CSE 4308/5360 – Artificial Intelligence I University of Texas at Arlington

Planning in More Complicated Domains

- Our discussion of planning so far assumed a fullyobservable, deterministic world.
 - The state of the world is fully known.
 - The effects of any action are known in advance.
 - Nothing ever goes wrong.
- Obviously, in real life these assumptions are often violated.
 - Some aspects of the current state may be unknown.
 - Some facts that we think are true may actually be false.
 - You think your car is in the parking lot, but it has been stolen :(
 - Some actions may not have the expected effect.

Three Planning Approaches

- Sensorless planning (also called conformant planning).
 - Handles domains where the state of the world is not fully known.
 - Comes up with plans that work in all possible cases.
- Contingent planning (also called conditional planning).
 - Handles domains where the effects of an action are not deterministic.
 - Approach: plan ahead for different possible results of each action.
- Execution monitoring and online replanning.
 - Handles domains where the effects of an action are not deterministic, or where, more generally, things in the world may unexpectedly change.
 - While executing the plan, before performing each action, monitor the environment.
 - If the environment is different than expected, replan.

- Handles domains where the state of the world is not fully known.
- Comes up with plans that work in all possible cases.

- You have a wall made of bricks.
- You have a can of white paint.
- Action: Paint(brick), effect: Color(brick, white).
- Goal: every brick should be painted white.

- You have a wall made of bricks.
- You have a can of white paint.
- Action: Paint(brick), effect: Color(brick, white).
- Goal: every brick should be painted white.
- In a fully observable domain, you could:
 - Know the initial color of every brick.
 - Make a plan to paint all the bricks that are not white initially.
 - No need to paint bricks that are already white.

- You have a wall made of bricks.
- You have a can of white paint.
- Action: Paint(brick), effect: Color(brick, white).
- Goal: every brick should be painted white.
- Suppose the world is not fully observable.
 - We actually cannot observe the color of a brick.
- Suppose that the world is deterministic.
 - The effects of an action are known in advance.
- What plan would ensure achieving the goal?

- You have a wall made of bricks.
- You have a can of white paint.
- Action: Paint(brick), effect: Color(brick, white).
- Goal: every brick should be painted white.
- Suppose the world is not fully observable.
 - We actually cannot observe the color of a brick.
- Suppose that the world is deterministic.
 - The effects of an action are known in advance.
- What plan would ensure achieving the goal?
 - Paint all bricks, regardless of their initial color (which we don't know anyway).
 - It may be overkill, since some bricks may already be white, but it is the only plan that guarantees achieving the goal.

• Limitations:

• Limitations:

- While there are a few domains simple enough to allow for sensorless planning:
- Many real world domains are too complicated for this approach, and you can't come up with plans that work regardless of what the state of the world is.

- Also called conditional planning.
- Handles domains where the effects of an action are not deterministic.
- Approach: plan ahead for different possible results of each action.

 Example: this was the definition of actions for the blocks world:

```
Action(Move(block, from, to),
PRECOND: On(block, from) AND Clear(block) AND Clear(to)
EFFECT: On(block, to) AND NOT(On(block, from)) AND
Clear(from) AND NOT(Clear(to))
```

Action(MoveToTable(block, from),

PRECOND: On(block, from) AND Clear(block)

EFFECT: On(block, Table) AND NOT(On(block, from)) AND Clear(from)

- Suppose now that we have a non-deterministic blocks-world.
- Moving a block may be successful or not.
 - If successful, the block ends up where we wanted.
 - If unsuccessful, the block falls on the table.
- To model this, we need to allow the effects of an action to include disjunctions:

```
Action(Move(block, from, to),
PRECOND: On(block, from) AND Clear(block) AND Clear(to)
EFFECT: NOT(On(block, from)) AND Clear(from)
AND ( (On(block, to) AND NOT(Clear(to))) OR (On(block, table)) ))
Action(MoveToTable(block, from),
PRECOND: On(block, from) AND Clear(block)
EFFECT: On(block, Table) AND NOT(On(block, from)) AND Clear(from)
```



