Temporal Fast Downward

Using the Context-enhanced Additive Heuristic for Temporal and Numeric Planning

Patrick Eyerich Robert Mattmüller Gabriele Röger

Department of Computer Science University of Freiburg, Germany

September 21, 2009

Observations:

- Time and resources important in real-world problems.
- Heuristic search with context-enhanced additive (cea) heuristic successful in sequential planning.

Question: Does the approach also work with time and resources?

Planning with Time and Resources

Example (Planning Task)

- Two gardening robots need to water flowers.
- Water levels, capacities and water needs are given.
- Robots can work concurrently.



- Actions have durations and may affect numeric variables.
- **Conditions** at-start, over-all, or at-end.
- Effects at-start or at-end.

Example (Durative Actions)

Walking from one location to an adjacent one.



Planning with Time and Resources Durative Actions

Example (Durative Actions, ctd.)

Watering a flower at a certain location.

$$\begin{array}{c} w_i \geq n_k - h_k \\ (\text{in } f_k \ \ell_j) \\ (\text{at } r_i \ \ell_j) & (\text{at } r_i \ \ell_j) & (\text{at } r_i \ \ell_j) \end{array} \\ \hline \left(\text{ (water } r_i \ \ell_j \ f_k) \ \left[n_k - h_k \right] \right] \\ h_k := n_k \\ w_i - = (n_k - h_k) \end{array}$$

Planning with Time and Resources Temporal Plans

- Must respect causal and temporal constraints.
- May contain concurrent actions.

Example (Temporal Plan)

Robots robot₁ and robot₂ work concurrently.



Definition (Temporal Numeric SAS⁺ Planning Task)

A temporal numeric SAS⁺ planning task $\Pi = \langle \mathcal{V}, s_0, s_{\star}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{O} \rangle$ consists of the following components:

- A finite set V of state variables. Each variable is either:
 - A numeric variable with values in \mathbb{R} .
 - A comparison variable with values in $\{T, F\}$.
 - A logical variable with arbitrary finite domain.
- An initial state s_0 .
- A goal description s_{\star} .
- A finite set \mathcal{A} of axioms.
- A finite set \mathcal{O} of durative actions.

Temporal Numeric SAS⁺ Planning Tasks

Representation of Subterms via Auxiliary Variable and Axioms

- Axioms and auxiliary variables used to represent numeric and logic subterms.
- Allows sharing of subterms.
- Convenient for heuristic computation.

Temporal Numeric SAS⁺ Planning Tasks

Representation of Subterms via Auxiliary Variable and Axioms

Example (Auxiliary variables and axioms for subterms)



Temporal Fast Downward (TFD)

Extends FAST DOWNWARD.

Uses FAST DOWNWARD architecture.

- Step 1: Translate PDDL to temporal numeric SAS⁺.
- Step 2: Preprocess temporal numeric SAS⁺.
- Step 3: Search for plan. [Topic of the rest of the talk]
 - Best-first search.
 - Context-enhanced additive heuristic.
 - Deferred heuristic evaluation.
 - Preferred operators.











Idea:

- Solve goals and
- recursively take care of subgoals/preconditions

to estimate makespan.

Return accumulated costs.

- Local contexts: Used to keep track of (side-)effects.
- Drawback inadmissibility:
 - Repeated solution of subproblems.
 - Transformation to instant-actions.
 - No concurrency-awareness.
- Advantage preferred operators:
 - By-product of heuristic.
 - Used to guide search towards better operators.

Instant Actions

- Problem: Need to simplify durative actions for heuristic.
- Solution: Ignore start-end distinction for conditions and effects.
- General form: instant action = (conditions, effects, cost)

Instant Actions

Example (Compressed-action transitions)

Pretend that action happens instantly.



Corresponding compressed-action transitions:

•
$$cond = \{a, b\};$$
 $eff = \{c, d, \neg d\};$ $cost = 17$

Instant Actions



Assume that

action is currently under execution and

■ no other action can restore *a*, and we need the end-effect *goal*.

