A Survey on Hierarchical Planning – One Abstract Idea, Many Concrete Realizations

Pascal Bercher¹ and Ron Alford² and Daniel Höller¹

¹Institute of Artificial Intelligence, Ulm University, Germany ²MITRE, McLean, Virginia, USA

August 14, 2019







A classical problem description consists of:

- Given an initial state s_l ,
- a portfolio of the system's available actions, and
- a goal description g.





A classical problem description consists of:

- Given an initial state *s*_l,
- a portfolio of the system's available actions, and
- a goal description g.

What are we looking for?





A classical problem description consists of:

- Given an initial state *s*_l,
- a portfolio of the system's available actions, and
- a goal description g.

What are we looking for?

 \rightarrow A *plan* that transforms s_l into g.





Introduction					
Planning	Applications: I	ntelligent Fact	ories		





The Scanalyzer Domain

- automatic greenhouse logistic management



Pictures with kind permission from LemnaTec GmbH



Introduction					
Planning	Applications: I	ntelligent Accie	etante		



Sink devices:

- Television (requires video)
- Amplifier (requires audio)

Source devices:

- Blu-ray player
- Satellite receiver (both produce audio & video)



Introduction HTN Planning Task Insertion Task Sharing Decompositional Planning HGN Planning Summary

Planning problems are usually defined in terms of a description language based on a first-order predicate logic.

• States are sets of (ground) propositions, e.g.,

s = {HasPort(AMPLIFIER, HDMI), HasPort(AMPLIFIER, CINCH), HasPort(CABLE_HDMI, HDMI)}



Planning problems are usually defined in terms of a description language based on a first-order predicate logic.

• States are sets of (ground) propositions, e.g.,

s = {HasPort(AMPLIFIER, HDMI), HasPort(AMPLIFIER, CINCH), HasPort(CABLE_HDMI, HDMI)}

Actions are defined by preconditions and effects, e.g.,

plugin(?cable, ?device, ?port)

precondition: HasPort(?device,?port) ∧ HasPort(?cable,?port) ∧ ∄?cable' : IsConnected(?device,?cable',?port)

effect: IsConnected(?device,?cable,?port)

(Signal flow not shown for the sake of simplicity)





- on the tasks, which need to be decomposed, or
- on the state features, which need to be achieved (or decomposed)





- on the tasks, which need to be decomposed, or
- on the state features, which need to be achieved (or decomposed)

Why should we incorporate task or state hierarchies?





- on the tasks, which need to be decomposed, or
- on the state features, which need to be achieved (or decomposed)

Why should we incorporate task or state hierarchies? E.g., because:

- Domain experts might want to model it that way.
- Plans can be presented *more abstract* by relying on task hierarchies.
- Standard solutions or search advice can be modeled.
- More control on the generated solutions using structures similar to formal grammars.





- on the tasks, which need to be decomposed, or
- on the state features, which need to be achieved (or decomposed)

Why should we incorporate task or state hierarchies? E.g., because:

- Domain experts might want to model it that way.
- Plans can be presented *more abstract* by relying on task hierarchies.
- Standard solutions or search advice can be modeled.
- More control on the generated solutions using structures similar to formal grammars.
- \rightsquigarrow Our focus: Survey of recent hierarchical problem classes.



	HTN Planning ●○				
Problem (Class: Hierarch	nical Task Netv	vork (HTN) Pl	anning	

$$\mathcal{P} = (V, P, \delta, C, M, s_l, c_l)$$

• V a set of state variables.











- $\mathcal{P} = (V, P, \delta, C, M, s_l, c_l)$
 - V a set of state variables.
 - *P* a set of primitive task names.
 - $\delta: \mathcal{P} \to (2^V)^3$ the task name mapping.
 - C a set of compound task names.



 $\mathcal{P} = (V, P, \delta, C, M, s_l, c_l)$

- V a set of state variables.
- *P* a set of primitive task names.
- $\delta: P \rightarrow (2^V)^3$ the task name mapping.
- C a set of compound task names.
- $c_l \in C$ the initial task.