- We also need to allow plans to have if statements.
- Example:

```
move(A, B, C)

if on(A, C) then done

else:
???
```



- We also need to allow plans to have if statements.
- Example:

```
move(A, B, C)
if on(A, C) then done
else:
  move(A, table, C)
  if on(A, C) then done
  else:
    ???
```



- We also need to allow plans to have if statements.
- Example:

```
move(A, B, C)
if on(A, C) then done
else:
    move(A, table, C)
    if on(A, C) then done
    else:
        move(A, table, C)
    if on(A, C) then done
```



- Theoretically, the execution of such a plan may never terminate.
- In practice, one of the attempts should be successful, and the plan should eventually terminate.
- This behavior matches real-world plan execution:
 - Usually there is no 100% guarantee that a plan will work.
 - In practice, well-made plans tend to work.
- Contingent plans look like decision trees. At each node, we choose a subtree based on a condition.

- Handles domains where:
 - The effects of an action are not deterministic.
 - More generally, things in the world may unexpectedly change.
- While executing the plan:
 - Before performing each action, monitor the environment.
 - If the environment is different than expected, replan.

- Example: the non-deterministic blocks world, again.
- As before, moving a block may be successful or not.
 - If successful, the block ends up where we wanted.
 - If unsuccessful, the block falls on the table.

```
Action(Move(block, from, to),
PRECOND: On(block, from) AND Clear(block) AND Clear(to)
EFFECT: On(block, to) AND NOT(On(block, from)) AND
Clear(from) AND NOT(Clear(to))
```

```
Action(MoveToTable(block, from),
PRECOND: On(block, from) AND Clear(block)
EFFECT: On(block, Table) AND NOT(On(block, from)) AND
Clear(from)
```



- In online replanning, we do not have to modify the action definitions.
- The plan we make is the same as in the deterministic case:



- In online replanning, we do not have to modify the action definitions.
- The plan we make is the same as in the deterministic case:
 move(A, B, C)
- When executing the plan:
- Before executing move(A, B, C), we check if the state of the world is as expected.
- If so, we execute the action.
- After we execute the action, we check if the goal is indeed achieved.
 - If not, we replan.

- Before executing the next action, the agent monitors the environment.
- There are different choices as to exactly what to monitor.
 - Action monitoring: verify that the preconditions of the next action still hold.
 - Plan monitoring: verify that the remaining plan will still succeed, given the current state of the world.
 - Goal monitoring: check to see if, given the current state of the world, there is a better plan to follow.
- Action monitoring is the most simple and efficient.
- Goal monitoring can take advantage of unexpected changes that may make it easier to achieve the goal.

- The two approaches can be applicable on the same problem.
- They both handle cases where the effects of an action are not deterministic.
- What are the relative pros and cons?
- When would it make more sense to use one approach, vs. the other approach?
- What are the pitfalls of each approach?

- Contingency planning becomes infeasible when there are too many possibilities.
 - At some point, the required plan may be too large to fit in memory, or to be able to compute in a reasonable amount of time.
 - Online replanning can help in such cases: focuses resources on analyzing the current situation, as opposed to planning for every possible situation.
- Online planning requires additional computational effort during plan execution.
 - In real-time environments, online planning may be too slow to be useful.
 - In such cases, contingency planning is a better approach: it does more computations offline, so that during execution we don't have to spend as much time computing new plans.
- Obviously, there may be cases where both approaches are too computationally expensive.

- How do humans approach this dilemma?
- We typically have conditional plans to handle problems that have high probability to occur.
- We typically do not plan for every possible thing that could go wrong.
 - If something unexpected happens, we adjust our plan on the fly.
- Example: suppose we plan to drive from point A to point B.
 - If we know that the preferred route is often closed due to construction, it makes sense to have an alternate route in mind before starting the trip.
 - However, we typically don't make plans in advance about every possible street that might be blocked, flat tires, dead batteries, etc.
 We deal with those situations as they happen.

• Summary:

- They both have advantages and disadvantages.
- In some domains, it may be best to include both approaches:
- Use contingency planning to be prepared for highprobability situations.
- Use online replanning to handle any unpredicted problems that arise in practice.