

Ex.1

$$(((P \vee Q) \Rightarrow R) \wedge (R \vee (P \wedge \neg Q))) \wedge \neg R$$

Translate the implication to an or-clause:

$$((\neg(P \vee Q) \vee R) \wedge (R \vee (P \wedge \neg Q))) \neg R$$

De Morgan:

$$(((\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \vee R) \wedge (R \vee (P \wedge \neg Q))) \wedge \neg R$$

Remove contradicting statements ($(\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$ and $(P \wedge \neg Q)$ can never be true at the same time):

$$(R \wedge R) \wedge \neg R$$

A literal AND the same literal is the same as just writing the literal:

$$R \wedge \neg R$$

We are ending up with a contradiction.

Ex.2

Action (Go(x, y, r)) ,

PRECOND: $At(Shakey, x) \wedge In(x, r) \wedge In(y, r)$

EFFECT: $At(y, Shakey) \wedge \neg At(x, Shakey)$

Action (Push(b, x, y, r)) ,

PRECOND: $At(b, x) \wedge In(x, r) \wedge In(y, r) \wedge In(Shakey, r) \wedge \neg At(Shakey, x) \wedge Box(b)$

EFFECT: $At(b, y) \wedge \neg At(b, x)$

Action (ClimbUp(x, b)) ,

PRECOND: $In(b, r) \wedge In(x, r) \wedge At(Shakey, x) \wedge \neg At(b, x) \wedge On(Shakey, Floor)$

EFFECT: $\neg On(Shakey, Floor) \wedge On(Shakey, b) \neg At(Shakey, x)$

Action (ClimbDown(b, x)) ,

PRECOND: $In(x, r) \wedge In(b, r) \wedge \neg At(b, x) \wedge On(Shakey, b)$

EFFECT: $\neg On(Shakey, Floor) \wedge On(Shakey, b) \neg At(Shakey, x)$