represent the name of an activity.
- A sort  $index = \{-1, 0, max\_len\}$  to represent the index of an action as part of an activity.
- A sort  $mental\_agent\_action = \{select\_activity(activity\_name)\}$  to represent the action of choosing and activity.

We also the following relations that give shape to the concept of activity.

```
activity\_component(activity\_name, index, physical\_agent\_action). activity\_goal(activity\_name, possible\_goal).
```

We create a hierarchical structure of actions as follows:

```
agent\_action = mental\_agent\_action + physical\_agent\_action, action = agent\_action + exo\_action.
```

As well as the previous statements included in the physical domain, we will include:

Possible goalst:

$$tidy\_book(B,R)$$
 if  $loc(B,R), \neg in\_hand(B)$ .  
 $missing\_book(R)$  if  $\neg tidy\_book(B,R)$ . (1)  
 $tidy\_all(R)$  if  $not\ missing\_book(R)$ .

# 2 The Architecture: Reasoning Tasks and Behaviour.

### 2.1 Introducing new relations

The axioms that need to be added to the ASP program also involve the following relations:

• impossible(A, I) means that action A is impossible at step I.

- candidate(AN) means that the goal of AN is the selected goal, and therefore a candidate to be the selected Activity.
- $has\_component(AN, K)$  means that activity AN has a component at index K.
- success

## 2.2 Translating AL to ASP

The following steps should be followed in order to translate the AL description into an ASP program.

```
For every causal law: a causes 1 if p_0, \ldots, p_m

The ASP contains: holds(l, I+1) :- holds(p_0, I), \ldots, holds(p_m, I), occurs(a, I).

For every state constraint: l if p_0, \ldots, p_m

the ASP contains holds(l, I) :- holds(p_0, I), \ldots, holds(p_m, I).

The ASP contains the CWA for defined fluents: -holds(F, I) :- \#physical\_defined\_fluent(F), not holds(F, I).

For every executability condition: impossible\ a\ if\ p_0, \ldots, p_m

the ASP contains: impossible(a, I) :- holds(p_0, I), \ldots, holds(p_m, I).

It also contains: -occurs(A, I) :- impossible(A, I).

The ASP contains the inertia axioms: holds(F, I+1) :- holds(F, I), not -holds(F, I+1).

The ASP contains the CWA for actions: -occurs(A, I) :- not\ occurs(A, I).
```

Once translation using the above steps has been completed, the axioms in the following section will also need to be added to the ASP program.

### 2.3 Reasoning Axioms

Defining candidates:

$$candidate(AN) \leftarrow activity\_goal(AN, G),$$
  
 $selected\_goal(G).$  (2)

Selecting candidates: If it is not impossible to select a candidate, it will be selected.

$$occurs(select\_activity(AN), 0) \leftarrow not\ impossible(select\_activity(AN), 0).$$
 (3)

It is impossible to select an activity at any step other than 0, it is impossible to select an activity if it is not a candidate, it is not possible to select an activity if the selected goal holds at 0, and it is impossible to select two different activities.

$$impossible(select\_activity(AN1), 0) \leftarrow occurs(select\_activity(AN2), 0),$$
 $AN1 \neq AN2.$ 
 $impossible(select\_activity(AN), 0) \leftarrow not\ candidate(AN).$  (4)
 $impossible(select\_activity(AN), I) \leftarrow 0 < I.$ 
 $impossible(select\_activity(AN), I) \leftarrow selected\_goal(G), holds(G, 0).$ 

This rule ensures that the selected exisiting activity has the minimal sequence to reach the goal among all existing activities:

$$occurs(PAA, I) \quad \stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} \quad occurs(select\_activity(AN), 0),$$

$$activity\_component(AN, I, PAA),$$

$$occurs(A, I - 1),$$

$$0 < I.$$

$$(5)$$

Planning module:

$$success \leftarrow holds(G, I), selected\_goal(G).$$

$$\leftarrow not success.$$
(6)