

$\alpha$

A	B	C	$A \vee C$	A	$A \vee B$	$B \vee \neg C$	$\neg B \vee C$	$K_B$
T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T✓
T	T	F	T	T	T	T	F	
T	F	T	T	T	T	F	T	
T	F	F	T	T	T	T	T	T✓
F	T	T	T	F	T	T	T	
F	T	F	F	F	T	T	F	
F	F	T	T	F	F	F	T	
F	F	F	F	F	F	T	T	

Yes  $K_B \models \alpha$

## 2. Planning

- States, goals and actions
- Model action consequences
- States not discrete  
(presence/absence of preconditions)
- Use divide and conquer with subgoals

## Problem Solving

- State representations complete
- Don't model actions and their effects
- Must start over if solution changes/wrong
- Relies on black-box calculations

## 3. POP steps at each iteration:

1. Select a step that allows us to achieve a precondition  $C$  of a step  $S_{need}$  that has open preconditions.
2. Choose an operator  $O$  to achieve  $C$  (from existing steps or a new step). preference
3. Add operator  $O$  to plan (if needed) and record causal link  $O, O_{S_{need}}$ .
4. If  $O$  is new add Start  $\Leftarrow O$  and  $O \Leftarrow End$  to ordering constraints.

4. • Clashing occurs when a new action threatens a causal link that already exists.  
 - To resolve, the new action could be demoted (placed after the causal links) or promoted (placed before) to not break the causal links.



5.

Start

$\text{On}(C, A), \text{On}(A, \text{Table}), \text{On}(B, \text{Table}), \text{Clear}(B), \text{Clear}(C)$

order

$\text{On}(C, A), \text{Clear}(C)$

$\boxed{\text{MoveToTable}(C, A)}$

$\text{On}(C, \text{Table}), \text{Clear}(A), \neg \text{On}(C, A)$

clobbers therefore promote  
 $\text{MoveToTable}(C, A)$

order

$\text{On}(B, \text{anything}), \text{Clear}(B), \text{Clear}(C)$

$\boxed{\text{Move}(B, \text{anything}, C)}$

$\text{Clear}(\text{Table}), \text{On}(B, C), \neg \text{On}(B, \text{anything}), \neg \text{Clear}(C)$

clobbers  
therefore  
promote  
 $\text{Move}(B, \text{anything}, C)$

$\text{On}(A, \text{anything}), \text{Clear}(B), \text{Clear}(A)$

$\boxed{\text{Move}(A, \text{anything}, B)}$

$\text{Clear}(\text{anything}), \text{On}(A, B), \neg \text{On}(A, \text{anything}), \neg \text{Clear}(B)$

1.

2.

3.

4.

$\text{On}(A, B), \text{On}(B, C), \text{On}(C, \text{Table}), \text{Clear}(A)$

Finish



## 6. • Used when:

- incomplete info: not known until run time
- incorrect info
- too many possible outcomes

## • Allows:

- creating subplans of the form [if  $a$  then plan1 else plan2]
- check the state of  $a$  using sensing at execution
- similar to POP-algorithm but:  
if a precondition can be achieved by observation, add observation to plan and complete plan for all outcomes  
(with conditional finish steps)

• Need to consider branching factor and the extra complexity.

7. • Action and plan monitoring are both methods to decide if we need to re-plan due to remaining parts of the plan not being able to be executed.

- Action-monitoring: look at preconditions of next action
- Plan-monitoring: look at preconditions of entire plan  
(excluding those that have a causal link not completed yet)

For the example:

Action: look at  $cg_1$  and  $cg_2$

Plan: look at  $cg_1, cg_2, ch_1, ch_2, ch_3, cf$

• not  $cg_{out1}$  or  $cg_{out2}$  because require  $g$  and  $h$  to be executed