

# Principles of AI Planning

## 15. Planning with State-Dependent Action Costs

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg



UNI  
FREIBURG

Bernhard Nebel and Robert Mattmüller

January 22nd, 2020



# Background

## Background

- State-Dependent
- Action Costs
- Edge-Valued
- Multi-Valued
- Decision Diagrams

## Compilation


## Relaxations

## Abstractions

## Summary


## References

# What are State-Dependent Action Costs?



- Background
- State-Dependent Action Costs
- Edge-Valued
- Multi-Valued
- Decision Diagrams
- Compilation
- Relaxations
- Abstractions
- Summary
- References

# What are State-Dependent Action Costs?




- Background
  - State-Dependent Action Costs
  - Edge-Valued
  - Multi-Valued
  - Decision Diagrams
- Compilation
- Relaxations
- Abstractions
- Summary
- References

Action costs: **unit** — constant — state-dependent

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cost}(\text{fly}(\text{Madrid}, \text{London})) &= 1, & \text{cost}(\text{fly}(\text{Paris}, \text{London})) &= 1, \\ \text{cost}(\text{fly}(\text{Freiburg}, \text{London})) &= 1, & \text{cost}(\text{fly}(\text{Istanbul}, \text{London})) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

# What are State-Dependent Action Costs?




- Background
- State-Dependent Action Costs
- Edge-Valued
- Multi-Valued
- Decision Diagrams
- Compilation
- Relaxations
- Abstractions
- Summary
- References

Action costs: **unit** — **constant** — **state-dependent**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cost}(\text{fly}(\text{Madrid}, \text{London})) &= 14, & \text{cost}(\text{fly}(\text{Paris}, \text{London})) &= 5, \\ \text{cost}(\text{fly}(\text{Freiburg}, \text{London})) &= 10, & \text{cost}(\text{fly}(\text{Istanbul}, \text{London})) &= 32. \end{aligned}$$

# What are State-Dependent Action Costs?



- Background
  - State-Dependent Action Costs
  - Edge-Valued
  - Multi-Valued
  - Decision Diagrams
- Compilation
- Relaxations
- Abstractions
- Summary
- References

Action costs: **unit** — **constant** — **state-dependent**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cost}(\text{flyTo}(\text{London})) &= |x_{\text{London}} - x_{\text{current}}| + |y_{\text{London}} - y_{\text{current}}| \\ &= |x_{\text{current}}| + |y_{\text{current}}|. \end{aligned}$$

# Why Study State-Dependent Action Costs?



- In classical planning: actions have **unit costs**.
  - Each action  $a$  costs 1.
- Simple extension: actions have **constant costs**.
  - Each action  $a$  costs some  $cost_a \in \mathbb{N}$ .
  - Example: Flying between two cities costs amount proportional to distance.
  - Still easy to handle algorithmically, e. g. when computing  $g$  and  $h$  values.
- Further extension: actions have **state-dependent costs**.
  - Each action  $a$  has **cost function**  $cost_a : S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ .
  - Example: Flying to a destination city costs amount proportional to distance, depending on the current city.

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Why Study State-Dependent Action Costs?



- **Human perspective:**
  - “**natural**”, “**elegant**”, and “**higher-level**”
  - **modeler-friendly**  $\rightsquigarrow$  less error-prone?
- **Machine perspective:**
  - more **structured**  $\rightsquigarrow$  exploit structure in algorithms?
  - fewer redundancies, exponentially more **compact**
- **Language support:**
  - numeric **PDDL**, PDDL 3
  - **RDDL**, **MDPs** (state-dependent rewards!)
- **Applications:**
  - modeling **preferences** and **soft goals**
  - application domains such as **PSR**

(**Abbreviation:** SDAC = state-dependent action costs)

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References





## Good news:

- Computing *g values* in forward search still *easy*.  
(When expanding state  $s$  with action  $a$ , we know  $cost_a(s)$ .)

## Challenge:

- But what about *SDAC-aware h values* (relaxation heuristics, abstraction heuristics)?
- Or can we simply *compile SDAC away*?

## This chapter:

- Proposed *answers* to these challenges.

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued

Multi-Valued

Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



## Roadmap:

- 1 Look at **compilations**.
- 2 This leads to **edge-valued multi-valued decision diagrams** (EVMDDs) as data structure to represent cost functions.
- 3 Based on EVMDDs, formalize and discuss:
  - compilations
  - relaxation heuristics
  - abstraction heuristics

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



## Definition

A **SAS<sup>+</sup> planning task with state-dependent action costs** or **SDAC planning task** is a tuple  $\Pi = \langle V, I, O, \gamma, (cost_a)_{a \in O} \rangle$  where  $\langle V, I, O, \gamma \rangle$  is a (regular) SAS<sup>+</sup> planning task with state set  $S$  and  $cost_a : S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is the **cost function** of  $a$  for all  $a \in O$ .

**Assumption:** For each  $a \in O$ , the set of variables occurring in the precondition of  $a$  is disjoint from the set of variables on which the cost function  $cost_a$  depends.

(**Question:** Why is this assumption unproblematic?)

Definitions of plans etc. stay as before. A plan is **optimal** if it minimizes the sum of action costs from start to goal.

For the rest of this chapter, we consider the following running example.

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



### Example (Household domain)

#### Actions:

$\text{vacuumFloor} = \langle \top, \text{floorClean} \rangle$

$\text{washDishes} = \langle \top, \text{dishesClean} \rangle$

$\text{doHousework} = \langle \top, \text{floorClean} \wedge \text{dishesClean} \rangle$

#### Cost functions:

$\text{cost}_{\text{vacuumFloor}} = [\neg \text{floorClean}] \cdot 2$

$\text{cost}_{\text{washDishes}} = [\neg \text{dishesClean}] \cdot (1 + 2 \cdot [\neg \text{haveDishwasher}])$

$\text{cost}_{\text{doHousework}} = \text{cost}_{\text{vacuumFloor}} + \text{cost}_{\text{washDishes}}$

(Question: How much can applying action washDishes cost?)

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



Different ways of compiling SDAC away:

- **Compilation I:** “Parallel Action Decomposition”
- **Compilation II:** “Purely Sequential Action Decomposition”
- **Compilation III:** “EVMDD-Based Action Decomposition”  
(combination of Compilations I and II)

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation


Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References

### Example



$\text{washDishes}(dC, hD) = \langle dC \wedge hD, dC \rangle, \text{ cost} = 0$

$\text{washDishes}(dC, \neg hD) = \langle dC \wedge \neg hD, dC \rangle, \text{ cost} = 0$

$\text{washDishes}(\neg dC, hD) = \langle \neg dC \wedge hD, dC \rangle, \text{ cost} = 1$

$\text{washDishes}(\neg dC, \neg hD) = \langle \neg dC \wedge \neg hD, dC \rangle, \text{ cost} = 3$

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



### Compilation I

Transform each action into multiple actions:

- one for each partial state relevant to cost function
- add partial state to precondition
- use cost for partial state as constant cost

Properties:

- ✓ always possible
- ✗ exponential blow-up

Question: Exponential blow-up avoidable?  $\rightsquigarrow$  Compilation II

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References

# State-Dependent Action Costs


## Compilation II: "Purely Sequential Action Decomposition"



### Example

Assume we own a dishwasher:

$$cost_{doHousework} = 2 \cdot [\neg floorClean] + [\neg dishesClean]$$



$$doHousework_1(\text{fC}) = \langle \text{fC}, \text{fC} \rangle, \quad cost = 0$$

$$doHousework_1(\neg \text{fC}) = \langle \neg \text{fC}, \text{fC} \rangle, \quad cost = 2$$

$$doHousework_2(\text{dC}) = \langle \text{dC}, \text{dC} \rangle, \quad cost = 0$$

$$doHousework_2(\neg \text{dC}) = \langle \neg \text{dC}, \text{dC} \rangle, \quad cost = 1$$

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References





### Compilation II

If costs are **additively decomposable/separable**:

- high-level actions  $\approx$  **macro actions**
- decompose into **sequential micro actions**

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



### Properties:

- ✓ only **linear** blow-up
- ✗ **not always possible**
- plan lengths not preserved

E. g., in a state where  $\neg fC$  and  $\neg dC$  hold, an application of

`doHousework`

in the SDAC setting is replaced by an application of the action **sequence**

`doHousework1( $\neg fC$ ), doHousework2( $\neg dC$ )`

in the compiled setting.

