Accelerating SAT-Based HTN Plan Verification by Exploiting Data Structures from HTN Planning

Songtuan Lin¹ Gregor Behnke² Pascal Bercher¹

¹School of Computing, The Australian National University ²Institute for Logic, Language, and Computation, University of Amsterdam

Oct 2023

$\stackrel{\rm Introduction}{\bullet}$		
Introduction		

Plan verification for hierarchical planning is hard!

• It is **NP**-complete in general.

Contribution

We developed a SAT-based HTN plan verifier by adapting data structures for *solving* HTN problems which can verify plans for *partial order* (PO) HTN problems more efficient.

	Background ●0		
HTN Planning	r S		

 $\bigcirc c_I$

- A domain $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M}, \alpha)$:
 - \mathcal{F} : A set of propositions.
 - \mathcal{A} : A set of primitive tasks.
 - $\bullet~ {\mathcal C} {:}~ {\rm A}$ set of compound tasks.
 - \mathcal{M} : A set of methods.
 - $\alpha: \mathcal{A} \to 2^{\mathcal{F}} \times 2^{\mathcal{F}} \times 2^{\mathcal{F}}.$
- A problem $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{D}, c_I, s_I)$:
 - c_I : The initial task.
 - s_I : The initial state.

	Background ●0		
HTN Planning)'		



- A domain $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M}, \alpha)$:
 - \mathcal{F} : A set of propositions.
 - \mathcal{A} : A set of primitive tasks.
 - $\bullet~ {\mathcal C} {:}~ {\rm A}$ set of compound tasks.
 - \mathcal{M} : A set of methods.
 - $\alpha: \mathcal{A} \to 2^{\mathcal{F}} \times 2^{\mathcal{F}} \times 2^{\mathcal{F}}.$
- A problem $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{D}, c_I, s_I)$:
 - c_I : The initial task.
 - s_I : The initial state.

	Background ●0		
HTN Planning	g		



- A domain $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M}, \alpha)$:
 - \mathcal{F} : A set of propositions.
 - \mathcal{A} : A set of primitive tasks.
 - $\bullet~ {\mathcal C} {:}~ {\rm A}$ set of compound tasks.
 - \mathcal{M} : A set of methods.
 - $\alpha: \mathcal{A} \to 2^{\mathcal{F}} \times 2^{\mathcal{F}} \times 2^{\mathcal{F}}.$
- A problem $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{D}, c_I, s_I)$:
 - c_I : The initial task.
 - s_I : The initial state.

	Background ●0		
HTN Plannir	ng		



- A domain $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M}, \alpha)$:
 - \mathcal{F} : A set of propositions.
 - \mathcal{A} : A set of primitive tasks.
 - $\bullet~ {\mathcal C} {:}~ {\rm A}$ set of compound tasks.
 - \mathcal{M} : A set of methods.
 - $\alpha: \mathcal{A} \to 2^{\mathcal{F}} \times 2^{\mathcal{F}} \times 2^{\mathcal{F}}.$
- A problem $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{D}, c_I, s_I)$:
 - c_I : The initial task.
 - s_I : The initial state.

	Background 0●		
PDTs and SO	Gs		

- Path Decomposition Trees (PDTs)
 - A PDT of certain height K stores compactly all valid decomposition trees of height up to K.
- Solution Order Graphs (SOGs)
 - A SOG stores the *yields* of all decomposition trees in a PDT of certain height.



	Verification $\bullet \circ$	
Procedure		

Main Procedure

- Starting with K = 1, we build a PDT of height K.
- We check whether there exists a decomposition tree in the constructed PDT which can lead to the plan and all method preconditions are satisfied (by SAT).
- If that is not the case, we increase K by 1 and repeat the previous steps.
- A method precondition can be compiled as a primitive task that is ordered before all the remaining tasks in the method.

	Verification $\circ \bullet$	
Encoding		



	Verification $0 \bullet$	
Encoding		

• Use a variable to represent the mapping between an action in the plan and a vertex in the SOG.



	Verification $\circ \bullet$	
Encoding		

- Use a variable to represent the mapping between an action in the plan and a vertex in the SOG.
- A vertex is activated if and only if it is mapped to an action.



	Verification $\circ \bullet$	
Encoding		

- Use a variable to represent the mapping between an action in the plan and a vertex in the SOG.
- A vertex is activated if and only if it is mapped to an action.
- If a vertex is activated, the decomposition tree to which the vertex belongs must also be activated.



	Verification $\circ \bullet$	
Encoding		

- Use a variable to represent the mapping between an action in the plan and a vertex in the SOG.
- A vertex is activated if and only if it is mapped to an action.
- If a vertex is activated, the decomposition tree to which the vertex belongs must also be activated.
- Every activated vertex should be mapped to an action (and vice versa).



		Evaluation $\bullet \circ$	
Configurations	3		

- The benchmarks are plans generated by planners that participated in the IPC 2020 on HTN Planning.
 - The set contains 1211 valid plans and 138 invalid plans.
- We manually added additional invalid plans to the benchmark set.
 - Most of the original invalid plans fail because of some simple reasons.
- We compared our new SAT-based verifier against the current SOTA one based on planning.
 - It has been shown that the planning-based verifier outperforms all other existing ones.







	Instances	SAT (Ours)		Planning	
		Loose	Tight	SAT	Progression
Satellite	269	269	269	269	269
Transport	219	219	219	219	141
Rover	171	171	171	171	163
Woodworking	162	162	162	162	162
Monroe (FO)	130	130	130	130	130
Monroe (PO)	103	103	103	103	103
Barman-BDI	68	63	63	58	58
UM-Translog	57	57	57	57	57
PCP	31	31	31	31	31
Zenotravel	1	1	1	1	1
	1211	1206	1206	1201	1115

	Instances	SAT (Ours)		Planning	
	motuneco	Loose	Tight	SAT	Progression
Satellite	66	66	66	23	66
Transport	64	54	64	18	33
UM-Translog	59	59	59	14	59
Rover	53	41	53	6	47
Monroe (FO)	24	24	24	1	24
Woodworking	21	21	21	0	21
Barman-BDI	18	18	18	0	16
Monroe (PO)	18	18	18	2	18
PCP	12	12	12	0	12
Zenotravel	4	4	4	0	4
	339	317	339	64	300

		\bigcirc Conclusion
Conclusion		

In this paper, we developed a new SAT-based HTN plan verifier.

- It exploits PDTs and SOGs from the SAT-based HTN problem solver.
- It outperforms the SOTA planning-based verifier in verifying plans for POHTN problems.