Foundations of Artificial Intelligence
40. Automated Planning: Landmark Heuristics

Martin Wehrle

Universität Basel

May 20, 2016

40.1 Finding Landmarks

40.2 The LM-Cut Heuristic

40.3 Summary

Automated Planning: Overview

Formalism and Example

- As in the previous chapter, we consider delete-free planning tasks in normal form.
- We continue with the example from the previous chapter:

Example

actions:

- $a_1 = \langle i \rightarrow x, y \rangle_3$
- $a_2 = \langle i \rightarrow x, z \rangle_4$
- $a_3 = \langle i \rightarrow y, z \rangle_5$
- $a_4 = \langle x, y, z \rightarrow g \rangle_0$

landmark examples:

- $A = \{a_4\}$ (cost $= 0$)
- $B = \{a_1, a_2\}$ (cost $= 3$)
- $C = \{a_1, a_3\}$ (cost $= 3$)
- $D = \{a_2, a_3\}$ (cost $= 4$)

40.1 Finding Landmarks

Justification Graphs

Definition (precondition choice function)

A precondition choice function (pcf) $P : A \rightarrow V$
maps every action to one of its preconditions.

Definition (justification graph)

The justification graph for pcf P is a directed graph
with annotated edges.

- vertices: the variables V
- edges: $P(a) \xrightarrow{a} e$ for every action a, every effect $e \in add(a)$

Example: Justification Graph

Example

pcf P: $P(a_1) = P(a_2) = P(a_3) = i$, $P(a_4) = y$

$a_1 = \langle i \rightarrow x, y \rangle_3$
$a_2 = \langle i \rightarrow x, z \rangle_4$
$a_3 = \langle i \rightarrow y, z \rangle_5$
$a_4 = \langle x, y, z \rightarrow g \rangle_0$

Cuts

Definition (cut)

A cut in a justification graph is a subset C of its edges
such that all paths from i to g contain an edge in C.

Proposition (cuts are landmarks)

Let C be a cut in a justification graph for an arbitrary pcf.

Then the edge annotations for C form a landmark.

Example: Cuts in Justification Graphs

Example

landmark $A = \{a_4\}$ (cost $= 0$)

$a_1 = \langle i \to x, y \rangle_3$
$a_2 = \langle i \to x, z \rangle_4$
$a_3 = \langle i \to y, z \rangle_5$
$a_4 = \langle x, y, z \to g \rangle_0$

Example: Cuts in Justification Graphs

Example

landmark $B = \{a_1, a_2\}$ (cost $= 3$)

$a_1 = \langle i \to x, y \rangle_3$
$a_2 = \langle i \to x, z \rangle_4$
$a_3 = \langle i \to y, z \rangle_5$
$a_4 = \langle x, y, z \to g \rangle_0$

Example: Cuts in Justification Graphs

Example

landmark $C = \{a_1, a_3\}$ (cost $= 3$)

$a_1 = \langle i \to x, y \rangle_3$
$a_2 = \langle i \to x, z \rangle_4$
$a_3 = \langle i \to y, z \rangle_5$
$a_4 = \langle x, y, z \to g \rangle_0$

## Example: Cuts in Justification Graphs

Example

landmark $D = \{a_2, a_3\}$ (cost $= 4$)

$a_1 = \langle i \to x, y \rangle_3$
$a_2 = \langle i \to x, z \rangle_4$
$a_3 = \langle i \to y, z \rangle_5$
$a_4 = \langle x, y, z \to g \rangle_0$

Power of Cuts in Justification Graphs

- ▶ Which landmarks can be computed with the cut method?
- ▶ all interesting ones!

Proposition (perfect hitting set heuristics)

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the set of all "cut landmarks" of a given planning task. Then $h^{\text{MHS}}(I) = h^{+}(I)$ for $\mathcal{L}$.

