

Principles of AI Planning

18. Computational complexity of classical planning

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg



Bernhard Nebel and Robert Mattmüller

February 8th, 2017



- Motivation
- Background
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

Motivation

February 8th, 2017

B. Nebel, R. Mattmüller – AI Planning

2 / 28

How hard is planning?



- Motivation
- Background
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

- We have seen that planning can be done in time **polynomial** in the size of the **transition system**.
- However, we have not seen algorithms which are polynomial in the **input size** (size of the task description).
- ↪ What is the precise **computational complexity** of the **planning problem**?

February 8th, 2017

B. Nebel, R. Mattmüller – AI Planning

3 / 28

Why computational complexity?



- Motivation
- Background
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

- **understand** the problem
- know what is **not** possible
- find interesting **subproblems** that are easier to solve
- distinguish **essential features** from **syntactic sugar**
 - Is STRIPS planning easier than general planning?
 - Is planning for FDR tasks harder than for propositional tasks?

February 8th, 2017

B. Nebel, R. Mattmüller – AI Planning

4 / 28

Background

- Motivation
- Background
- Turing machines
- Complexity classes
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

Nondeterministic Turing machines

Definition (nondeterministic Turing machine)

A **nondeterministic Turing machine (NTM)** is a 6-tuple $\langle \Sigma, \square, Q, q_0, q_Y, \delta \rangle$ with the following components:

- **input alphabet** Σ and **blank symbol** $\square \notin \Sigma$
 - alphabets always nonempty and finite
 - **tape alphabet** $\Sigma_{\square} = \Sigma \cup \{\square\}$
- finite set Q of **internal states** with **initial state** $q_0 \in Q$ and **accepting state** $q_Y \in Q$
 - **nonterminal states** $Q' := Q \setminus \{q_Y\}$
- **transition relation** $\delta \subseteq (Q' \times \Sigma_{\square}) \times (Q \times \Sigma_{\square} \times \{-1, +1\})$

- Motivation
- Background
- Turing machines
- Complexity classes
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

Deterministic Turing machines

Definition (deterministic Turing machine)

A **deterministic Turing machine (DTM)** is an NTM where the transition relation is **functional**, i. e., for all $\langle q, a \rangle \in Q' \times \Sigma_{\square}$, there is exactly one triple $\langle q', a', \Delta \rangle$ with $\langle \langle q, a \rangle, \langle q', a', \Delta \rangle \rangle \in \delta$.

Notation: We write $\delta(q, a)$ for the unique triple $\langle q', a', \Delta \rangle$ such that $\langle \langle q, a \rangle, \langle q', a', \Delta \rangle \rangle \in \delta$.

- Motivation
- Background
- Turing machines
- Complexity classes
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

Turing machine configurations

Definition (Configuration)

Let $M = \langle \Sigma, \square, Q, q_0, q_Y, \delta \rangle$ be an NTM.

A **configuration** of M is a triple $\langle w, q, x \rangle \in \Sigma_{\square}^* \times Q \times \Sigma_{\square}^+$.

- w : tape contents before tape head
- q : current state
- x : tape contents after and including tape head

- Motivation
- Background
- Turing machines
- Complexity classes
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

Definition (yields relation)

Let $M = \langle \Sigma, \square, Q, q_0, q_Y, \delta \rangle$ be an NTM.