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



### Properties (ctd.):

- plan costs preserved
- blow-up in search space

E. g., in a state where  $\neg fC$  and  $\neg dC$  hold, should we apply  $\text{doHousework}_1(\neg fC)$  or  $\text{doHousework}_2(\neg dC)$  first?

$\rightsquigarrow$  impose action ordering!

- attention: we should apply all partial effects at end!  
Otherwise, an effect of an earlier action in the compilation might affect the cost of a later action in the compilation.

**Question:** Can this **always work** (kind of)?  $\rightsquigarrow$  Compilation III

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary


References

### Example

$$\text{cost}_{\text{doHousework}} = [\neg \text{floorClean}] \cdot 2 +$$

---

$$[\neg \text{dishesClean}] \cdot (1 + 2 \cdot [\neg \text{haveDishwasher}])$$



Simplify right-hand part of diagram:

- Branch over single variable at a time.
- Exploit: haveDishwasher irrelevant if dishesClean is true.

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary


References

# State-Dependent Action Costs

## Compilation III: "EVMDD-Based Action Decomposition"



### Example (ctd.)



### Later:

- Compiled actions
- Auxiliary variables to enforce action ordering

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



### Compilation III

- exploit as much **additive separability** as possible
- **multiply out variable domains** where inevitable
- Technicalities:
  - fix **variable ordering**
  - perform **Shannon** and **isomorphism reduction** (cf. theory of BDDs)

### Properties:

- ✓ **always possible**
- **worst-case exponential** blow-up, but **as good as it gets**
- as with Compilation II: plan lengths not preserved, plan costs preserved
- as with Compilation II: action ordering, all effects at end!

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



Compilation III provides **optimal** combination of sequential and parallel action decomposition, given fixed variable ordering.

**Question:** How to find such decompositions **automatically**?

**Answer:** Figure for Compilation III basically a **reduced ordered edge-valued multi-valued decision diagram (EVMDD)**!

[Lai et al., 1996; Ciardo and Siminiceanu, 2002]

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



### EVMDDs:

- Decision diagrams for arithmetic functions
- Decision nodes with associated decision variables
- Edge weights: partial costs contributed by facts
- Size of EVMDD **compact** in many “typical”, well-behaved cases (**Question**: For example?)

### Properties:

- ✓ **satisfy all requirements** for Compilation III, even (almost) uniquely determined by them
- ✓ already have **well-established theory and tool support**
- ✓ **detect and exhibit additive structure** in arithmetic functions

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References





### Consequence:

- represent cost functions as **EVMDDs**
- **exploit** additive structure exhibited by them
- draw on theory and tool support for EVMDDs

### Two perspectives on EVMDDs:

- graphs specifying how to **decompose** action costs
- data structures **encoding** action costs  
(used **independently from compilations**)

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions


Summary

References

### Example (EVMDD Evaluation)

$$cost_a = xy^2 + z + 2$$

$$\mathcal{D}_x = \mathcal{D}_z = \{0, 1\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_y = \{0, 1, 2\}$$



- Directed acyclic graph
- Dangling incoming edge
- Single terminal node **0**
- Decision nodes with:
  - decision variables
  - edge label
  - edge weights
- We see:  $z$  independent from rest,  $y$  only matters if  $x \neq 0$ .

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions


Summary

References

### Example (EVMDD Evaluation)

$$cost_a = xy^2 + z + 2$$

$$\mathcal{D}_x = \mathcal{D}_z = \{0, 1\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_y = \{0, 1, 2\}$$



■  $s = \{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 2, z \mapsto 0\}$

■  $cost_a(s) =$

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions


Summary

References

### Example (EVMDD Evaluation)

$$cost_a = xy^2 + z + 2$$

$$\mathcal{D}_x = \mathcal{D}_z = \{0, 1\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_y = \{0, 1, 2\}$$



- $s = \{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 2, z \mapsto 0\}$

- $cost_a(s) = 2 +$

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions


Summary

References

### Example (EVMDD Evaluation)

$$cost_a = xy^2 + z + 2$$

$$\mathcal{D}_x = \mathcal{D}_z = \{0, 1\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_y = \{0, 1, 2\}$$



■  $s = \{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 2, z \mapsto 0\}$

■  $cost_a(s) = 2 + 0 +$

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions


Summary

References

### Example (EVMDD Evaluation)

$$cost_a = xy^2 + z + 2$$

$$\mathcal{D}_x = \mathcal{D}_z = \{0, 1\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_y = \{0, 1, 2\}$$



- $s = \{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 2, z \mapsto 0\}$

- $cost_a(s) = 2 + 0 + 4 +$

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions


Summary

References

### Example (EVMDD Evaluation)

$$cost_a = xy^2 + z + 2$$

$$\mathcal{D}_x = \mathcal{D}_z = \{0, 1\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_y = \{0, 1, 2\}$$



- $s = \{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 2, z \mapsto 0\}$

- $cost_a(s) = 2 + 0 + 4 + 0 = 6$

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



### Properties of EVMDDs:

- ✓ Existence for finitely many finite-domain variables
- ✓ Uniqueness/canonicity if reduced and ordered
- ✓ Basic arithmetic operations supported

(Lai et al., 1996; Ciardo and Siminiceanu, 2002)

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References





Given arithmetic operator  $\otimes \in \{+, -, \cdot, \dots\}$ , EVMDDs  $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ .  
Compute EVMDD  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{E}_2$ .

**Implementation:** procedure `apply( $\otimes, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$ )`:

- **Base case:** single-node EVMDDs encoding constants
- **Inductive case:** apply  $\otimes$  recursively:
  - push down edge weights
  - recursively apply  $\otimes$  to corresponding children
  - pull up excess edge weights from children

**Time complexity [Lai et al., 1996]:**

- **additive operations:** product of input EVMDD sizes
- **in general:** exponential

Background

State-Dependent  
Action Costs

Edge-Valued  
Multi-Valued  
Decision Diagrams

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



# Compilation

Background

**Compilation**

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References

**Idea:** each edge in the EVMDD becomes a new micro action with constant cost corresponding to the edge constraint, precondition that we are currently at its start EVMDD node, and effect that we are currently at its target EVMDD node.

## Example (EVMDD-based action compilation)

Let  $a = \langle \chi, e \rangle$ ,  $cost_a = xy^2 + z + 2$ .

