# Generalized Potential Heuristics for Classical Planning

### Guillem Francès, Augusto B. Corrêa, Cedric Geissmann, Florian Pommerening

University of Basel, Switzerland

February 7, 2020

Originally presented at IJCAI'19

## In this Work

- Context: classical planning using heuristic search
- Some domains can be solved in linear time
- Hill-climbing + heuristic leading direct to the goal
- We want to learn these heuristics automatically

Learning the Heuristic 0000 Conclusion 00

## Generalized Potential Heuristics

### Definition (Generalized Potential Heuristic)

Linear combination of features well-defined over all tasks:

$$h(s) = \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} w(f) \cdot f(s)$$

Learning the Heuristic

Conclusion 00

# Description Logics for Planning



#### **Primitive Concepts & Roles**

- ontable =  $\{\blacksquare, \blacksquare\}$
- $on = \{(\blacksquare, \blacksquare)\}$
- holding  $= \emptyset$
- $clear = \{\blacksquare, \blacksquare\}$
- $clear_G = \{\blacksquare\}$

# Description Logic

Description Logic $\mathcal{SOI}$ with Role Value Maps				
Complex concepts	Complex roles			
● ⊥, ⊤	• R <sup>-1</sup>			
• ¬ <i>C</i>	• R <sup>+</sup>			
• $C_1 \sqcup C_2$ , $C_1 \sqcap C_2$	• $R_1 \circ R_2$			
<ul> <li>∀R.C, ∃R.C</li> </ul>				
• $R_1 = R_2$				
• { <i>a</i> <sub>1</sub> ,, <i>a</i> <sub>n</sub> }				

### **Complex Concepts & Roles**

• "Set of blocks above some block that needs to be cleared"  $\exists on^+.clear_G = \{\blacksquare\}$ 

earning the Heuristic

Conclusion 00

## Example: Clearing a Block

#### Generalized Potential Heuristic for Blocksworld

ightarrow Blocksworld tasks where the goal is to clear a set of blocks

$$h(s) = 2 \cdot |C_1| + |C_2|$$

•  $C_1 \equiv \exists on^+.clear_G$ :

"Set of blocks above some block that needs to be cleared"

•  $C_2 \equiv holding$ :

"Set of blocks being held"

## Existence

- We prove that generalized heuristics leading directly to a goal state exist for a number of standard domains:
  - Blocksworld
  - Gripper
  - Spanner
  - Logistics
  - ...
- Greedy search solves any task in time O(|Objects|)

## Existence

- We prove that generalized heuristics leading directly to a goal state exist for a number of standard domains:
  - Blocksworld
  - Gripper
  - Spanner
  - Logistics
  - ...
- Greedy search solves any task in time O(|Objects|)

# Can we obtain these heuristics automatically?

Learning the Heuristic  $0 \bullet 00$ 

## Learning the Heuristic

Overview of our inductive approach:

• Fully expand small tasks to generate training set S.

Overview of our inductive approach:

- Fully expand small tasks to generate training set S.
- Generate set of generalized features *F* with all features under a certain syntactic complexity.

Overview of our inductive approach:

- Fully expand small tasks to generate training set S.
- Generate set of generalized features *F* with all features under a certain syntactic complexity.
- Ompute simplest potential heuristic on *F* leading states from *S* directly to the goal.
  - If no such h exists, augment  $\mathcal{F}$ .
  - If it does exist, test *h* on unseen tasks.

Conclusion 00

## Computing the Weights

### Mixed Integer Linear Program

$$egin{aligned} & \min_w \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} [w_f 
eq 0] \mathcal{K}(f) \ & \bigvee_{s' \in \textit{succ}(s)} h(s') + 1 \leq h(s) \ & h(s') \geq h(s) \end{aligned}$$

subject to

for alive states s

for transitions (s, s')where s is alive and s' is unsolvable

## Results

- Learn: Generalized heuristics on standard domains
  - Gripper, Miconic, Spanner, VisitAll.
- Prove: Heuristics generalize all possible tasks.
  - Except VisitAll: No linear solution possible
- Solve: Steepest-ascent hill-climbing in linear time.
- In some domains, such heuristics exist but we cannot scale.

Conclusion •0

# Conclusion

# Contributions

- Generalized descending and dead-end avoiding heuristics exist for several planning domains.
- Heuristics learned can be intepreted.
- Solve any task in linear time.
- We can learn them automatically from a suitable logical model and small tasks.
  - Heuristic refinement procedure in the paper

# **Bonus Slides**

### Semantics – Examples

#### **Concepts:**

$$(\exists R.C)^{\mathcal{M}} = \{ a \mid \exists b : (a, b) \in R^{\mathcal{M}} \land b \in C^{\mathcal{M}} \},\ (R = R')^{\mathcal{M}} = \{ a \mid \forall b : (a, b) \in R^{\mathcal{M}} \leftrightarrow (a, b) \in {R'}^{\mathcal{M}} \}.$$

**Roles:** 

$$(R^{-1})^{\mathcal{M}} = \{(b, a) \mid (a, b) \in R^{\mathcal{M}}\},\ (R \circ R')^{\mathcal{M}} = \{(a, c) \mid \exists b : (a, b) \in R^{\mathcal{M}} \land (b, c) \in {R'}^{\mathcal{M}}\}$$

#### Example: unrestricted Blocksworld tasks

$$h_{\mathsf{bw}}(s) = -4|C_6| - |\mathit{holding}| - 2|\mathit{ontable}| - 2|C_7|,$$

- C<sub>1</sub>: ontable<sub>G</sub> □ ontable
   Blocks that are correctly placed on the table
- C<sub>2</sub>: (∃on<sub>G</sub>.⊤) ⊓ (on = on<sub>G</sub>)
   Blocks that are placed on their target block
- C<sub>3</sub>: ¬(ontable<sub>G</sub> ⊔ ∃on<sub>G</sub>.⊤) Blocks that are not mentioned in the goal
- $C_4$ :  $C_1 \sqcup C_2 \sqcup C_3$ Blocks where block (or table) below is consistent with the goal
- C<sub>5</sub>: ∀on<sup>-1</sup><sub>G</sub>.(on = on<sub>G</sub>)
   Blocks where the block above is consistent with the goal
- C<sub>6</sub>: C<sub>4</sub> □ ∀on<sup>+</sup>.(C<sub>4</sub> □ C<sub>5</sub>) Blocks that are well-placed.
- C<sub>7</sub>: holding □ ∃on<sub>G</sub>.(clear □ C<sub>6</sub>)
   Blocks held while their target block is clear and well-placed.

	G	М	S	V
# of training instances	8	12	11	9
# of iterations	2.0	2.7	1.0	1.7
$ \mathcal{F} $	469	2105	904	330
# of MIP variables	2017	7273	3381	1039
# of MIP constraints	2238	7331	3370	1190
Complexity of <i>h</i>	8 (18)	6 (14)	8 (20)	5 (8)
# of features in $h$	5	4	5	3
Total time	8h	32m	178s	87s
Total MIP time	7.4h	26m	6.8s	2.1s