A configuration c of M **yields** a configuration c' of M , in symbols $c \vdash c'$, as defined by the following rules, where $a, a', b \in \Sigma_{\square}$, $w, x \in \Sigma_{\square}^*$, $q, q' \in Q$ and $\langle \langle q, a \rangle, \langle q', a', \Delta \rangle \rangle \in \delta$:

- $\langle w, q, ax \rangle \vdash \langle wa', q', x \rangle$ if $\Delta = +1, |x| \geq 1$
- $\langle w, q, a \rangle \vdash \langle wa', q', \square \rangle$ if $\Delta = +1$
- $\langle wb, q, ax \rangle \vdash \langle w, q', ba'x \rangle$ if $\Delta = -1$
- $\langle \varepsilon, q, ax \rangle \vdash \langle \varepsilon, q', \square a'x \rangle$ if $\Delta = -1$

- Motivation
- Background
- Turing machines
- Complexity classes
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

Definition (accepting configuration, time)

Let $M = \langle \Sigma, \square, Q, q_0, q_Y, \delta \rangle$ be an NTM, let $c = \langle w, q, x \rangle$ be a configuration of M , and let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

- If $q = q_Y$, M **accepts c in time n** .
- If $q \neq q_Y$ and M accepts some c' with $c \vdash c'$ in time n , then M **accepts c in time $n + 1$** .

Definition (accepting configuration, space)

Let $M = \langle \Sigma, \square, Q, q_0, q_Y, \delta \rangle$ be an NTM, let $c = \langle w, q, x \rangle$ be a configuration of M , and let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

- If $q = q_Y$ and $|w| + |x| \leq n$, M **accepts c in space n** .
- If $q \neq q_Y$ and M accepts some c' with $c \vdash c'$ in space n , then M **accepts c in space n** .

- Motivation
- Background
- Turing machines
- Complexity classes
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

Definition (accepting words)

Let $M = \langle \Sigma, \square, Q, q_0, q_Y, \delta \rangle$ be an NTM.

M **accepts the word $w \in \Sigma^*$ in time (space) $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$** iff M accepts $\langle \varepsilon, q_0, w \rangle$ in time (space) n .

- Special case: M accepts ε in time (space) $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ iff M accepts $\langle \varepsilon, q_0, \square \rangle$ in time (space) n .

Definition (accepting languages)

Let $M = \langle \Sigma, \square, Q, q_0, q_Y, \delta \rangle$ be an NTM, and let $f : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$.

M **accepts the language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ in time (space) f** iff M accepts each word $w \in L$ in time (space) $f(|w|)$, and M does not accept any word $w \notin L$ (in any time/space).

- Motivation
- Background
- Turing machines
- Complexity classes
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

Definition (DTIME, NTIME, DSPACE, NSPACE)

Let $f : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$.

Complexity class **DTIME(f)** contains all languages accepted in time f by some DTM.

Complexity class **NTIME(f)** contains all languages accepted in time f by some NTM.

Complexity class **DSPACE(f)** contains all languages accepted in space f by some DTM.

Complexity class **NSPACE(f)** contains all languages accepted in space f by some NTM.

- Motivation
- Background
- Turing machines
- Complexity classes
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

- Motivation
- Background
- Turing machines
- Complexity classes
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

Let \mathcal{P} be the set of polynomials $p : \mathbb{N}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ whose coefficients are natural numbers.

Definition (P, NP, PSPACE, NPSPACE)

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \text{DTIME}(p) \\ NP &= \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \text{NTIME}(p) \\ PSPACE &= \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \text{DSPACE}(p) \\ NPSPACE &= \bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \text{NSPACE}(p) \end{aligned}$$

- Motivation
- Background
- Turing machines
- Complexity classes
- Complexity of planning
- More complexity results
- Summary

Theorem (complexity class hierarchy)

$$P \subseteq NP \subseteq PSPACE = NPSPACE$$

Proof.

$P \subseteq NP$ and $PSPACE \subseteq NPSPACE$ is obvious because deterministic Turing machines are a special case of nondeterministic ones.

$NP \subseteq NPSPACE$ holds because a Turing machine can only visit polynomially many tape cells within polynomial time.