Auxiliary variables:

- One **semaphore variable**  $\sigma$  with  $\mathcal{D}_\sigma = \{0, 1\}$  for entire planning task.
- One **auxiliary variable**  $\alpha = \alpha_a$  with  $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha_a} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$  for action  $a$ .

Replace  $a$  by new auxiliary actions (similarly for other actions).

Background

Compilation


Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References

## Example (EVMDD-based action compilation, ctd.)



$$\begin{aligned}
 a^x &= \langle \chi \wedge \sigma = 0 \wedge \alpha = 0, & \sigma := 1 \wedge \alpha := 1 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 2 \\
 a^{1,x=0} &= \langle \alpha = 1 \wedge x = 0, \alpha := 3 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 0 \\
 a^{1,x=1} &= \langle \alpha = 1 \wedge x = 1, \alpha := 2 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 0 \\
 a^{2,y=0} &= \langle \alpha = 2 \wedge y = 0, \alpha := 3 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 0 \\
 a^{2,y=1} &= \langle \alpha = 2 \wedge y = 1, \alpha := 3 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 1 \\
 a^{2,y=2} &= \langle \alpha = 2 \wedge y = 2, \alpha := 3 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 4 \\
 a^{3,z=0} &= \langle \alpha = 3 \wedge z = 0, \alpha := 4 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 0 \\
 a^{3,z=1} &= \langle \alpha = 3 \wedge z = 1, \alpha := 4 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 1 \\
 a^e &= \langle \alpha = 4, e \wedge \sigma := 0 \wedge \alpha := 0 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

## Definition (EVMDD-based action compilation)

Let  $\Pi = \langle V, I, O, \gamma, (cost_a)_{a \in O} \rangle$  be an SDAC planning task, and for each action  $a \in O$ , let  $\mathcal{E}_a$  be an EVMDD that encodes the cost function  $cost_a$ .

Let  $EAC(a)$  be the set of actions created from  $a$  using  $\mathcal{E}_a$  similar to the previous example. Then the **EVMDD-based action compilation** of  $\Pi$  using  $\mathcal{E}_a$ ,  $a \in O$ , is the task

$\Pi' = EAC(\Pi) = \langle V', I', O', \gamma' \rangle$ , where

- $V' = V \cup \{\sigma\} \cup \{\alpha_a \mid a \in O\}$ ,
- $I' = I \cup \{\sigma \mapsto 0\} \cup \{\alpha_a \mapsto 0 \mid a \in O\}$ ,
- $O' = \bigcup_{a \in O} EAC(a)$ , and
- $\gamma' = \gamma \wedge (\sigma = 0) \wedge \bigwedge_{a \in O} (\alpha_a = 0)$ .

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References

# EVMDD-Based Action Compilation



Let  $\Pi$  be an SDAC task and  $\Pi' = EAC(\Pi)$  its EVMDD-based action compilation (for appropriate EVMDDs  $\mathcal{E}_a$ ).

## Proposition

$\Pi'$  has only state-**independent** costs.

## Proof.

By construction.

## Proposition

The size  $\|\Pi'\|$  is in the order  $O(\|\Pi\| \cdot \max_{a \in O} \|\mathcal{E}_a\|)$ , i. e. **polynomial** in the size of  $\Pi$  and the largest used EVMDD.

## Proof.

By construction.

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References

Let  $\Pi$  be an SDAC task and  $\Pi' = EAC(\Pi)$  its EVMDD-based action compilation (for appropriate EVMDDs  $\mathcal{E}_a$ ).

## Proposition

$\Pi$  and  $\Pi'$  admit the same plans (up to replacement of actions by action **sequences**). Optimal plan costs are preserved.

## Proof.

Let  $\pi = a_1, \dots, a_n$  be a plan for  $\Pi$ , and let  $s_0, \dots, s_n$  be the corresponding state sequence such that  $a_i$  is applicable in  $s_{i-1}$  and leads to  $s_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

For each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , let  $\mathcal{E}_{a_i}$  be the EVMDD used to compile  $a_i$ . State  $s_{i-1}$  determines a unique path through the EVMDD  $\mathcal{E}_{a_i}$ , which uniquely corresponds to an action sequence  $a_i^0, \dots, a_i^{k_i}$  (for some  $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$ ; including  $a_i^x$  and  $a_i^e$ ).

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References

## Proof (ctd.)

By construction,  $cost(a_i^0) + \dots + cost(a_i^{k_i}) = cost_{a_i}(s_{i-1})$ .

Moreover, the sequence  $a_i^0, \dots, a_i^{k_i}$  is applicable in  $s_{i-1} \cup \{\sigma \mapsto 0\} \cup \{\alpha_a \mapsto 0 \mid a \in O\}$  and leads to  $s_i \cup \{\sigma \mapsto 0\} \cup \{\alpha_a \mapsto 0 \mid a \in O\}$ .

Therefore, by induction,  $\pi' = a_1^0, \dots, a_1^{k_1}, \dots, a_n^0, \dots, a_n^{k_n}$  is applicable in  $s_0 \cup \{\sigma \mapsto 0\} \cup \{\alpha_a \mapsto 0 \mid a \in O\}$  (and leads to a goal state). Moreover,

$$cost(\pi') = cost(a_1^0) + \dots + cost(a_1^{k_1}) + \dots + cost(a_n^0) + \dots + cost(a_n^{k_n}) = cost_{a_1}(s_0) + \dots + cost_{a_n}(s_{n-1}) = cost(\pi).$$

Still to show:  $\Pi'$  admits no other plans. It suffices to see that the semaphore  $\sigma$  prohibits interleaving more than one EVMDD evaluation, and that each  $\alpha_a$  makes sure that the EVMDD for  $a$  is traversed in the unique correct order. □

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



## Example

Let  $\Pi = \langle V, I, O, \gamma \rangle$  with  $V = \{x, y, z, u\}$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_x = \mathcal{D}_z = \{0, 1\}$ ,  
 $\mathcal{D}_y = \mathcal{D}_u = \{0, 1, 2\}$ ,  $I = \{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 2, z \mapsto 0, u \mapsto 0\}$ ,  
 $O = \{a, b\}$ , and  $\gamma = (u = 2)$  with

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \langle u = 0, u := 1 \rangle, & \text{cost}_a &= xy^2 + z + 2, \\ b &= \langle u = 1, u := 2 \rangle, & \text{cost}_b &= z + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Optimal plan for  $\Pi$ :

$$\pi = a, b \text{ with } \text{cost}(\pi) = 6 + 1 = 7.$$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations


Abstractions

Summary

References

## Example (Ctd.)

### Compilation of $a$ :



$$\begin{aligned}
 a^x &= \langle u = 0 \wedge \sigma = 0 \wedge \alpha_a = 0, & \sigma := 1 \wedge \alpha_a := 1 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 2 \\
 a^{1,x=0} &= \langle \alpha_a = 1 \wedge x = 0, \alpha_a := 3 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 0 \\
 a^{1,x=1} &= \langle \alpha_a = 1 \wedge x = 1, \alpha_a := 2 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 0 \\
 a^{2,y=0} &= \langle \alpha_a = 2 \wedge y = 0, \alpha_a := 3 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 0 \\
 a^{2,y=1} &= \langle \alpha_a = 2 \wedge y = 1, \alpha_a := 3 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 1 \\
 a^{2,y=2} &= \langle \alpha_a = 2 \wedge y = 2, \alpha_a := 3 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 4 \\
 a^{3,z=0} &= \langle \alpha_a = 3 \wedge z = 0, \alpha_a := 4 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 0 \\
 a^{3,z=1} &= \langle \alpha_a = 3 \wedge z = 1, \alpha_a := 4 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 1 \\
 a^e &= \langle \alpha_a = 4, u := 1 \wedge \sigma := 0 \wedge \alpha_a := 0 \rangle, & \text{cost} = 0
 \end{aligned}$$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations


Abstractions

Summary

References

## Example (Ctd.)

### Compilation of $b$ :



$$b^x = \langle u = 1 \wedge \sigma = 0 \wedge \alpha_b = 0, \quad \sigma := 1 \wedge \alpha_b := 1 \rangle, \quad \text{cost} = 1$$

$$b^{1,z=0} = \langle \alpha_b = 1 \wedge z = 0, \alpha_b := 2 \rangle, \quad \text{cost} = 0$$

$$b^{1,z=1} = \langle \alpha_b = 1 \wedge z = 1, \alpha_b := 2 \rangle, \quad \text{cost} = 1$$

$$b^e = \langle \alpha_b = 2, u := 2 \wedge \sigma := 0 \wedge \alpha_b := 0 \rangle, \quad \text{cost} = 0$$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations


Abstractions

Summary

References

## Example (Ctd.)

### Compilation of $b$ :



$\alpha_b = 0$

$\alpha_b = 1$

$\alpha_b = 2$

$$b^x = \langle u = 1 \wedge \sigma = 0 \wedge \alpha_b = 0, \quad \sigma := 1 \wedge \alpha_b := 1 \rangle, \quad \text{cost} = 1$$

$$b^{1,z=0} = \langle \alpha_b = 1 \wedge z = 0, \alpha_b := 2 \rangle, \quad \text{cost} = 0$$

$$b^{1,z=1} = \langle \alpha_b = 1 \wedge z = 1, \alpha_b := 2 \rangle, \quad \text{cost} = 1$$

$$b^e = \langle \alpha_b = 2, u := 2 \wedge \sigma := 0 \wedge \alpha_b := 0 \rangle, \quad \text{cost} = 0$$

Optimal plan for  $\Pi'$  (with  $\text{cost}(\pi') = 6 + 1 = 7 = \text{cost}(\pi)$ ):

$$\pi' = \underbrace{a^x, a^{1,x=1}, a^{2,y=2}, a^{3,z=0}, a^e}_{\text{cost}=2+0+4+0+0=6}, \underbrace{b^x, b^{1,z=0}, b^e}_{\text{cost}=1+0+0=1}$$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



- Okay. We can compile SDAC away somewhat efficiently. Is this the end of the story?
- No! Why not?
  - **Tighter integration** of SDAC into planning process might be **beneficial**.
  - Analysis of heuristics for SDAC might **improve our understanding**.
- **Consequence**: Let's study heuristics for SDAC in **uncompiled** setting.

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



# Relaxations

Background

Compilation

**Relaxations**

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References



**We know:** Delete-relaxation heuristics informative in classical planning.

**Question:** Are they also informative in SDAC planning?

Background

Compilation

**Relaxations**

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References



- Assume we want to compute the **additive heuristic**  $h^{add}$  in a task with state-dependent action costs.
- But what does an action  $a$  cost in a relaxed state  $s^+$ ?
- And how to compute that cost?

[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

[Delete Relaxations  
in SAS<sup>+</sup>](#)

[Costs in Relaxed  
States](#)

[Additive Heuristic](#)

[Relaxed Planning  
Graph](#)

[Abstractions](#)

[Summary](#)

[References](#)





Delete relaxation in SAS<sup>+</sup> tasks works as follows:

- Operators are already in effect normal form.
- We do not need to impose a positive normal form, because all conditions are conjunctions of facts, and facts are just variable-value pairs and hence always positive.
- Hence  $a^+ = a$  for any operator  $a$ , and  $\Pi^+ = \Pi$ .
- For simplicity, we identify relaxed states  $s^+$  with their on-sets  $on(s^+)$ .
- Then, a relaxed state  $s^+$  is a set of facts  $(v, d)$  with  $v \in V$  and  $d \in \mathcal{D}_v$  including at least one fact  $(v, d)$  for each  $v \in V$  (but possibly more than one, which is what makes it a **relaxed** state).

[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

[Delete Relaxations  
in SAS<sup>+</sup>](#)

[Costs in Relaxed  
States](#)

[Additive Heuristic](#)

[Relaxed Planning  
Graph](#)

[Abstractions](#)

[Summary](#)

[References](#)



- A relaxed operator  $a$  is applicable in a relaxed state  $s^+$  if all precondition facts of  $a$  are contained in  $s^+$ .
- Relaxed states **accumulate** facts reached so far.
- Applying a relaxed operator  $a$  to a relaxed state  $s^+$  adds to  $s^+$  those facts made true by  $a$ .

## Example

Relaxed operator  $a^+ = \langle x = 2, y := 1 \wedge z := 0 \rangle$  is applicable in relaxed state  $s^+ = \{(x, 0), (x, 2), (y, 0), (z, 1)\}$ , because precondition  $(x, 2) \in s^+$ , and leads to successor  $(s^+)' = s^+ \cup \{(y, 1), (z, 0)\}$ .

Relaxed plans, dominance, monotonicity etc. as before. The above definition generalizes the one for propositional tasks.

[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

[Delete Relaxations in SAS<sup>+</sup>](#)

[Costs in Relaxed States](#)

[Additive Heuristic](#)

[Relaxed Planning Graph](#)

[Abstractions](#)

[Summary](#)


[References](#)

## Example

Assume  $s^+$  is the relaxed state with

$$s^+ = \{(x, 0), (x, 1), (y, 1), (y, 2), (z, 0)\}.$$

What should action  $a$  with  $cost_a = xy^2 + z + 2$  cost in  $s^+$ ?



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic  
Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions


Summary

References

**Idea:** We should assume the **cheapest** way of applying  $o^+$  in  $s^+$  to guarantee admissibility of  $h^+$ .

(Allow at least the behavior of the unrelaxed setting at no higher cost.)

## Example



[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

[Abstractions](#)

[Summary](#)

[References](#)


# Action Costs in Relaxed States



**Idea:** We should assume the **cheapest** way of applying  $o^+$  in  $s^+$  to guarantee admissibility of  $h^+$ .

(Allow at least the behavior of the unrelaxed setting at no higher cost.)

## Example



[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

**Costs in Relaxed  
States**

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

[Abstractions](#)

[Summary](#)

[References](#)



## Definition

Let  $V$  be a set of FDR variables,  $s : V \rightarrow \bigcup_{v \in V} \mathcal{D}_v$  an unrelaxed state over  $V$ , and  $s^+ \subseteq \{(v, d) \mid v \in V, d \in \mathcal{D}_v\}$  a relaxed state over  $V$ . We call  $s$  **consistent** with  $s^+$  if  $\{(v, s(v)) \mid v \in V\} \subseteq s^+$ .

