

# Learning General Policies and Helpful Action Classifiers from Partial State Spaces

---



Dominik Drexler<sup>1</sup>

Javier Segovia-Aguas<sup>2</sup>

Jendrik Seipp<sup>1</sup>

July 23, 2022

<sup>1</sup>Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden,

<sup>2</sup>Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain

## Motivation

- A **general policy** encodes domain general strategies  
→ Only exist for tractable domains
- How to learn **partial policies** for **intractable domains**?
- How to learn general policies for **difficult but tractable domains**?
- Idea: find policy that solves **partial state spaces**

## Example General Policy for Visitall

### Features $\Phi$

- $d$ : distance to nearest unvisited cell
- $n$ : number of unvisited cells

### Policy rules $\pi_\Phi$      Meaning

$\{d > 0, n > 0\} \mapsto \{d\downarrow\}$	; decrease distance to nearest unvisited cell
$\{d > 0, n > 0\} \mapsto \{d?, n\downarrow\}$	; visit unvisited cell

# Syntax and Semantics of Policies [Francès et al., 2021]

- Syntax:

- Policy  $\pi_\Phi$  consists of **policy rules** of form  $C \mapsto E$  over features  $\Phi$
- For **Boolean feature**  $p$  and **numerical feature**  $n$ , we can have
  - $p, \neg p, n > 0, n = 0$  in  $C$
  - $p, \neg p, p?, n\uparrow, n\downarrow, n?$  in  $E$

- Semantics:

- **Transition**  $(s, a, s')$  is  $\pi_\Phi$ -**compatible** iff
  1.  $s \models C$ , and
  2.  $(s, s') \models E$
- A policy is **general** if for every alive state there exists  $\pi_\Phi$ -compatible transition
- A policy is **partial** if there exists an alive state with no  $\pi_\Phi$ -compatible transition
- In both cases, **acyclicity** over the  $\pi_\Phi$ -compatible transitions is required

# Learning Policies from Complete State Spaces

The learning problem [Francès et al., 2021]

Given: fully expanded state spaces  $S(P_1), \dots, S(P_n)$ , and feature pool  $\mathcal{F}$

Find: policy  $\pi_\Phi$  with  $\Phi \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ , s.t.,  $\pi_\Phi$  solves all  $S(P_1), \dots, S(P_n)$

- Generality of policy across whole domain can often be proven
  - No provable generalization capabilities in intractable domains
  - W-Max-SAT encoding: scalability problems, even more in intractable domains
- Idea: observe only fragments of the state space

# Learning Policies from Partial State Spaces

## The learning problem

Given: partially expanded state spaces  $\mathcal{S}(P_1), \dots, \mathcal{S}(P_n)$ , and feature pool  $\mathcal{F}$

Find: policy  $\pi_\Phi$  with  $\Phi \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ , s.t.,  $\pi_\Phi$  solves all  $\mathcal{S}(P_1), \dots, \mathcal{S}(P_n)$

- How to obtain an informative fragment of the state space?  
→ Idea: optimal plans contain goal directed information

## Learning Policies from Partial State Spaces: Details

- Notation: expanded states  $\mathcal{S}$ , generated states  $\mathcal{G}$
- Initially,  $\mathcal{G}_0$  only contains initial states  $s_0$ ,  $\mathcal{S} = \emptyset$ ,  $\pi_\Phi = \emptyset$
- In each iteration  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ 
  - Sample one **optimal s-plan**  $p$  for  $s \in \mathcal{G}_{i-1}$  where  $\pi_\Phi$  fails
  - $\mathcal{S}_i = \mathcal{S}_{i-1} \cup \{ \text{alive states on } p \}$
  - $\mathcal{G}_i = \mathcal{G}_{i-1} \cup \{ \text{alive states on } p \} \cup \{ \text{1-step successor states } s \text{ along } p \}$
  - Generate feature pool  $\mathcal{F}_i$  with respect to  $\mathcal{G}_i$
  - Solve W-Max-SAT encoding  $\Gamma(\mathcal{S}_i, \mathcal{G}_i, \mathcal{F}_i)$  to find  $\pi_\Phi$  that solves  $\mathcal{S}_i$  **suboptimally**
  - Aim for “simplest” policy: minimize  $\sum_{f \in \Phi} \text{complexity}(f)$

