

Learning STRIPS action models from *state-invariants*

Diego Aineto¹, Sergio Jiménez¹, Eva Onaindia¹

¹Departamento de Sistemas Informáticos y Computación. Universitat Politècnica de València. Valencia, Spain

{dieaigar,serjice,onaindia}@dsic.upv.es

Abstract

1 Introduction

The specification of a planning action model is a complex process that limits, too often, the application of model-based planning to real-world tasks [Kambhampati, 2007]. The *machine learning* of action models can relieve this *knowledge acquisition bottleneck of AI planning* and nowadays, there exists a wide range of effective approaches for learning planning action models [Arora *et al.*, 2018]. Many of the most successful approaches for learning planning action models are however purely *inductive* [Yang *et al.*, 2007; Pasula *et al.*, 2007; Mourao *et al.*, 2010; Zhuo and Kambhampati, 2013], meaning that their performance depends on the *amount* and *quality* of the input examples (namely observations of plan executions generated with the aimed action model).

This paper proposes the exploitation of *deductive* knowledge in the form of *state-invariants* (i.e logic formulae that specify constraints about the possible states of a given domain) to reduce the negative effects of insufficient input observations when learning STRIPS action models. Given an action model state-of-the-art planners use to compute *state-invariants* to reduce their search space and make the planning process more efficient [Helmert, 2009]. In this paper we follow the opposite direction and exploit *state-invariants* to learn a planning action model.

Our approach is built on top of the *classical planning* compilation for the learning of STRIPS action models [Aineto *et al.*, 2018]. This compilation is flexible to different kinds of input knowledge (e.g., partially/fully observations of actions of plan executions as well as partially/fully observed intermediate states) and outputs an action model that is *consistent* with the given input knowledge. In this paper we show that, in unfavorable scenarios where input observations are minimal (just an *initial state* and the *goals*), *state-invariant* help to learn better STRIPS models with the *classical planning* compilation.

2 Background

This section formalizes the *classical planning model* we follow in this work and the kind of *knowledge* that can be given as input to the task of learning STRIPS action models.

2.1 Classical planning with conditional effects

Let F be the set of propositional state variables (*fluents*) describing a state. A *literal* l is a valuation of a fluent $f \in F$; i.e. either $l = f$ or $l = \neg f$. A set of literals L represents a partial assignment of values to fluents (without loss of generality, we will assume that L does not contain conflicting values). Given L , let $\neg L = \{\neg l : l \in L\}$ be its complement. We use $\mathcal{L}(F)$ to denote the set of all literal sets on F ; i.e. all partial assignments of values to fluents. A *state* s is a full assignment of values to fluents; $|s| = |F|$.

A *classical planning action* $a \in A$ has: a precondition $\text{pre}(a) \in \mathcal{L}(F)$, a set of effects $\text{eff}(a) \in \mathcal{L}(F)$, and a positive action cost $\text{cost}(a)$. The semantics of actions $a \in A$ is specified with two functions: $\rho(s, a)$ denotes whether action a is *applicable* in a state s and $\theta(s, a)$ denotes the *successor state* that results of applying action a in a state s . Then, $\rho(s, a)$ holds iff $\text{pre}(a) \subseteq s$, i.e. if its precondition holds in s . The result of executing an applicable action $a \in A$ in a state s is a new state $\theta(s, a) = (s \setminus \neg \text{eff}(a)) \cup \text{eff}(a)$. Subtracting the complement of $\text{eff}(a)$ from s ensures that $\theta(s, a)$ remains a well-defined state. The subset of action effects that assign a positive value to a state fluent is called *positive effects* and denoted by $\text{eff}^+(a) \in \text{eff}(a)$ while $\text{eff}^-(a) \in \text{eff}(a)$ denotes the *negative effects* of an action $a \in A$.

