Planning Domain Repair as a Diagnosis Problem

Songtuan Lin Alban Grastien Pascal Bercher

2022

	<u> </u>		D 1
l in	(-raction	and	Bercher
	Grastien.	anu	Dercher

Repair as Diagnosis

2022

< □ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 >

Issue with Model Based Approaches

Modelling is hard!

This is also true for planning:

```
(:action move
  :parameters (?from - location ?to - location)
  :precondition (and (at-location ?from) (road ?from ?to))
  :effect (and (at-location ?to) (not (at-location ?to)))
)
```

通 ト イ ヨ ト イ ヨ ト

Our Goal

We have:

- a domain
- a (incorrect) model of the domain
- a plan that is valid for the domain, but invalid according to the model

We want to

 compute the "minimal" "repair" of the model so that the plan is valid for the repaired model

・ 何 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

Content





3 Algorithm



Lin, Grastien, and Bercher

<ロト <回ト < 回ト < 回ト -

æ

Classical Planning (STRIPS)

Classical planning problem: $\mathcal{P} = \langle \mathcal{F}, A, \alpha, s_I, g \rangle$ where

- \mathcal{F} set of **facts** (Boolean state variables)
 - $s_I \subseteq \mathcal{F}$: initial state
 - $g \subseteq \mathcal{F}$: goal facts
- A: set of action names (or actions)
- $\alpha: A \to 2^F \times 2^F \times 2^F$: action description

An action is described by $\alpha(a) = \langle pre, eff^+, eff^- \rangle$:

- **applicable** in state s iff $pre \subseteq s$
- leads to state $s[a] := s \setminus eff^- \cup eff^+$

A plan π is a sequence of actions. It is **valid** iff it is applicable in s_I and leads to a goal state ($g \subseteq s_I[\pi]$)

<ロト <回ト < 回ト < 回ト = 三日

2022

Example of Invalid Plan



2022

< □ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 >

6/16

Example of Invalid Plan

$$s_{I} = \{q\} \qquad \underline{q} \qquad \underline{q} \qquad \underline{q} \qquad \underline{l} \qquad$$

An **atomic repair** is one of three things:

- Remove a fact f from the preconditions of action a: $\langle F_a|_f^p \rangle$
- Remove a fact f from the negative effects of action a: $\langle F_a|_f^- \rangle$
- Add a fact f to the positive effects of action a: $\langle F_a|_f^+ \rangle$

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト

g

Repair Problem

Applying a repair set $R: \mathcal{P} \Rightarrow_R \mathcal{P}'$

Repair Problem

Given a planning problem \mathcal{P} and a plan π , find a **cardinality minimal** repair set R such that π is valid for problem \mathcal{P}' where $\mathcal{P} \Rightarrow_R \mathcal{P}'$.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Model Based Diagnosis

A model based diagnosis problem is a tuple $\langle Comps, SD, Obs \rangle$ where

- Comps is a set of components
- SD is the system description (logical statement)
 - Ab(c) =component c is *abnormal*
- Obs is an observation (logical statement)

A **diagnosis** δ is a set of components that satisfies:

 $SD, Obs, \{Ab(c) \mid c \in \delta\}, \{\neg Ab(c) \mid c \in Comps \setminus \delta\} \not\models \bot.$

イロト 不得 トイヨト イヨト 二日

Repair as Diagnosis

- Each potential atomic repair is interpreted as a component
 - A component is faulty = the atomic repair should be performed
 - A diagnosis is a repair set
- The system description explains the value of each fact in each state during the execution the plan
- The observation is "the plan is valid"

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 >

System Description

1. If $f \notin eff^+(a_t)$ and $f \notin eff^-(a_t)$

$$\neg Ab(\langle F_{a_t}|_f^+\rangle) \rightarrow (\neg f@(t-1) \rightarrow \neg f@t)$$

2. If $f \in eff^{-}(a_t)$ and $f \notin eff^{+}(a_t)$

$$\neg \mathsf{Ab}(\langle F_{a_t}|_f^+\rangle) \to \left((\neg f@(t-1) \lor \neg \mathsf{Ab}(\langle F_{a_t}|_f^-\rangle)) \to \neg f@t\right)$$

3. If $f \in pre(a)$

$$\neg Ab(\langle F_{a_t}|_f^p)) \rightarrow (\neg f@(t-1) \rightarrow \neg VALID)$$

- 20

10/16

・ロト ・聞 ト ・ ヨト ・ ヨト

System Description (Example)



2022

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 >

11/16

System Description (Example)

Lin, Grastien, and Bercher

2022

æ

11/16

g

Solving MBD Problems

Input: A diagnosis problem (*Comps*, *SD*, *Obs*) **Output**: A minimal cardinality diagnosis

Collection of known conflicts

 $\mathcal{C} \gets \emptyset$

loop

 $\delta \leftarrow a \text{ minimal cardinality hitting set of } C$ if $SD, Obs, \varphi(\delta) \not\models \bot$ then return δ $C \leftarrow a \text{ conflict } C \text{ with } C \subseteq Comps \setminus \delta$ $C \leftarrow C \cup \{C\}$

Slaney, John. "Set-theoretic duality: A fundamental feature of combinatorial optimisation." *ECAI 2014.* IOS Press, 2014. 843-848.

Lin, Grastien, and Bercher

12/16

2022

1. Verifying that a Repair Set is Correct

Simulate the execution of the plan

Lin, Grastien, and Bercher

Repair as Diagnosis

2022

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

13/16

э

2. Computing a Conflict

- $\textbf{0} \quad \text{Identify in } \mathcal{P}' \text{ a time step } t \text{ when the precondition } f \text{ is not satisfied}$
- **2** Determine the time step t' < t when this fact was made false
- A correct conflict is:

$$\{\langle F_{a_{t'}}|_f^-\rangle, \langle F_{a_t}|_f^p\rangle\} \cup \{\langle F_{a_i}|_f^+\rangle \mid i \in \{t'+1, \dots, t-1\}\}$$

< ロ > < 同 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 回 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 > < 0 >

2. Computing a Conflict

- Identify in P' a time step t when the precondition f is not satisfied
 Determine the time step t' < t when this fact was made false
- A correct conflict is:

(1 - 1 - 1) (1 - 1) (1 - 1) (1 - 1) (1 - 1) (1 - 1)

Here, *l* is required by *c*: $\{\langle F_b|_l^-\rangle, \langle F_c|_l^p\rangle, \langle F_d|_l^+\rangle\}$

Lin, Grastien, and Bercher

Experiments

Important implementation result: each fact $f \in \mathcal{F}$ can be diagnosed individually!



Extensions

- Negative preconditions ("strong-fault model")
- Lifted representation
- Multiple problems and plans, same domain
- A priori probabilities
- More sophisticated repairs (swap a variable with another one)

- 4 回 ト 4 三 ト 4 三 ト