## Definition

Let  $a \in O$  be an action with cost function  $cost_a$ , and  $s^+$  a relaxed state. Then the **relaxed cost** of  $a$  in  $s^+$  is defined as

$$cost_a(s^+) = \min_{s \in S \text{ consistent with } s^+} cost_a(s).$$

(**Question:** How many states  $s$  are consistent with  $s^+$ ?)

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References



**Problem with this definition:** There are generally **exponentially** many states  $s$  consistent with  $s^+$  to minimize over.

**Central question:** Can we still do this minimization efficiently?

**Answer:** Yes, at least efficiently in the size of an EVMDD encoding  $cost_a$ .

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph


Abstractions

Summary

References

## Example

Relaxed state  $s^+ = \{(x, 0), (x, 1), (y, 1), (y, 2), (z, 0)\}$ .



- Computing  $cost_a(s^+) =$  minimizing over  $cost_a(s)$  for all  $s$  consistent with  $s^+ =$  minimizing over all start-end-paths in EVMDD following only edges consistent with  $s^+$ .
- **Observation:** Minimization over exponentially many paths can be replaced by **top-sort traversal of EVMDD**, minimizing over incoming arcs consistent with  $s^+$  at all nodes!

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions


Summary

References



## Example

Relaxed state  $s^+ = \{(x, 0), (x, 1), (y, 1), (y, 2), (z, 0)\}$ .



- Computing  $cost_a(s^+) =$  minimizing over  $cost_a(s)$  for all  $s$  consistent with  $s^+ =$  minimizing over all start-end-**paths** in EVMDD following only edges consistent with  $s^+$ .
- **Observation:** Minimization over exponentially many paths can be replaced by **top-sort traversal of EVMDD**, minimizing over incoming arcs consistent with  $s^+$  at all nodes!

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph


Abstractions

Summary

References

## Example

Relaxed state  $s^+ = \{(x, 0), (x, 1), (y, 1), (y, 2), (z, 0)\}$ .



- Computing  $cost_a(s^+) =$  minimizing over  $cost_a(s)$  for all  $s$  consistent with  $s^+ =$  minimizing over all start-end-paths in EVMDD following only edges consistent with  $s^+$ .
- **Observation:** Minimization over exponentially many paths can be replaced by **top-sort traversal of EVMDD**, minimizing over incoming arcs consistent with  $s^+$  at all nodes!

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS<sup>+</sup>

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph


Abstractions

Summary

References

## Example

Relaxed state  $s^+ = \{(x, 0), (x, 1), (y, 1), (y, 2), (z, 0)\}$ .



- Computing  $cost_a(s^+) =$  minimizing over  $cost_a(s)$  for all  $s$  consistent with  $s^+ =$  minimizing over all start-end-paths in EVMDD following only edges consistent with  $s^+$ .
- **Observation:** Minimization over exponentially many paths can be replaced by **top-sort traversal of EVMDD**, minimizing over incoming arcs consistent with  $s^+$  at all nodes!

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations in SAS<sup>+</sup>

Costs in Relaxed States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning Graph


Abstractions

Summary

References

## Example

Relaxed state  $s^+ = \{(x, 0), (x, 1), (y, 1), (y, 2), (z, 0)\}$ .



- Computing  $cost_a(s^+) =$  minimizing over  $cost_a(s)$  for all  $s$  consistent with  $s^+ =$  minimizing over all start-end-**paths** in EVMDD following only edges consistent with  $s^+$ .
- **Observation:** Minimization over exponentially many paths can be replaced by **top-sort traversal of EVMDD**, minimizing over incoming arcs consistent with  $s^+$  at all nodes!

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph


Abstractions

Summary

References

## Example

Relaxed state  $s^+ = \{(x, 0), (x, 1), (y, 1), (y, 2), (z, 0)\}$ .



- $cost_a(s^+) = 2$
- Cost-minimizing  $s$  consistent with  $s^+$ :  $s(x) = s(z) = 0, s(y) \in \{1, 2\}$ .

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References



## Theorem

*A top-sort traversal of the EVMDD for  $cost_a$ , adding edge weights and minimizing over incoming arcs consistent with  $s^+$  at all nodes, computes  $cost_a(s^+)$  and takes time in the order of the size of the EVMDD.*

## Proof.

Homework?

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

The following definition is equivalent to the RPG-based one.

## Definition (Classical additive heuristic $h^{add}$ )

$$h^{add}(s) = h_s^{add}(GoalFacts)$$

$$h_s^{add}(Facts) = \sum_{fact \in Facts} h_s^{add}(fact)$$

$$h_s^{add}(fact) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } fact \in s \\ \min_{\text{achiever } a \text{ of } fact} [h_s^{add}(pre(a)) + cost_a] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

**Question:** How to generalize  $h^{add}$  to SDAC?

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

**Additive Heuristic**

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

## Example

$$a = \langle \top, x=1 \rangle$$

$$\text{cost}_a = 2 - 2y$$

$$b = \langle \top, y=1 \rangle$$

$$\text{cost}_b = 1$$

$$s = \{x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 0\}$$

$$h_s^{add}(y=1) = 1$$

$$h_s^{add}(x=1) = ?$$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

**Additive Heuristic**

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References



## Example

$$a = \langle T, x = 1 \rangle$$

$$\text{cost}_a = 2 - 2y$$


$$b = \langle T, y = 1 \rangle$$

$$\text{cost}_b = 1$$

$$s = \{x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 0\}$$

$$h_s^{add}(y = 1) = 1$$

$$h_s^{add}(x = 1) = ?$$



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

**Additive Heuristic**

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

## Example

$$a = \langle T, x = 1 \rangle$$

$$cost_a = 2 - 2y$$


$$b = \langle T, y = 1 \rangle$$

$$cost_b = 1$$

$$s = \{x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 0\}$$

$$h_s^{add}(y = 1) = 1$$

$$h_s^{add}(x = 1) = ?$$



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References



(Here, we need the assumption that no variable occurs both in the cost function and the precondition of the same action):

## Definition (Additive heuristic $h_s^{add}$ for SDAC)

$$h_s^{add}(fact) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } fact \in s \\ \min_{\text{achiever } a \text{ of } fact} [h_s^{add}(pre(a)) + cost_a] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

**Additive Heuristic**  
Relaxed Planning  
Graph

[Abstractions](#)

[Summary](#)

[References](#)

(Here, we need the assumption that no variable occurs both in the cost function and the precondition of the same action):

## Definition (Additive heuristic $h^{add}$ for SDAC)

$$h_s^{add}(fact) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } fact \in s \\ \min_{\text{achiever } a \text{ of } fact} [h_s^{add}(pre(a)) + Cost_a^s] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$Cost_a^s = \min_{\hat{s} \in S_a} [cost_a(\hat{s}) + h_s^{add}(\hat{s})]$$

$S_a$ : set of partial states over variables in cost function

$|S_a|$  **exponential** in number of variables in cost function

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References



## Theorem

*Let  $\Pi$  be an SDAC planning task, let  $\Pi'$  be an EVMDD-based action compilation of  $\Pi$ , and let  $s$  be a state of  $\Pi$ . Then the classical  $h^{add}$  heuristic in  $\Pi'$  gives the same value for  $s \cup \{\sigma \mapsto 0\} \cup \{\alpha_a \mapsto 0 \mid a \in O\}$  as the generalization of  $h^{add}$  to SDAC tasks defined above gives for  $s$  in  $\Pi$ . □*

## Computing $h^{add}$ for SDAC:

- **Option 1:** Compute classical  $h^{add}$  on compiled task.
- **Option 2:** Compute  $Cost_a^s$  directly. How?
  - Plug EVMDDs as subgraphs into RPG
  - $\rightsquigarrow$  efficient computation of  $h^{add}$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References



**Remark:** We can use EVMDDs to compute  $C_s^a$  and hence the generalized additive heuristic directly, by embedding them into the relaxed planning task.