A *classical planning problem* is a tuple $P = \langle F, A, I, G \rangle$, where I is the initial state and $G \in \mathcal{L}(F)$ is the set of goal conditions over the state variables. A *plan* π is an action sequence $\pi = \langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle$, with $|\pi| = n$ denoting its *plan length* and $\text{cost}(\pi) = \sum_{a \in \pi} \text{cost}(a)$ its *plan cost*. The execution of π on the initial state of P induces a *trajectory* $\tau(\pi, P) = \langle s_0, a_1, s_1, \dots, a_n, s_n \rangle$ such that $s_0 = I$ and, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, it holds $\rho(s_{i-1}, a_i)$ and $s_i = \theta(s_{i-1}, a_i)$. A plan π solves P iff the induced *trajectory* $\tau(\pi, P)$ reaches a final state $G \subseteq s_n$, where all goal conditions are met. A solution plan is *optimal* iff its cost is minimal.

We also define *actions with conditional effects* because they are useful to compactly formulate our approach for *goal recognition with unknown domain models*. An action $a_c \in A$ with conditional effects is a set of preconditions $\text{pre}(a_c) \in \mathcal{L}(F)$ and a set of *conditional effects* $\text{cond}(a_c)$. Each conditional effect $C \triangleright E \in \text{cond}(a_c)$ is composed of two sets of literals: $C \in \mathcal{L}(F)$, the *condition*, and $E \in \mathcal{L}(F)$, the *effect*. An action a_c is applicable in a state s if $\rho(s, a_c)$ is true, and the result of applying action a_c in state s is

$\theta(s, a_c) = \{s \setminus \neg \text{eff}_c(s, a) \cup \text{eff}_c(s, a)\}$ where $\text{eff}_c(s, a)$ are the *triggered effects* resulting from the action application (conditional effects whose conditions hold in s):

$$\text{eff}_c(s, a) = \bigcup_{C \supseteq E \in \text{cond}(a_c), C \subseteq s} E,$$

2.2 State-invariants

The notion of *state-constraint* is very general and has been used in different areas of AI and for different purposes. If we restrict ourselves to planning, *state-constraints* are abstractions for compactly specifying sets of states. For instance, *state-constraints* in planning allow to specify the set of states where a given action is applicable, the set of states where a given *derived predicate* holds or the set of states that are considered goal states.

State invariants is a kind of state-constraints useful for computing more compact state representations [Helmert, 2009] or making *satisfiability planning* and *backward search* more efficient [Rintanen, 2014; Alcázar and Torralba, 2015]. Given a classical planning problem $P = \langle F, A, I, G \rangle$, a *state invariant* is a formula ϕ that holds at the initial state of a given classical planning problem, $I \models \phi$, and at every state s , built from F , that is reachable from I by applying actions in A .

The formula $\phi_{I,A}^*$ represents the *strongest invariant* and exactly characterizes the set of all states reachable from I with the actions in A . For instance Figure 1 shows five clauses that define the *strongest invariant* for the *blocksworld* planning domain [Slaney and Thiébaux, 2001]. There are infinitely many strongest invariants, but they are all logically equivalent, and computing the strongest invariant is PSPACE-hard (as hard as testing plan existence [Bylander, 1994]).

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x_1, x_2 \text{ ontable}(x_1) &\leftrightarrow \neg \text{on}(x_1, x_2). \\ \forall x_1, x_2 \text{ clear}(x_1) &\leftrightarrow \neg \text{on}(x_2, x_1). \\ \forall x_1, x_2, x_3 \neg \text{on}(x_1, x_2) \vee \neg \text{on}(x_1, x_3) &\text{ such that } x_2 \neq x_3. \\ \forall x_1, x_2, x_3 \neg \text{on}(x_2, x_1) \vee \neg \text{on}(x_3, x_1) &\text{ such that } x_2 \neq x_3. \\ \forall x_1, \dots, x_n \neg (\text{on}(x_1, x_2) \wedge \text{on}(x_2, x_3) \wedge \dots \wedge \text{on}(x_{n-1}, x_n) \wedge & \\ \text{on}(x_n, x_1)) &. \end{aligned}$$

Figure 1: *Strongest invariant* for the *blocksworld* domain.