Then the other types of instant actions do not help in reaching goal, even though we can actually obtain goal by waiting long enough.

Corresponding waiting transitions:

•
$$cond = \emptyset; \quad eff = \{goal\}; \quad cost = \Delta t$$

Instant Actions

Example (Axiom transitions)

All axioms are interpreted as instant actions with cost 0.

Local Problems

A local problem answers the question: "What does it cost to change the value of v from w to w'?"

Causal graph



Comparison axiom



Current state: g = FGoal: g = T



 n_2

 $n_4 = \overline{0}$

 $g = \overline{F}$













 $n_4 = \overline{0}$

 $g = \overline{F}$





 $n_4 = 0$

 $g = \overline{F}$















 $n_4 = \overline{0}$

 $g = \overline{F}$

















 $n_4 = \overline{0}$

 $g = \overline{F}$





 n_2

 $n_4 = \overline{0}$

 $g = \overline{F}$



- Planners: Six temporal planning systems.
- Benchmarks: IPC 2008 deterministic temporal problems.
- Evaluation Scheme: Scheme used at IPC 2008

$$Score(Planner) = \sum_{\substack{\text{solved} \\ \text{problem } \pi \\ (\text{solution } p)}} \frac{\min_{\substack{p^* \text{ for } \pi \\ makespan(p)}} makespan(p^*)}{makespan(p)}$$

 Environment: 2.66 GHz Intel Xeon CPU, 2 GB memory limit, 30 minutes time limit per problem, anytime search.

Domain	Base	Crikey	LPG	Sapa	SGP	TFD
Crewplanning	16.19	22.59	12.76	_	22.44	28.72
Elevators	18.38	2.60	22.75	5.64	15.09	19.38
Modeltrain	11.92	—	—	—	11.11	0.96
Openstacks	18.14	20.67	14.35	25.90	12.49	26.66
Parcprinter	13.84	8.58	18.20	5.25	11.00	9.10
Pegsol	24.35	18.30	25.81	18.98	15.39	27.57
Sokoban	15.52	7.03	11.95	0.00	8.73	13.00
Transport	5.50	2.83	11.57	1.91	7.46	6.91
Woodworking	12.14	11.96	26.37	9.36	10.44	16.04
Overall	135.97	94.55	143.76	67.02	114.15	148.34

Experimental Results

Interpretation

■ TEMPORAL FAST DOWNWARD scores highest.

Reason for high score:

- Not so much number of solved problems
- ... but rather solution quality.

How Much Longer the Plans From Other Planners Are On Average

Domain	Base	Crikey	LPG	Sapa	SGP
Crewplanning	(18) 14%	(29) 38%	(13) 1%	_	(28) 39%
Elevators	(17) 58%	(10) 200%	(23) 11%	(12) 126%	(17) 84%
Modeltrain	(1) 5%	—	—	—	(1) 1%
Openstacks	(30) 55%	(30) 33%	(30) 166%	(30) 4%	(30) 144%
Parcprinter	(13) 37%	(13) 34%	(12) -30%	(5) 12%	(13) 32%
Pegsol	(28) 19%	(28) 60%	(28) 12%	(24) 28%	(18) 21%
Sokoban	(13) 29%	(9) 50%	(12) 50%		(9) 22%
Transport	(7) 18%	(6) 79%	(7) -25%	(3) 54%	(10) 37%
Woodworking	(27) 42%	(27) 44%	(28) -34%	(20) 37%	(21) 29%
Overall	(154) 36%	(152) 55%	(153) 31%	(94) 35%	(147) 60%

Summary and Conclusion

- Temporal and numeric planning via forward search in space of time-stamped states.
- Heuristic guidance by extension of context-enhanced additive heuristic.
- **Competitive** with other approaches to temporal planning.

Future Work

- Make heuristic concurrency-aware.
- Use weaker relaxation of numeric features in heuristic.