We just briefly show the example, without going into too much detail.

**Idea:** Augment EVMDD with input nodes representing  $h^{add}$  values from the previous RPG layer.

- Use augmented diagrams as RPG subgraphs.
- Allows efficient computation of  $h^{add}$ .

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: RPG Compilation



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States


Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References



■  $cost_a = xy^2 + z + 2$

0, Output

# Option 2: RPG Compilation



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States


Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References




■ variable nodes become  
 $V$ -nodes

■ weights become  
 $\Delta$ -nodes

0, Output



# Option 2: RPG Compilation



■ Augment with input nodes

[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

[Delete Relaxations in SAS\\*](#)

[Costs in Relaxed States](#)

[Additive Heuristic](#)


[Relaxed Planning Graph](#)

[Abstractions](#)

[Summary](#)

[References](#)

# Option 2: RPG Compilation



■ Ensure complete evaluation

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed States

Additive Heuristic


Relaxed Planning Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic


Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



Evaluate nodes:

- $\wedge$ :  $\sum(\text{parents}) + \text{weight}$
- $\vee$ :  $\min(\text{parents})$

[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

[Delete Relaxations in SAS\\*](#)

[Costs in Relaxed States](#)

[Additive Heuristic](#)


[Relaxed Planning Graph](#)

[Abstractions](#)

[Summary](#)

[References](#)

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



Evaluate nodes:

- $\wedge$ :  $\sum(\text{parents}) + \text{weight}$
- $\vee$ :  $\min(\text{parents})$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic


Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



Evaluate nodes:

- $\wedge$ :  $\sum(\text{parents}) + \text{weight}$
- $\vee$ :  $\min(\text{parents})$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic


Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



Evaluate nodes:

- $\Delta$ :  $\sum(\text{parents}) + \text{weight}$
- $\nabla$ :  $\min(\text{parents})$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed States

Additive Heuristic


Relaxed Planning Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



Evaluate nodes:

- $\wedge$ :  $\sum(\text{parents}) + \text{weight}$
- $v$ :  $\min(\text{parents})$

[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

[Delete Relaxations in SAS\\*](#)

[Costs in Relaxed States](#)

[Additive Heuristic](#)

[Relaxed Planning Graph](#)


[Abstractions](#)

[Summary](#)

[References](#)



# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



Evaluate nodes:

- $\Lambda$ :  $\sum(\text{parents}) + \text{weight}$
- $\nabla$ :  $\min(\text{parents})$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic


Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



Evaluate nodes:

- $\wedge$ :  $\sum(\text{parents}) + \text{weight}$
- $\vee$ :  $\min(\text{parents})$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic


Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



Evaluate nodes:

- $\wedge$ :  $\sum(\text{parents}) + \text{weight}$
- $\vee$ :  $\min(\text{parents})$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic


Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



Evaluate nodes:

- $\wedge$ :  $\sum(\text{parents}) + \text{weight}$
- $\vee$ :  $\min(\text{parents})$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed States

Additive Heuristic


Relaxed Planning Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



$$Cost_a^S = \min_{\hat{s} \in S_a} [cost_a(\hat{s}) + h_s^{add}(\hat{s})]$$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed States

Additive Heuristic


Relaxed Planning Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



- $Cost_a^S = \min_{\hat{s} \in S_a} [cost_a(\hat{s}) + h_s^{add}(\hat{s})]$
- $cost_a = xy^2 + z + 2$
- $\hat{s} = \{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 2, z \mapsto 0\}$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed States

Additive Heuristic


Relaxed Planning Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



- $Cost_a^S = \min_{\hat{s} \in S_a} [cost_a(\hat{s}) + h_s^{add}(\hat{s})]$
- $cost_a = xy^2 + z + 2$
- $\hat{s} = \{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 2, z \mapsto 0\}$
- $cost_a(\hat{s}) = 1 \cdot 2^2 + 0 + 2 = 6$   
 $= 2 + 0 + 4 + 0$
- $h_s^{add}(\hat{s}) = 0 + 1 + 2 = 3$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed States

Additive Heuristic


Relaxed Planning Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References

# Option 2: Computing $Cost_a^S$



- $Cost_a^S = \min_{\hat{s} \in S_a} [cost_a(\hat{s}) + h_s^{add}(\hat{s})]$
- $cost_a = xy^2 + z + 2$
- $\hat{s} = \{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 2, z \mapsto 0\}$
- $cost_a(\hat{s}) = 1 \cdot 2^2 + 0 + 2 = 6$   
 $= 2 + 0 + 4 + 0$
- $h_s^{add}(\hat{s}) = 0 + 1 + 2 = 3$
- $Cost_a^S = 6 + 3 = 9$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References





- Use above construction as subgraph of RPG in each layer, for each action (as operator subgraphs).
- Add AND nodes conjoining these subgraphs with operator precondition graphs.
- Link EVMDD outputs to next proposition layer.

## Theorem

*Let  $\Pi$  be an SDAC planning task. Then the classical additive RPG evaluation of the RPG constructed using EVMDDs as above computes the generalized additive heuristic  $h^{add}$  defined before.* □

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Delete Relaxations  
in SAS\*

Costs in Relaxed  
States

Additive Heuristic

Relaxed Planning  
Graph

Abstractions

Summary

References



# Abstractions

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

**Abstractions**

Cartesian  
Abstractions  
CEGAR

Summary

References



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

**Abstractions**

Cartesian

Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary


References

**Question:** Why consider **abstraction heuristics**?

**Answer:**

- admissibility
- $\rightsquigarrow$  **optimality**

# Abstraction Heuristics for SDAC



Background

Compilation


Relaxations

**Abstractions**

Cartesian  
Abstractions  
CEGAR

Summary

References



Question: What are the **abstract action costs**?

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

**Abstractions**


Cartesian

Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References



**Question:** What are the **abstract action costs**?

**Answer:** For **admissibility**, abstract cost of  $a$  should be

$$cost_a(s^{abs}) = \min_{\substack{\text{concrete state } s \\ \text{abstracted to } s^{abs}}} cost_a(s).$$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

**Abstractions**


Cartesian

Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References



**Question:** What are the **abstract action costs**?

**Answer:** For **admissibility**, abstract cost of  $a$  should be

$$cost_a(s^{abs}) = \min_{\substack{\text{concrete state } s \\ \text{abstracted to } s^{abs}}} cost_a(s).$$

**Problem:** exponentially many states in minimization

**Aim:** Compute  $cost_a(s^{abs})$  efficiently  
(given EVMDD for  $cost_a(s)$ ).

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

**Abstractions**

Cartesian

Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References

# Cartesian Abstractions



We will see: possible if the abstraction is **Cartesian** or coarser.

(Includes projections and domain abstractions.)

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References



We will see: possible if the abstraction is **Cartesian** or coarser.

(Includes projections and domain abstractions.)