A *mutex* (mutually exclusive) is a state invariant that takes the form of a binary clause and indicates a pair of different properties that cannot be simultaneously true [Kautz and Selman, 1999]. For instance in a three-block *blocksworld*, $\phi_1 = \neg \text{on}(\text{block}_A, \text{block}_B) \vee \neg \text{on}(\text{block}_A, \text{block}_C)$ is a *mutex* because block_A can only be on top of a single block.

A *domain invariant* is an instance-independent invariant, i.e. holds for any possible initial state and set of objects. Therefore, if a given state s holds $s \not\models \phi$ such that ϕ is a *domain invariant*, it means that s is not a valid state. Domain invariants are often compactly defined as *lifted invariants* (also called schematic invariants) [Rintanen and others, 2017]. For instance, $\phi_2 = \forall x : (\neg \text{handempty} \vee \neg \text{holding}(x))$, is a *domain mutex* for the *blocksworld* because the robot hand is never empty and holding a block at the same time.

2.3 The observation model

Given a planning problem $P = \langle F, A, I, G \rangle$, a plan π and a trajectory $\tau(\pi, P)$, we define the *observation of the trajectory* as an interleaved combination of actions and states that represents the observation from the execution of π in P . Formally, $\mathcal{O}(\tau) = \langle s_0^o, a_1^o, s_1^o, \dots, a_l^o, s_m^o \rangle, s_0^o = I$, and:

- The **observed actions** are consistent with π , which means that $\langle a_1^o, \dots, a_l^o \rangle$ is a sub-sequence of π . The number of observed actions, l , ranges from 0 (fully unobserved action sequence) to $|\pi|$ (fully observed action sequence).
- The **observed states** $\langle s_0^o, s_1^o, \dots, s_m^o \rangle$ is a sequence of possibly *partially observable states*, except for the initial state s_0^o , which is fully observed. A partially observable state s_i^o is one in which $|s_i^o| < |F|$; i.e., a state in which at least a fluent of F is not observable. Note that this definition also comprises the case $|s_i^o| = 0$, when the state is fully unobservable. Whatever the sequence of observed states of $\mathcal{O}(\tau)$ is, it must be consistent with the sequence of states of $\tau(\pi, P)$, meaning that $\forall i, s_i^o \subseteq s_i$. The number of observed states, m , range from 1 (the initial state, at least), to $|\pi| + 1$, and each *observed states* comprises $[1, |F|]$ fluents (the observation can still miss intermediate states that are *unobserved*).

We assume a bijective monotone mapping between actions/states of trajectories and observations [Ramírez and Geffner, 2009], thus also granting the inverse consistency relationship (the trajectory is a superset of the observation). Therefore, transiting between two consecutive observed states in $\mathcal{O}(\tau)$ may require the execution of more than a single action ($\theta(s_i^o, \langle a_1, \dots, a_k \rangle) = s_{i+1}^o$, where $k \geq 1$ is unknown but finite. In other words, having an input observation $\mathcal{O}(\tau)$ does not imply knowing the actual length of π .

3 Learning action models from state-invariants

We define the task of learning an action model from *state-invariants* as a tuple $\Lambda = \langle F, I, G, \Phi, M \rangle$, where:

- F is a state of fluents, I is an initial state (a full assignment of the fluents), and G is a set of goal conditions over the fluents.
- Φ , a set of *state-invariants* that constrain the set of possible states in the given domain.
- M is the *space of possible action model*. This set is the *full space* of action models, when learning from scratch, or *partially specified*, when some fragments of the action models are known a priori. A set of action models can be defined *explicitly*, enumerating all the models that belong to the set or *implicitly*, enumerating all the constraints that must satisfy any model that belongs to the set. A *partially specified STRIPS action model* is then a formalism for the *implicit* representation of a set of STRIPS schemes [Sreedharan et al., 2018].

A *solution* to a $\Lambda = \langle F, I, G, \Phi, M \rangle$ learning task is a model $\mathcal{M}' \in M$ that is *consistent* with the given input knowledge. This means that, let $P = \langle F, A_{\mathcal{M}'}, I, G \rangle$ be a *classical*

planning problem where the dynamics of the actions is given by the action model \mathcal{M}' , there exists a plan π such that any state traversed in the trajectory $\tau(\pi, P_O)$ satisfies all the *state-invariants* in Φ .