A solution task network *tn* must:

• be a refinement of c_l,



Cl

$$\mathcal{P} = (V, P, \delta, C, M, s_l, c_l)$$

- V a set of state variables.
- *P* a set of primitive task names.
- $\delta: \mathcal{P} \to (2^V)^3$ the task name mapping.
- C a set of compound task names.
- $c_l \in C$ the initial task.
- $M \subseteq C \times 2^{TN}$ the methods.

- be a refinement of c_l,
- only contain primitive tasks, and



IT Class. Filerarchical task network (FTN) Flamming

$$\mathcal{P} = (V, P, \delta, C, M, s_l, c_l)$$

• V a set of state variables.



- $\delta: \mathcal{P} \to (2^V)^3$ the task name mapping.
- C a set of compound task names.
- $c_l \in C$ the initial task.
- $M \subseteq C \times 2^{TN}$ the methods.

- be a refinement of c_l,
- only contain primitive tasks, and







- $\mathcal{P} = (V, P, \delta, C, M, s_l, c_l)$
 - V a set of state variables.
 - *P* a set of primitive task names.
 - $\delta: \mathcal{P} \to (2^V)^3$ the task name mapping.
 - C a set of compound task names.
 - $c_l \in C$ the initial task.
 - $M \subseteq C \times 2^{TN}$ the methods.

- be a refinement of c_l,
- only contain primitive tasks, and







- $\mathcal{P} = (V, P, \delta, C, M, s_l, c_l)$
 - V a set of state variables.
 - *P* a set of primitive task names.
 - $\delta: \mathcal{P} \to (2^V)^3$ the task name mapping.
 - C a set of compound task names.
 - $c_l \in C$ the initial task.
 - $M \subseteq C \times 2^{TN}$ the methods.

- be a refinement of c_l,
- only contain primitive tasks, and







- $\mathcal{P} = (V, P, \delta, C, M, s_l, c_l)$
 - V a set of state variables.
 - *P* a set of primitive task names.
 - δ : P → (2^V)³ the task name mapping.
 - C a set of compound task names.
 - $c_l \in C$ the initial task.
 - $M \subseteq C \times 2^{TN}$ the methods.

- be a refinement of c_l,
- only contain primitive tasks, and







- $\mathcal{P} = (V, P, \delta, C, M, s_l, c_l)$
 - V a set of state variables.
 - *P* a set of primitive task names.
 - $\delta: \mathcal{P} \to (2^V)^3$ the task name mapping.
 - C a set of compound task names.
 - $c_l \in C$ the initial task.
 - $M \subseteq C \times 2^{TN}$ the methods.

- be a refinement of c_l,
- only contain primitive tasks, and







- $\mathcal{P} = (V, P, \delta, C, M, s_l, c_l)$
 - V a set of state variables.
 - *P* a set of primitive task names.
 - $\delta: \mathcal{P} \to (2^V)^3$ the task name mapping.
 - C a set of compound task names.
 - $c_l \in C$ the initial task.
 - $M \subseteq C \times 2^{TN}$ the methods.

- be a refinement of c_l,
- only contain primitive tasks, and







- $\mathcal{P} = (V, P, \delta, C, M, s_l, c_l)$
 - V a set of state variables.
 - *P* a set of primitive task names.
 - $\delta: \mathcal{P} \to (2^V)^3$ the task name mapping.
 - C a set of compound task names.
 - $c_l \in C$ the initial task.
 - $M \subseteq C \times 2^{TN}$ the methods.
 - $s_I \subseteq V$ the initial state.

- be a refinement of c_l,
- only contain primitive tasks, and







- $\mathcal{P} = (V, P, \delta, C, M, s_l, c_l)$
 - V a set of state variables.
 - *P* a set of primitive task names.
 - δ : P → (2^V)³ the task name mapping.
 - C a set of compound task names.
 - $c_l \in C$ the initial task.
 - $M \subseteq C \times 2^{TN}$ the methods.
 - $s_I \subseteq V$ the initial state.

- be a refinement of c_l,
- only contain primitive tasks, and
- have an executable linearization.





- In contrast to classical planning, there is no state-based goal.
- The objective is to decompose the initial abstract tasks into an executable primitive action sequence.





- In contrast to classical planning, there is no state-based goal.
- The objective is to decompose the initial abstract tasks into an executable primitive action sequence.
- In contrast to classical planning, the planner is *not* allowed to insert actions arbitrarily.