## Definition (Cartesian abstraction)

A set of states  $s^{\text{abs}}$  is **Cartesian** if it is of the form

$$D_1 \times \cdots \times D_n,$$

where  $D_i \subseteq \mathcal{D}_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

An abstraction is Cartesian if all abstract states are Cartesian sets.

[Seipp and Helmert, 2013]

**Intuition:** Variables are abstracted **independently**.

$\rightsquigarrow$  **exploit independence** when computing abstract costs!

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions


Cartesian  
Abstractions  
CEGAR

Summary

References

## Example (Cartesian abstraction)

Cartesian abstraction over  $x, y$



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary



References

## Example (Cartesian abstraction)

Cartesian abstraction over  $x, y$

Cost  $x + y + 1$

(edges consistent with  $s^{abs}$ )





- Background
- Compilation
- Relaxations
- Abstractions
- Cartesian Abstractions
- CEGAR
- Summary
- References

## Example (Cartesian abstraction)

Cartesian abstraction over  $x, y$

Cost  $x + y + 1$

(edges consistent with  $s^{abs}$ )





- Background
- Compilation
- Relaxations
- Abstractions
- Cartesian Abstractions
- CEGAR
- Summary
- References

## Example (Cartesian abstraction)

Cartesian abstraction over  $x, y$

Cost  $x + y + 1$   
(edges consistent with  $s^{abs}$ )





- Background
- Compilation
- Relaxations
- Abstractions
- Cartesian Abstractions
- CEGAR
- Summary
- References

## Example (Cartesian abstraction)

Cartesian abstraction over  $x, y$

Cost  $x + y + 1$

(edges consistent with  $s^{abs}$ )



- Background
- Compilation
- Relaxations
- Abstractions
- Cartesian Abstractions
- CEGAR
- Summary
- References

# Cartesian Abstractions





## Example (Cartesian abstraction)

Cartesian abstraction over  $x, y$

Cost  $x + y + 1$

(edges consistent with  $s^{abs}$ )



- Background
- Compilation
- Relaxations
- Abstractions
  - Cartesian Abstractions
  - CEGAR
- Summary
- References

Why does the topsort EVMDD traversal (cheapest path computation) correctly compute  $cost_a(s^{abs})$ ?

**Short answer:** The exact same thing as with relaxed states, because **relaxed states are Cartesian sets!**

**Longer answer:**

- 1 For each Cartesian state  $s^{abs}$  and each variable  $v$ , each value  $d \in \mathcal{D}_v$  is either **consistent** with  $s^{abs}$  or not.
- 2 This implies: at all decision nodes associated with variable  $v$ , some outgoing edges are **enabled**, others are **disabled**. This is **independent** from all other decision nodes.
- 3 This allows **local minimizations** over linearly many **edges** instead of **global minimization** over exponentially many **paths** in the EVMDD when computing minimum costs.

$\rightsquigarrow$  **polynomial** in EVMDD size!

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions  
CEGAR

Summary

References





If abstraction **not Cartesian**: two variables can be

- **independent** in cost function ( $\rightsquigarrow$  compact EVMDD), but
- **dependent** in abstraction.

$\rightsquigarrow$  cannot consider independent parts of EVMDD separately.

[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

[Abstractions](#)

Cartesian

Abstractions

CEGAR

[Summary](#)

[References](#)



If abstraction **not Cartesian**: two variables can be

- **independent** in cost function ( $\rightsquigarrow$  compact EVMDD), but
- **dependent** in abstraction.

$\rightsquigarrow$  cannot consider independent parts of EVMDD separately.

### Example (Non-Cartesian abstraction)

$cost : x + y + 1$ ,  $cost(s^{abs}) = 2$ , local minim.: 1  $\rightsquigarrow$  underestimate!



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian

Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References


# Counterexample-Guided Abstraction Refinement



Wanted: principled way of computing Cartesian abstractions.

↪ Counterexample-Guided Abstraction Refinement (CEGAR)

[Clarke et al., 2000] [Seipp and Helmert, 2013]



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions  
CEGAR

Summary

References

Assume the following:

- **Initial abstraction** is one-state abstraction with single abstract state  $\mathcal{D}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{D}_n$ .  
 $\rightsquigarrow$  **Cartesian abstraction**
- Each **refinement step** takes one abstract state  $s^{\text{abs}} = D_1 \times \dots \times D_n$ , one variable  $v_i$ , and splits  $s^{\text{abs}}$  into
  - $D_1 \times \dots \times D_{i-1} \times D'_i \times D_{i+1} \times \dots \times D_n$
  - $D_1 \times \dots \times D_{i-1} \times D''_i \times D_{i+1} \times \dots \times D_n$such that  $D'_i \cap D''_i = \emptyset$  and  $D'_i \cup D''_i = D_i$ .  
 $\rightsquigarrow$  still a **Cartesian abstraction**

So, inductively:

- Initial abstraction is Cartesian.
- Each refinement step preserves being Cartesian.
- $\rightsquigarrow$  **All generated abstractions are Cartesian.**

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions  
CEGAR

Summary

References



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian

Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References

## Some questions:

- Q: **When** to split abstract states?  
A: When first **flaw** is identified. (Details below.)
- Q: **How** to split abstract states?  
A: So as to **resolve that flaw**. (Details below.)



## Some questions:

- **Q: How long** to stay in refinement loop?
- **A:** Until one of the following **termination criteria** is met:
  - **No abstract plan** exists.
    - ↪ Terminate with result “unsolvable”.
  - Abstract plan  $\pi$  is **concretizable** (= has no flaw).
    - ↪ Return  $\pi$  as concrete plan.
  - Available **resources** (time, memory, abstraction size bound, ...) exhausted.
    - ↪ Use current abstraction as basis for **abstraction heuristic** for concrete planning task (i. e., compute abstract goal distances, store in lookup table, ...).

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References

## Example (one package, one truck)

Consider the following FDR planning task  $\langle V, I, O, \gamma \rangle$ :

- $V = \{t, p\}$  with
  - $\mathcal{D}_t = \{L, R\}$
  - $\mathcal{D}_p = \{L, T, R\}$
- $I = \{t \mapsto L, p \mapsto L\}$
- $O = \{pick\text{-}in_i \mid i \in \{L, R\}\} \cup \{drop\text{-}in_i \mid i \in \{L, R\}\} \cup \{move_{i,j} \mid i, j \in \{L, R\}, i \neq j\}$ , where
  - $pick\text{-}in_i = \langle t = i \wedge p = i, p := T \rangle$
  - $drop\text{-}in_i = \langle t = i \wedge p = T, p := i \rangle$
  - $move_{i,j} = \langle t = i, t := j \rangle$
- $\gamma = (p = R)$ .

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions


CEGAR

Summary

References

## Example (Ctd.)

Before we look at CEGAR applied to this task, here is the concrete transition system (just for reference):



[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

[Abstractions](#)

[Cartesian](#)

[Abstractions](#)

[CEGAR](#)


[Summary](#)

[References](#)



## Example (Ctd.)

Refinement step 0 (initial abstraction):



Abstract plan:  $\pi_0 = \langle \rangle$

Flaw:  $s_0 = LL$  is not a goal state.

Consequence: Split abstract state  $\{L, R\} \times \{L, T, R\}$  wrt. goal condition  $\gamma = (p = R)$  into goal states and non-goal states.