Next we show that the set M of possible action models can be encoded as a set of propositional variables and a set of constraints over those variables. Then, we show how to exploit this encoding to solve the $\Lambda = \langle M, \Phi, \mathcal{O}(\tau) \rangle$ learning task with an off-the-shelf classical planner.

3.1 A propositional encoding for the space of STRIPS action models

A STRIPS *action schema* ξ is defined by four lists: A list of *parameters* $\text{pars}(\xi)$, and three list of predicates (namely $\text{pre}(\xi)$, $\text{del}(\xi)$ and $\text{add}(\xi)$) that shape the kind of fluents that can appear in the *preconditions*, *negative effects* and *positive effects* of the actions induced from that schema. Let be Ψ the set of *predicates* that shape the propositional state variables F , and a list of *parameters* $\text{pars}(\xi)$. The set of elements that can appear in $\text{pre}(\xi)$, $\text{del}(\xi)$ and $\text{add}(\xi)$ of the STRIPS action schema ξ is given by FOL interpretations of Ψ over the parameters $\text{pars}(\xi)$ and is denoted as $\mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \xi}$.

For instance in a four-operator *blocksworld* [Slaney and Thiébaux, 2001], the $\mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \xi}$ set contains only five elements for the *pickup*(v_1) schemata, $\mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \text{pickup}} = \{\text{handempty}, \text{holding}(v_1), \text{clear}(v_1), \text{ontable}(v_1), \text{on}(v_1, v_1)\}$ while it contains eleven elements for the *stack*(v_1, v_2) schemata, $\mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \text{stack}} = \{\text{handempty}, \text{holding}(v_1), \text{holding}(v_2), \text{clear}(v_1), \text{clear}(v_2), \text{ontable}(v_1), \text{ontable}(v_2), \text{on}(v_1, v_1), \text{on}(v_1, v_2), \text{on}(v_2, v_1), \text{on}(v_2, v_2)\}$.

Despite any element of $\mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \xi}$ can *a priori* appear in the $\text{pre}(\xi)$, $\text{del}(\xi)$ and $\text{add}(\xi)$ of schema ξ , the actual space of possible STRIPS schemata is bounded by constraints of three kinds:

1. **Syntactic constraints.** STRIPS constraints require $\text{del}(\xi) \subseteq \text{pre}(\xi)$, $\text{del}(\xi) \cap \text{add}(\xi) = \emptyset$ and $\text{pre}(\xi) \cap \text{add}(\xi) = \emptyset$. Considering exclusively these syntactic constraints, the size of the space of possible STRIPS schemata is given by $2^{2 \times |\mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \xi}|}$. *Typing constraints* are also of this kind [McDermott *et al.*, 1998].
2. **Domain-specific constraints.** One can introduce domain-specific knowledge to constrain further the space of possible schemata. For instance, in the *blocksworld* one can argue that $\text{on}(v_1, v_1)$ and $\text{on}(v_2, v_2)$ will not appear in the $\text{pre}(\xi)$, $\text{del}(\xi)$ and $\text{add}(\xi)$ lists of an action schema ξ because, in this specific domain, a block cannot be on top of itself. *State invariants* are also constraints of this kind.
3. **Observation constraints.** An observation $\mathcal{O}(\tau)$ depicts *semantic knowledge* that constraints further the space of possible action schemata.

In this work we introduce a propositional encoding of the *preconditions*, *negative*, and *positive* effects of a STRIPS action schema ξ using only fluents of two kinds $\text{pre}_e \xi$ and $\text{eff}_e \xi$ (where $e \in \mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \xi}$). This encoding exploits the syntactic constraints of STRIPS so it is more compact than the

```
(:action stack
:parameters (?v1 ?v2)
:precondition (and (holding ?v1) (clear ?v2))
:effect (and (not (holding ?v1)) (not (clear ?v2))
             (clear ?v1) (handempty) (on ?v1 ?v2)))

(pre_holding_v1_stack) (pre_clear_v2_stack)
(eff_holding_v1_stack) (eff_clear_v2_stack)
(eff_clear_v1_stack) (eff_handempty_stack) (eff_on_v1_v2_stack)
```