- In contrast to classical planning, there is no state-based goal.
- The objective is to decompose the initial abstract tasks into an executable primitive action sequence.
- In contrast to classical planning, the planner is *not* allowed to insert actions arbitrarily.
- Still, every classical problem can be encoded as an HTN problem, but HTN planning is more expressive.
- In the general case, it is undecidable to determine whether an HTN problem has a solution.





- In contrast to classical planning, there is no state-based goal.
- The objective is to decompose the initial abstract tasks into an executable primitive action sequence.
- In contrast to classical planning, the planner is *not* allowed to insert actions arbitrarily.
- Still, every classical problem can be encoded as an HTN problem, but HTN planning is more expressive.
- In the general case, it is undecidable to determine whether an HTN problem has a solution.
- The paper also *very briefly* explains all standard algorithms for solving HTN problems.



		Task Insertion ●		
Optional	Feature: Task	Insertion		



 Allowing Task Insertion means that actions can be inserted arbitrarily.

What to do when plans are not executable?



		Task Insertion ●		
Optional I	Feature: Task	Insertion		



- Allowing Task Insertion means that actions can be inserted arbitrarily.
- This gives greater flexibility: certain parts do not need to be modeled via the hierarchy.

What to do when plans are not executable?



		Task Insertion ●		
Optional	Feature: Task	Insertion		



- Allowing Task Insertion means that actions can be inserted arbitrarily.
- This gives greater flexibility: certain parts do not need to be modeled via the hierarchy.
- Allowing Task Insertion in HTN planning results in the problem class called *TIHTN planning*.

What to do when plans are not executable?





Task Sharing allows to eliminate duplicates that might just be modeling artifacts:







Task Sharing allows to eliminate duplicates that might just be modeling artifacts:





















 They are e.g. used for checking implementation or legality criteria of methods,







- They are e.g. used for checking implementation or legality criteria of methods,
- or to insert abstract tasks during planning.







- They are e.g. used for checking implementation or legality criteria of methods,
- or to insert abstract tasks during planning.
- Some of these formalizations feature an initial task network, others do not.



				HGN Planning ●	
Problem C	Class: HGN Pla	anning			

 Instead of restricting what to do (i.e., which action to perform), we can restrict what to achieve (i.e., which state features).





- Instead of restricting what to do (i.e., which action to perform), we can restrict what to achieve (i.e., which state features).
- For this, *Hierarchical Goal Network (HGN) planning* defines a hierarchy on *goals*.





- Instead of restricting what to do (i.e., which action to perform), we can restrict what to achieve (i.e., which state features).
- For this, *Hierarchical Goal Network (HGN) planning* defines a hierarchy on *goals*.
- Methods thus refine goals rather than tasks.





- Instead of restricting what to do (i.e., which action to perform), we can restrict what to achieve (i.e., which state features).
- For this, *Hierarchical Goal Network (HGN) planning* defines a hierarchy on *goals*.
- Methods thus refine goals rather than tasks.
- Actions can be applied to a current state only if they contribute towards a goal without predecessors.





- Instead of restricting what to do (i.e., which action to perform), we can restrict what to achieve (i.e., which state features).
- For this, *Hierarchical Goal Network (HGN) planning* defines a hierarchy on *goals*.
- Methods thus refine goals rather than tasks.
- Actions can be applied to a current state only if they contribute towards a goal without predecessors.
- Goals are achieved if they hold in the current state.



				Summary •
Core Cont	tributions of the	e Survey		

• We provided a survey on hierarchical planning.



				Summary •
Core Cont	tributions of th	e Survey		

- We provided a survey on *hierarchical planning*.
- We focused on various problem classes, most of which were developed or formalized within the last 10 years.



				Summary •
Core Cont	tributions of th	e Survey		

- We provided a survey on *hierarchical planning*.
- We focused on various problem classes, most of which were developed or formalized within the last 10 years.
- We discussed the impact of the different problem classes/features on the set of solutions.



				Summary •
Core Con	tributions of th	ie Survey		

- We provided a survey on *hierarchical planning*.
- We focused on various problem classes, most of which were developed or formalized within the last 10 years.
- We discussed the impact of the different problem classes/features on the set of solutions.
- We provided a brief explanation of all standard algorithms for solving HTN problems.