⤳ hitting set heuristic for $\mathcal{L}$ is perfect.

proof idea:
- ▶ Show 1:1 correspondence of hitting sets H for $\mathcal{L}$ and plans, i.e., each hitting set for $\mathcal{L}$ corresponds to a plan, and vice versa.

40.2 The LM-Cut Heuristic

LM-Cut Heuristic: Motivation

- ▶ In general, there are exponentially many pcfs, hence computing all relevant landmarks is not tractable.
- ▶ The LM-cut heuristic is a method that chooses pcfs and computes cuts in a goal-oriented way.
- ▶ A cost partitioning is computed as a side effect and is usually not optimal.
- ▶ On the other hand, it can be computed efficiently and is optimal for planning tasks with uniform costs (i.e., $cost(a) = 1$ for all actions).
- ⤳ currently the best admissible planning heuristic

The LM-Cut Heuristic

$h^{\text{LM-cut}}$: Helmert & Domshlak (2009)

Initialize $h^{\text{LM-cut}}(I) := 0$. Then iterate:

1. Compute $h^{\max}$ values of the variables. Stop if $h^{\max}(g) = 0$.
2. Let P be a pcf that chooses preconditions with maximal $h^{\max}$ value.
3. Compute the justification graph for P.
4. Compute a cut which guarantees $cost(L) > 0$ for the corresponding landmark L.
5. Increase $h^{\text{LM-cut}}(I)$ by $cost(L)$.
6. Decrease $cost(a)$ by $cost(L)$ for all $a \in L$.

Example: Computation of LM-Cut

Example

round 1: $P(a_4) = c \rightsquigarrow L = \{a_2, a_3\}$ [4]

$a_1 = \langle i \rightarrow a, b \rangle_3$
$a_2 = \langle i \rightarrow a, c \rangle_4$
$a_3 = \langle i \rightarrow b, c \rangle_5$
$a_4 = \langle a, b, c \rightarrow g \rangle_0$

Example: Computation of LM-Cut

Example

round 1: $P(a_4) = c \rightsquigarrow L = \{a_2, a_3\}$ [4] $\rightsquigarrow h^{\text{LM-cut}}(I) := 4$

$a_1 = \langle i \rightarrow a, b \rangle_3$
$a_2 = \langle i \rightarrow a, c \rangle_0$
$a_3 = \langle i \rightarrow b, c \rangle_1$
$a_4 = \langle a, b, c \rightarrow g \rangle_0$

Example: Computation of LM-Cut

Example

round 2: $P(a_4) = b \rightsquigarrow L = \{a_1, a_3\}$ [1]

$a_1 = \langle i \rightarrow a, b \rangle_3$
$a_2 = \langle i \rightarrow a, c \rangle_0$
$a_3 = \langle i \rightarrow b, c \rangle_1$
$a_4 = \langle a, b, c \rightarrow g \rangle_0$

Example: Computation of LM-Cut

Example

round 2: $P(a_4) = b \rightsquigarrow L = \{a_1, a_3\}$ [1] $\rightsquigarrow h^{\text{LM-cut}}(I) := 4 + 1 = 5$

$a_1 = \langle i \rightarrow a, b \rangle_2$
$a_2 = \langle i \rightarrow a, c \rangle_0$
$a_3 = \langle i \rightarrow b, c \rangle_0$
$a_4 = \langle a, b, c \rightarrow g \rangle_0$

Example: Computation of LM-Cut

Example

round 3: $h^{\max}(g) = 0 \rightsquigarrow$ done! $\rightsquigarrow h^{\text{LM-cut}}(I) = 5$

$a_1 = \langle i \to a, b \rangle_2$
$a_2 = \langle i \to a, c \rangle_0$
$a_3 = \langle i \to b, c \rangle_0$
$a_4 = \langle a, b, c \to g \rangle_0$

40.3 Summary

Summary

- Cuts in justification graphs
  are a general method to find landmarks.
- Hitting sets over all cut landmarks yield a perfect heuristic
  for delete-free planning tasks.
- The LM-cut heuristic is an admissible heuristic
  based on these ideas.