Figure 2: PDDL encoding of the *stack*($?v1, ?v2$) schema and our propositional representation for this same schema.

one previously proposed by Aineto *et al.* 2018 for learning classical planning action models. In more detail, if $\text{pre}_e \xi$ holds it means that $e \in \mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \xi}$ is a *precondition* in ξ . If $\text{pre}_e \xi$ and $\text{eff}_e \xi$ holds it means that $e \in \mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \xi}$ is a *negative effect* in ξ while if $\text{pre}_e \xi$ does not hold but $\text{eff}_e \xi$ holds, it means that $e \in \mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \xi}$ is a *positive effect* in ξ . Figure 2 shows the PDDL encoding of the *stack*($?v1, ?v2$) schema and our propositional representation for this same schema with $\text{pre}_e \text{stack}$ and $\text{eff}_e \text{stack}$ fluents ($e \in \mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \text{stack}}$).

3.2 Learning STRIPS action models with classical planning

Given a $\Lambda = \langle M, \Phi, \mathcal{O}(\tau) \rangle$ where Φ is a set of *domain mutex* $\phi \in \Phi$, we create a classical planning problem $P' = \langle F', A', I, G \rangle$ such that:

- F' extends F with a fluent $\text{mode}_{\text{insert}}$, to indicate whether action models are being programmed, and the fluents for the propositional encoding of the corresponding space of STRIPS action models. This is a set of fluents of the type $\{\text{pre}_e \xi, \text{eff}_e \xi\}_{e \in \mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \xi}}$ such that $e \in \mathcal{I}_{\Psi, \xi}$ is a single element from the set of FOL interpretations of predicates Ψ over the corresponding action parameters $\text{pars}(\xi)$.
- A' replaces the actions in A with two types of actions.
 1. Actions for *inserting* a *precondition*, *positive* effect or *negative* effect in ξ following the syntactic constraints of STRIPS models. In the particular case that M is a *partially specified model* then only the actions for inserting a possible *precondition* or *effect* are necessary.
 - Actions which support the addition of a *precondition* $p \in \Psi_\xi$ to the action model ξ . A precondition p is inserted in ξ when neither pre_p , eff_p exist in ξ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pre}(\text{insertPre}_{p, \xi}) &= \{\neg \text{pre}_p(\xi), \neg \text{eff}_p(\xi), \text{mode}_{\text{insert}}\}, \\ \text{cond}(\text{insertPre}_{p, \xi}) &= \{\emptyset\} \triangleright \{\text{pre}_p(\xi)\}. \end{aligned}$$

- Actions which support the addition of a *negative* or *positive* effect $p \in \Psi_\xi$ to the action model ξ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pre}(\text{insertEff}_{p, \xi}) &= \{\neg \text{eff}_p(\xi), \text{mode}_{\text{insert}}\}, \\ \text{cond}(\text{insertEff}_{p, \xi}) &= \{\emptyset\} \triangleright \{\text{eff}_p(\xi)\}. \end{aligned}$$

2. Actions for *applying* an action model ξ built by the *insert* actions and bounded to objects $\omega \subseteq \Omega^{|pars(\xi)|}$ (where Ω is the set of *objects* used to induce the fluents F by assigning objects in Ω to the Ψ predicates and Ω^k is the k -th Cartesian power of Ω). The action parameters, $pars(\xi)$, are bound to the objects in ω that appear in the same position.

$$\begin{aligned} pre(\text{apply}_{\xi, \omega}) &= \{pre_p(\xi) \implies p(\omega)\}_{\forall p \in \Psi_\xi}, \\ cond(\text{apply}_{\xi, \omega}) &= \{pre_p(\xi) \wedge eff_p(\xi)\} \triangleright \{\neg p(\omega)\}_{\forall p \in \Psi_\xi}, \\ &\quad \{\neg pre_p(\xi) \wedge eff_p(\xi)\} \triangleright \{p(\omega)\}_{\forall p \in \Psi_\xi}, \\ &\quad \{\emptyset\} \triangleright \{\neg mode_{insert}\}. \end{aligned}$$

domain mutex are useful to reduce the amount of applicable actions for programming a precondition or an effect for a given action schema. For example given the *domain mutex* $\phi = (\neg f_1 \vee \neg f_2)$ such that $f_1 \in F_v(\xi)$ and $f_2 \in F_v(\xi)$, we can redefine the corresponding programming actions for **moving** the *precondition* $f_1 \in F_v(\xi)$ from the action schema $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$ as:

4 Evaluation

5 Conclusions

References

- [Aineto *et al.*, 2018] Diego Aineto, Sergio Jiménez, and Eva Onaindia. Learning STRIPS action models with classical planning. In *International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling, (ICAPS-18)*, pages 399–407. AAAI Press, 2018.
- [Alcázar and Torralba, 2015] Vidal Alcázar and Alvaro Torralba. A reminder about the importance of computing and exploiting invariants in planning. In *ICAPS*, pages 2–6. AAAI Press, 2015.
- [Arora *et al.*, 2018] Ankuj Arora, Humbert Fiorino, Damien Pellier, Marc Métivier, and Sylvie Pesty. A review of learning planning action models. *The Knowledge Engineering Review*, 2018.
- [Bylander, 1994] Tom Bylander. The computational complexity of propositional strips planning. *Artificial Intelligence*, 69(1-2):165–204, 1994.
- [Helmert, 2009] Malte Helmert. Concise finite-domain representations for pddl planning tasks. *Artificial Intelligence*, 173(5-6):503–535, 2009.
- [Kambhampati, 2007] Subbarao Kambhampati. Model-lite planning for the web age masses: The challenges of planning with incomplete and evolving domain models. In *National Conference on Artificial Intelligence, (AAAI-07)*, 2007.
- [Kautz and Selman, 1999] Henry Kautz and Bart Selman. Unifying SAT-based and graph-based planning. In *IJCAI*, volume 99, pages 318–325, 1999.
- [McDermott *et al.*, 1998] Drew McDermott, Malik Ghallab, Adele Howe, Craig Knoblock, Ashwin Ram, Manuela Veloso, Daniel Weld, and David Wilkins. PDDL – The Planning Domain Definition Language, 1998.
- [Mourao *et al.*, 2010] Kira Mourao, Ronald PA Petrick, and Mark Steedman. Learning action effects in partially observable domains. In *ECAI*, pages 973–974. Citeseer, 2010.
- [Pasula *et al.*, 2007] Hanna M Pasula, Luke S Zettlemoyer, and Leslie Pack Kaelbling. Learning symbolic models of stochastic domains. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 29:309–352, 2007.
- [Ramírez and Geffner, 2009] Miquel Ramírez and Hector Geffner. Plan recognition as planning. In *International Joint conference on Artificial Intelligence, (IJCAI-09)*, pages 1778–1783. AAAI Press, 2009.
- [Rintanen and others, 2017] Jussi Rintanen et al. Schematic invariants by reduction to ground invariants. In *AAAI*, pages 3644–3650, 2017.
- [Rintanen, 2014] Jussi Rintanen. Madagascar: Scalable planning with SAT. In *International Planning Competition, (IPC-2014)*, 2014.
- [Slaney and Thiébaux, 2001] John Slaney and Sylvie Thiébaux. Blocks world revisited. *Artificial Intelligence*, 125(1-2):119–153, 2001.
- [Sreedharan *et al.*, 2018] Sarath Sreedharan, Tathagata Chakraborti, and Subbarao Kambhampati. Handling model uncertainty and multiplicity in explanations via model reconciliation. In *International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling, (ICAPS-18)*, pages 518–526, 2018.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2007] Qiang Yang, Kangheng Wu, and Yunfei Jiang. Learning action models from plan examples using weighted MAX-SAT. *Artificial Intelligence*, 171(2-3):107–143, 2007.
- [Zhuo and Kambhampati, 2013] Hankz Hankui Zhuo and Subbarao Kambhampati. Action-model acquisition from noisy plan traces. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-13*, pages 2444–2450, 2013.