## Helpful Actions with Partial Policies

- Need additional **thinking** if policy is partial
- Combine heuristic search with policy: GBFS with  $h_{FF}$  and helpful actions [Hoffmann and Nebel, 2001]
- Dual-queue approach: one prioritized queue for states reached by helpful actions
- **Action  $a$  is  $\pi_\Phi$ -helpful** in state  $s$  if transition  $(s, a, s')$  is  $\pi_\Phi$ -compatible
- **Action  $a$  is relaxed-helpful** in state  $s$  if  $a$  is applicable in  $s$  and part of a relaxed plan from  $s$

## Experiments: Configurations

- All configurations use GBFS and  $h_{\text{FF}}$ 
  - FF: –
  - $\text{FF}'$ : dual-queue and **relaxed-helpful** actions
  - $\text{FF}^\pi$ : dual-queue and  $\pi_\Phi$ -**helpful** actions
  - $\text{FF}_\infty$ : like FF but **greedily** following the policy after each expansion step
  - $\text{FF}'_\infty$ : like  $\text{FF}'$  but **greedily** following the policy after each expansion step
- Search properties: suboptimal, sound and complete

# Experiments

	FF			FF <sup>r</sup>			FF <sup>π</sup>			FF <sub>∞</sub>			FF <sub>∞</sub> <sup>r</sup>		
	S	E	T	S	E	T	S	E	T	S	E	T	S	E	T
Barman <sub>(30)</sub>	6	0.05	0.08	23	0.50	0.34	8	0.06	0.09	7	0.08	0.11	20	0.39	0.28
Blocks <sub>(30)</sub>	26	0.85	0.48	26	0.86	0.48	26	0.86	0.47	24	0.80	0.44	26	0.86	0.43
Blocks-clear <sub>(30)</sub>	30	0.98	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	0.99	30	1.00	0.99
Blocks-on <sub>(30)</sub>	30	0.95	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	0.95	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00
Childsnack <sub>(30)</sub>	1	0.00	0.01	7	0.12	0.16	3	0.02	0.03	1	0.02	0.03	8	0.20	0.21
Delivery <sub>(30)</sub>	30	0.99	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00
Depots <sub>(30)</sub>	5	0.15	0.20	6	0.18	0.21	5	0.10	0.12	6	0.16	0.18	5	0.16	0.17
Driverlog <sub>(30)</sub>	8	0.13	0.16	18	0.34	0.29	4	0.06	0.07	6	0.10	0.10	7	0.14	0.13
Ferry <sub>(30)</sub>	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00
Freecell <sub>(30)</sub>	27	0.49	0.63	26	0.54	0.65	26	0.40	0.57	26	0.48	0.62	27	0.52	0.65
Gripper <sub>(30)</sub>	30	0.61	0.81	30	0.68	0.80	30	0.54	0.57	30	0.87	0.94	30	0.87	0.94
Miconic <sub>(30)</sub>	30	0.90	0.97	30	0.90	0.96	30	0.90	0.76	30	0.90	0.84	30	0.90	0.84
N-puzzle <sub>(30)</sub>	30	0.88	1.00	30	0.87	1.00	30	0.89	1.00	30	0.88	1.00	30	0.87	1.00
Nomystery <sub>(30)</sub>	7	0.09	0.13	10	0.22	0.26	3	0.05	0.02	6	0.17	0.11	6	0.16	0.11
Parking <sub>(30)</sub>	9	0.21	0.18	11	0.29	0.25	6	0.10	0.08	18	0.51	0.35	17	0.49	0.35
Pipes-nt <sub>(30)</sub>	12	0.17	0.26	24	0.52	0.62	13	0.24	0.32	11	0.15	0.22	24	0.63	0.71
Pipes-t <sub>(30)</sub>	11	0.14	0.22	28	0.65	0.63	13	0.17	0.24	12	0.16	0.23	25	0.61	0.61
Reward <sub>(30)</sub>	30	0.92	1.00	30	0.94	1.00	30	0.99	0.99	30	0.99	1.00	30	0.99	1.00
Satellite <sub>(30)</sub>	10	0.33	0.36	14	0.47	0.44	10	0.31	0.34	10	0.33	0.36	13	0.43	0.42
Sokoban <sub>(30)</sub>	19	0.24	0.45	22	0.26	0.46	15	0.24	0.32	14	0.24	0.32	13	0.23	0.31
Spanner <sub>(30)</sub>	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	27	0.74	0.13	30	0.87	0.30	30	0.87	0.30
Visitall <sub>(30)</sub>	5	0.05	0.11	5	0.06	0.11	6	0.12	0.14	25	0.59	0.44	25	0.59	0.44
Zenotravel <sub>(30)</sub>	12	0.34	0.43	15	0.49	0.67	9	0.21	0.26	9	0.24	0.35	15	0.45	0.55
<b>Sum<sub>(690)</sub></b>	<b>398</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>0.58</b>