$PSPACE = NPSPACE$ is a special case of a classical result known as Savitch's theorem (Savitch 1970). \square

Complexity of propositional planning

- Motivation
- Background
- Complexity of planning
- (Bounded) plan existence
- PSPACE-completeness
- More complexity results
- Summary

The propositional planning problem

- Motivation
- Background
- Complexity of planning
- (Bounded) plan existence
- PSPACE-completeness
- More complexity results
- Summary

Definition (plan existence)

The **plan existence** problem (PLANEX) is the following decision problem:

GIVEN: Planning task Π
QUESTION: Is there a plan for Π ?

\rightsquigarrow decision problem analogue of **satisficing planning**

Definition (bounded plan existence)

The **bounded plan existence** problem (PLANLEN) is the following decision problem:

GIVEN: Planning task Π , length bound $K \in \mathbb{N}_0$
QUESTION: Is there a plan for Π of length at most K ?

\rightsquigarrow decision problem analogue of **optimal planning**

Plan existence vs. bounded plan existence



Theorem (reduction from PLANEX to PLANLEN)

$\text{PLANEX} \leq_p \text{PLANLEN}$

Proof.

A propositional planning task with n state variables has a plan iff it has a plan of length at most $2^n - 1$.

\rightsquigarrow map instance Π of PLANEX to instance $\langle \Pi, 2^n - 1 \rangle$ of PLANLEN, where n is the number of n state variables of Π

\rightsquigarrow polynomial reduction □

Motivation
Background
Complexity of planning
(Bounded) plan existence
PSPACE-completeness
More complexity results
Summary

Membership in PSPACE



Theorem (PSPACE membership for PLANLEN)

$\text{PLANLEN} \in \text{PSPACE}$

Proof.

Show $\text{PLANLEN} \in \text{NPSPACE}$ and use Savitch's theorem.

Nondeterministic algorithm:

```
def plan( $\langle A, I, O, G \rangle, K$ ):  
   $s := I$   
   $k := K$   
  while  $s \not\models G$ :  
    guess  $o \in O$   
    fail if  $o$  not applicable in  $s$  or  $k = 0$   
     $s := \text{app}_o(s)$   
     $k := k - 1$   
  accept
```

Motivation
Background
Complexity of planning
(Bounded) plan existence
PSPACE-completeness
More complexity results
Summary

Hardness for PSPACE



Idea: generic reduction

- For an arbitrary fixed DTM M with space bound polynomial p and input w , generate planning task which is solvable iff M accepts w in space $p(|w|)$.
- For simplicity, restrict to TMs which never move to the left of the initial head position (no loss of generality).

Motivation
Background
Complexity of planning
(Bounded) plan existence
PSPACE-completeness
More complexity results
Summary

Reduction: state variables



Let $M = \langle \Sigma, \square, Q, q_0, q_Y, \delta \rangle$ be the fixed DTM and let p be its space-bound polynomial.

Given input $w_1 \dots w_n$, define relevant tape positions $X := \{1, \dots, p(n)\}$.

State variables

- state_q for all $q \in Q$
- head_i for all $i \in X \cup \{0, p(n) + 1\}$
- $\text{content}_{i,a}$ for all $i \in X, a \in \Sigma \square$

\rightsquigarrow allows encoding a Turing machine configuration

Motivation
Background
Complexity of planning
(Bounded) plan existence
PSPACE-completeness
More complexity results
Summary

Reduction: initial state



Let $M = \langle \Sigma, \square, Q, q_0, q_Y, \delta \rangle$ be the fixed DTM and let p be its space-bound polynomial.

Given input $w_1 \dots w_n$, define **relevant tape positions**

$X := \{1, \dots, p(n)\}$.

Initial state

Initially true:

- state_{q_0}
- head_1
- $\text{content}_{i,w_i}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$
- $\text{content}_{i,\square}$ for all $i \in X \setminus \{1, \dots, n\}$

Initially false:

- all others

Motivation
Background
Complexity of planning
(Bounded) plan existence
PSPACE-completeness
More complexity results
Summary

Reduction: operators



Let $M = \langle \Sigma, \square, Q, q_0, q_Y, \delta \rangle$ be the fixed DTM and let p be its space-bound polynomial.

