

Assignment 5

Benjamin Sorenson

December 10, 2015

Question 1: (a)

Action(*GoAndPick*(x, y, o))

Precond : $At(Robot, x) \wedge EmptyHand(Robot) \wedge At(o, y)$

Effect : $\neg At(robot, x) \wedge At(Robot, y) \wedge \neg EmptyHand(robot) \wedge \neg At(o, y) \wedge Holding(Robot, o)$

(b)

Action(*PickAndGo*(x, y, o))

Precond : $At(Robot, x) \wedge EmptyHand(robot) \wedge At(o, x)$

Effect : $\neg At(Robot, x) \wedge \neg EmptyHand(Robot) \wedge \neg At(o, x) \wedge Holding(Robot, o) \wedge At(Robot, y)$

- (c) In general, action schemes can be combined by conjoining their preconditions and effects. This can be useful when a conceptually single action may take several smaller actions to complete, but this may not be a good idea when the smaller component actions have more universal complexity. In this case, we may end up defining a lot of overly complex actions.

Question 2: The action *Go* is unmodified, but *Pick* can be replaced with the following actions;

Action(*PickLeft*(o, x))

Precond : $EmptyLeftHand(Robot) \wedge At(Robot, x) \wedge At(o, x)$

Effect : $\neg EmptyLeftHand(Robot) \wedge \neg At(o, x) \wedge Holding(Robot, o)$

Action(*PickRight*(o, x))

Precond : $EmptyRightHand(Robot) \wedge At(Robot, x) \wedge At(o, x)$

Effect : $\neg EmptyRightHand(Robot) \wedge \neg At(o, x) \wedge Holding(Robot, o)$

Question 3: (a)

Action(*MoveTray*(*x*, *y*)
Precond : *At*(*Robot*, *x*) \wedge *At*(*Tray*, *y*) \wedge *EmptyHand*(*Robot*)
Effect : \neg *At*(*Robot*, *x*) \wedge \neg *At*(*Tray*, *x*) \wedge *At*(*Robot*, *y*) \wedge *At*(*Tray*, *x*))

Action(*RemoveFromTray*(*o*, *x*)
Precond : *On*(*o*, *Tray*) \wedge *At*(*Tray*, *x*) \wedge *At*(*Robot*, *x*) \wedge *EmptyHand*(*Robot*)
Effect : \neg *On*(*o*, *Tray*))

(b)

Action(*RemoveGlassFromTray*
Precond : *GlassOnTray* \wedge *RobotInLivingRoom* \wedge *TrayInLivingRoom* \wedge *RobotHandEmpty*
Effect : \neg *GlassOnTray*))

Action(*MoveTrayToKitchen*
Precond : *TrayInLivingRoom* \wedge *RobotInLivingRoom* \wedge *RobotHandEmpty*
Effect : *TrayInKitchen* \wedge \neg *TrayInLivingRoom* \wedge *RobotInKitchen* \wedge \neg *RobotInLivingRoom*))

Question 4: The predicate calculus allows variables, and proposition calculus does not. In propositional calculus we need a different fluent for each possible combination of variables which may become impractical as the number of variables becomes large. While the predicate calculus allows variables, and thus has more expressive power than the propositional calculus, the propositional calculus is easier to analyze because each proposition is decidable.

Question 5: (a)

Action(*CallElevatorFloor1*
Precond : *OnFloor1* \wedge *AtElevatorFloor2*
Effect : *AtElevatorFloor1* \wedge \neg *AtElevatorFloor2*)

Action(*RideElevatorFloor1-Floor2*
Precond : *OnFloor1* \wedge *AtElevatorFloor1*
Effect : *OnFloor2* \wedge \neg *OnFloor1* \wedge *AtElevatorFloor2* \wedge \neg *AtElevatorFloor1*)

(b) See last page ...

(c) The problem is solved at the second level. The plan is

CallElevatorFloor2 \rightarrow *RideElevatorFloor2-Floor1*

Question 6: (a) If a literal does not appear in the final level of the planning graph it means that it is not a possible result of any action—if it were, it would persist to the final level.

- (b) It is not necessary to add to the predecessor state the literals that are negative effects of the action because if the literal is a negative effect of the action, it could not have been negative in the predecessor state.