# Experiments

	FF			FF'			FF $\pi$			FF $\infty$			FF' $\infty$		
	S	E	T	S	E	T	S	E	T	S	E	T	S	E	T
Barman (30)	6	0.05	0.08	23	0.50	0.34	8	0.06	0.09	7	0.08	0.11	20	0.39	0.28
Blocks (30)	26	0.85	0.48	26	0.86	0.48	26	0.86	0.47	24	0.80	0.44	26	0.86	0.43
Blocks-clear (30)	30	0.98	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	0.99	30	1.00	0.99
Blocks-on (30)	30	0.95	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	0.95	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00
Childsnack (30)	1	0.00	0.01	7	0.12	0.16	3	0.02	0.03	1	0.02	0.03	8	0.20	0.21
Delivery (30)	30	0.99	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00
Depots (30)	5	0.15	0.20	6	0.18	0.21	5	0.10	0.12	6	0.16	0.18	5	0.16	0.17
Driverlog (30)	8	0.13	0.16	18	0.34	0.29	4	0.06	0.07	6	0.10	0.10	7	0.14	0.13
Ferry (30)	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00	30	1.00	1.00
Freecell (30)	27	0.49	0.63	26	0.54	0.65	26	0.40	0.57	26	0.48	0.62	27	0.52	0.65
Gripper (30)	30	0.61	0.81	30	0.68	0.80	30	0.54	0.57	30	0.87	0.94	30	0.87	0.94
Miconic (30)	30	0.90	0.97	30	0.90	0.96	30	0.90	0.76	30	0.90	0.84	30	0.90	0.84
N-puzzle (30)	30	0.88	1.00	30	0.87	1.00	30	0.89	1.00	30	0.88	1.00	30	0.87	1.00
Nomystery (30)	7	0.09	0.13	10	0.22	0.26	3	0.05	0.02	6	0.17	0.11	6	0.16	0.11
Parking (30)	9	0.21	0.18	11	0.29	0.25	6	0.10	0.08	18	0.51	0.35	17	0.49	0.35
Pipes-nt (30)	12	0.17	0.26	24	0.52	0.62	13	0.24	0.32	11	0.15	0.22	24	0.63	0.71
Pipes-t (30)	11	0.14	0.22	28	0.65	0.63	13	0.17	0.24	12	0.16	0.23	25	0.61	0.61
Reward (30)	30	0.92	1.00	30	0.94	1.00	30	0.99	0.99	30	0.99	1.00	30	0.99	1.00
Satellite (30)	10	0.33	0.36	14	0.47	0.44	10	0.31	0.34	10	0.33	0.36	13	0.43	0.42
Sokoban (30)	19	0.24	0.45	22	0.26	0.46	15	0.24	0.32	14	0.24	0.32	13	0.23	0.31
Spanner (30)	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	27	0.74	0.13	30	0.87	0.30	30	0.87	0.30
Visitall (30)	5	0.05	0.11	5	0.06	0.11	6	0.12	0.14	25	0.59	0.44	25	0.59	0.44
Zenotravel (30)	12	0.34	0.43	15	0.49	0.67	9	0.21	0.26	9	0.24	0.35	15	0.45	0.55
<b>Sum (690)</b>	398	0.45	0.50	475	0.56	0.58	414	0.48	0.46	445	0.54	0.52	501	0.62	0.58

## Future Work & Conclusions

- We presented a method for combining heuristic search with partial policies learned from partial state spaces
- How to obtain more informed fragments of the state space?
- How to identify tractable fragments?

 Francès, G., Bonet, B., and Geffner, H. (2021).  
**Learning general planning policies from small examples without supervision.**

In Leyton-Brown, K. and Mausam, editors, *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2021)*, pages 11801–11808. AAAI Press.

 Hoffmann, J. and Nebel, B. (2001).  
**The FF planning system: Fast plan generation through heuristic search.**  
*Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 14:253–302.