Given input $w_1 \dots w_n$, define **relevant tape positions**

$X := \{1, \dots, p(n)\}$.

Operators

One operator for each transition rule $\delta(q, a) = \langle q', a', \Delta \rangle$ and each cell position $i \in X$:

- precondition: $\text{state}_q \wedge \text{head}_i \wedge \text{content}_{i,a}$
- effect: $\neg \text{state}_q \wedge \neg \text{head}_i \wedge \neg \text{content}_{i,a}$
 $\wedge \text{state}_{q'} \wedge \text{head}_{i+\Delta} \wedge \text{content}_{i,a'}$
- If $q = q'$ and/or $a = a'$, omit the effects on state_q and/or $\text{content}_{i,a}$, to avoid consistency condition issues.

Motivation
Background
Complexity of planning
(Bounded) plan existence
PSPACE-completeness
More complexity results
Summary

Reduction: goal



Let $M = \langle \Sigma, \square, Q, q_0, q_Y, \delta \rangle$ be the fixed DTM and let p be its space-bound polynomial.

Given input $w_1 \dots w_n$, define **relevant tape positions**

$X := \{1, \dots, p(n)\}$.

Goal

state_{q_Y}

Motivation
Background
Complexity of planning
(Bounded) plan existence
PSPACE-completeness
More complexity results
Summary

PSPACE-completeness for STRIPS plan existence



Theorem (PSPACE-completeness; Bylander, 1994)

PLANEX and PLANLEN are PSPACE-complete.

This is true even when restricting to STRIPS tasks.

Proof.

Membership for PLANLEN was already shown.

Hardness for PLANEX follows because we just presented a polynomial reduction from an arbitrary problem in PSPACE to PLANEX. (Note that the reduction only generates STRIPS tasks.)

Membership for PLANEX and hardness for PLANLEN follows from the polynomial reduction from PLANEX to PLANLEN. □

Motivation
Background
Complexity of planning
(Bounded) plan existence
PSPACE-completeness
More complexity results
Summary

More complexity results

More complexity results

In addition to the basic complexity result presented in this chapter, there are many special cases, generalizations, variations and related problems studied in the literature:

- **different planning formalisms**
 - e. g., finite-domain representation, nondeterministic effects, partial observability, schematic operators, numerical state variables, state-dependent action costs
- **syntactic restrictions** of planning tasks
 - e. g., without preconditions, without conjunctive effects, STRIPS without delete effects
- **semantic restrictions** of planning task
 - e. g., restricting to certain classes of causal graphs
- **particular planning domains**
 - e. g., Blocksworld, Logistics, FreeCell

Complexity results for different planning formalisms

Some results for different planning formalisms:

- **FDR tasks:**
 - same complexity as for propositional tasks (“folklore”)
 - also true for the SAS⁺ special case
- **nondeterministic effects:**
 - fully observable: EXP-complete (Littman, 1997)
 - unobservable: EXPSPACE-complete (Haslum & Jonsson, 1999)
 - partially observable: 2-EXP-complete (Rintanen, 2004)
- **schematic operators:**
 - usually adds one exponential level to PLANEx complexity
 - e. g., classical case EXPSPACE-complete (Erol et al., 1995)
- **numerical state variables:**
 - undecidable in most variations (Helmert, 2002)

Summary

- **Propositional planning is PSPACE-complete.**
- The hardness proof is a polynomial reduction that translates an **arbitrary polynomial-space DTM** into a **STRIPS task**:
 - Configurations of the DTM are encoded by propositional variables.
 - Operators simulate transitions of the DTM.
 - The DTM accepts an input iff there is a plan for the corresponding STRIPS task.
- This implies that there is **no polynomial algorithm** for classical planning unless $P=PSPACE$.
- It also means that classical planning is not polynomially reducible to any problem in NP unless $NP=PSPACE$.