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions


CEGAR

Summary

References

## Example (Ctd.)

### Refinement step 1:



**Abstract plan:**  $\pi_1 = \langle \text{drop-in}_R \rangle$

**Flaw:** Preconditions  $(t = R)$  and  $(p = T)$  of  $\text{drop-in}_R$  not satisfied in  $s_0 = LL$ .

**Consequence:** Pick one of the unsatisfied preconditions, say  $(t = R)$ , and split abstract state  $\{L, R\} \times \{L, T\}$  wrt.  $(t = R)$ .

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions


CEGAR

Summary

References

## Example (Ctd.)

### Refinement step 2:



**Abstract plan:**  $\pi_2 = \langle move_{L,R}, drop-in_R \rangle$

**Flaw:** Precondition ( $p = T$ ) of  $drop-in_R$  not satisfied in  $s_1 = RL$ .

**Consequence:** Split abstract state  $\{R\} \times \{L, T\}$  wrt. ( $p = T$ ).

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions


CEGAR

Summary

References

## Example (Ctd.)

### Refinement step 3:



**Abstract plan:**  $\pi_3 = \langle move_{L,R}, drop-in_R \rangle$

**Flaw:** Concrete and abstract paths diverge ( $\{R\} \times \{L\}$  vs.  $\{R\} \times \{T\}$ ).

**Consequence:** Regress from  $\{R\} \times \{T\}$  through  $move_{L,R}$ , obtain  $\{L\} \times \{T\}$ , split abstract state  $\{L\} \times \{L, T\}$  accordingly.

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions


CEGAR

Summary

References

## Example (Ctd.)

### Refinement step 4:



**Abstract plan:**  $\pi_4 = \langle \text{pick-in}_L, \text{move}_{L,R}, \text{drop-in}_R \rangle$

**Flaw:** None.  $\pi_4$  is concretizable!

**Consequence:** Concrete plan found! Return and terminate.

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References



CEGAR for unit-cost tasks. **Three kinds of flaws:**

- Abstract plan works in concrete transition system, but ends in **non-goal state**.  
(Step 0 in example.)
- Some step of abstract plan fails in concrete transition system, because **operator precondition is violated**.  
(Steps 1 and 2 in example.)
- Concrete and abstract **paths diverge** at some point, because abstract transition system is nondeterministic.  
(Step 3 in example.)

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian

Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References

**Flaw 1:** Abstract plan terminates in concrete non-goal state.

**Resolution:** Split abstraction of last state  $s_n$  of concrete trace into (a) part containing  $s_n$ , but containing no concrete goal state, and (b) rest.



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian

Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References

**Flaw 2:** Abstract plan fails because some operator precondition is violated.

**Resolution:** Split abstraction of state  $s_{i-1}$  of concrete trace, where operator precondition  $\chi$  is violated, into (a) part containing  $s_{i-1}$ , but no concrete state in which precondition  $\chi$  is satisfied, and (b) rest.





Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions  
CEGAR

Summary

References

**Flaw 3:** Concrete and abstract paths diverge.

**Resolution:** Split abstraction of state  $s_{i-1}$  of concrete trace, after which paths diverge when applying operator  $o$ , into (a) part containing  $s_{i-1}$  where applying  $o$  always leads to the “wrong” abstract successor state, and (b), rest.



**Remark:** In tasks with state-dependent action costs, there is a fourth type of flaws, so-called **cost-mismatch** flaws.

**Flaw 4:** Action is **more costly** in concrete state than in abstract state.

**Resolution:** Split abstraction of violating concrete state into two parts that differ on the value of a variable that is relevant to the cost function of the operator in question, such that we have different cost values in the two parts.

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions  
CEGAR

Summary

References


## Example (Cost-mismatch flaw)

$$a = \langle \top, x \wedge y \rangle, \text{cost}_a = 2x + 1$$

$$s_0 = 10$$

$$b = \langle \top, \neg x \wedge y \rangle, \text{cost}_b = 1$$

$$s_* = x \wedge y$$



Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian

Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References


## Example (Cost-mismatch flaw)

$$a = \langle \top, x \wedge y \rangle, \text{cost}_a = 2x + 1$$

$$s_0 = 10$$

$$b = \langle \top, \neg x \wedge y \rangle, \text{cost}_b = 1$$

$$s_* = x \wedge y$$



- Optimal abstract plan:  $\langle a \rangle$  (abstract cost 1)

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References


## Example (Cost-mismatch flaw)

$$a = \langle \top, x \wedge y \rangle, \text{cost}_a = 2x + 1$$

$$s_0 = 10$$

$$b = \langle \top, \neg x \wedge y \rangle, \text{cost}_b = 1$$

$$s_* = x \wedge y$$



- Optimal abstract plan:  $\langle a \rangle$  (abstract cost 1)
- This is also a **concrete plan** (concrete cost  $3 \neq 1$ )  
 $\rightsquigarrow$  split  $\{0, 1\} \times \{0\}$

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian

Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References


## Example (Cost-mismatch flaw)

$$a = \langle \top, x \wedge y \rangle, \text{cost}_a = 2x + 1$$

$$s_0 = 10$$

$$b = \langle \top, \neg x \wedge y \rangle, \text{cost}_b = 1$$

$$s_* = x \wedge y$$



- Optimal abstract plan:  $\langle a \rangle$  (abstract cost 1)
- This is also a **concrete plan** (concrete cost  $3 \neq 1$ )  
 $\rightsquigarrow$  split  $\{0, 1\} \times \{0\}$
- Cf. optimal concrete plan:  $\langle b, a \rangle$  (concr. and abstr. cost 2)

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

Cartesian  
Abstractions

CEGAR

Summary

References



# Summary

Background

Compilation

Relaxations

Abstractions

**Summary**

References



### Summary:

- State-dependent actions costs practically relevant.
- EVMDDs exhibit and exploit structure in cost functions.
- Graph-based representations of arithmetic functions.
- Edge values express partial cost contributed by facts.
- Size of EVMDD is **compact** in many “typical” cases.
- Can be used to compile tasks with state-dependent costs to tasks with state-independent costs.
- Alternatively, can be embedded into the RPG to compute forward-cost heuristics directly.
- For  $h^{add}$ , both approaches give the same heuristic values.
- Abstraction heuristics can also be generalized to state-dependent action costs.

[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

[Abstractions](#)

[Summary](#)

[References](#)





### Future Work and Work in Progress:

- Investigation of other delete-relaxation heuristics for tasks with state-dependent action costs.
- Investigation of static and dynamic EVMDD variable orders.
- Application to cost partitioning, to planning with preferences, ...
- Better integration of SDAC in PDDL.
- Tool support.
- Benchmarks.

[Background](#)

[Compilation](#)

[Relaxations](#)

[Abstractions](#)

[Summary](#)

[References](#)



# References

Background

Compilation




Relaxations

Abstractions

Summary

References



-  *Ciardo and Siminiceanu, **Using edge-valued decision diagrams for symbolic generation of shortest paths**, in Proc. 4th Intl. Conference on Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design (FMCAD 2002), pp. 256–273, 2002.*
-  *Geißer, Keller, and Mattmüller, **Delete relaxations for planning with state-dependent action costs**, in Proc. 24th Intl. Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 2015), pp. 1573–1579, 2015.*
-  *Geißer, Keller, and Mattmüller, **Abstractions for planning with state-dependent action costs**, in Proc. 26th Intl. Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS 2016), pp. 140–148, 2016.*