## **Dofri: Planner Abstract**

# Paul Höft, David Speck, Jendrik Seipp

Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden \(\rangle\text{paul.hoft,david.speck,jendrik.seipp}\)\(\rangle\text{@liu.se}\)

#### **Abstract**

Cost partitioning is the foundation of today's strongest heuristics for optimal classical planning. Many cost partitioning algorithms use linear programs (LPs) to compute the heuristic value. In practice, it is often too time-consuming to solve a separate LP for each state, so it is necessary to approximate the heuristic. Our planner, Dofri, uses a refined version of the Saturated Post-hoc Optimization heuristic that reduces the computational cost without approximating the heuristic. This is done by simplifying the LPs and avoiding duplicate computations, so that we can precisely compute the heuristics for each state without sacrificing heuristic quality.

### Introduction

Dofri is an optimal planner submitted to the *optimal track* of the International Planning Competition (IPC) 2023 that is based on the Scorpion planning system (Seipp, Keller, and Helmert 2020), which in turn is based on the Fast Downward planning system 22.12 (Helmert 2006). Our planner, Dofri, uses an improved version of Saturated Post-hoc Optimization (SPhO) that we call lazy SPhO. It reduces the computational costs of the SPhO heuristic, not by approximation, as done for similar heuristics (Karpas, Katz, and Markovitch 2011; Seipp, Keller, and Helmert 2020), but by simplifying and skipping some of the costly linear program (LP) computations without losing heuristic quality. The improvements of lazy SPhO can be summarized as three simple but collectively significant enhancements:

- 1. Ignore abstractions with useless *minimum saturated cost functions*.
- 2. Group abstractions with the same *minimum saturated* cost functions.
- 3. Avoid duplicate LP calculations.

## **Saturated Post-hoc Optimization**

Post-hoc optimization (Pommerening, Röger, and Helmert 2013) is an operator-counting heuristic that can also be interpreted as a cost partitioning heuristic. It dominates the canonical heuristic, which is based on pattern collections (Haslum et al. 2007), and is less informed but faster to compute than optimal cost partitioning (Pommerening et al. 2015). Saturated Post-hoc Optimization is an improved variant introduced by Seipp, Keller, and Helmert (2021) that

combines it with *Saturated Cost Partitioning* (Seipp, Keller, and Helmert 2020) that not only is a strict improvement in theory and practice but also simplifies the theory for the heuristic. In the following, we briefly motivate and summarize the idea behind Saturated Post-hoc Optimization, followed by the optimized computation we use in Dofri.

### **Saturated Post-hoc Optimization**

Saturated Post-hoc Optimization (SPhO), as an operator counting heuristic, computes an LP that minimizes the amount that each action must be used to to satisfy the given abstraction heuristic.

As an abstraction based heuristic SPhO is computed over a set of abstractions H that each constraint the use of the labels l. For operator counting these labels correspond to the operators in the given task. The heuristic optimizes the operator count  $Y_l$  for each operator with respect to the restrictions derived from the abstractions by optimizing the SPhO-LP:

**Definition 1 (h**<sup>SPhO</sup> **Seipp, Keller, and Helmert (2021))**  $h^{SPhO}(s)$  is the objective value of the SPhO-LP:

$$\begin{aligned} & \textit{minimize} \sum_{l \in L} cost(l) Y_{l} \; \textit{s.t} \\ & \sum_{l \in L} \textit{msc} f_{h}(l) Y_{l} \geq \textit{h}(cost, s) \; \textit{for all} \; h \in H \\ & Y_{l} \geq 0 \; \textit{for all} \; l \in L \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

#### Simplification of the linear program

SPhO uses the *minimum saturated cost function* of abstractions instead of the operator cost to calculate the heuristic values. We have found that this often leads to duplicate or even completely zero cost functions. This is interesting, because the cost functions solely define the coefficient matrix of the SPhO-LP. Equal cost functions produce duplicate constraints that differ only in their bound, the abstract goal distance. This means that the tightest constraint dominates all other constraints with the same cost function making all other duplicate constraints redundant. Lazy SPhO combines all abstractions with the same *minimum saturated cost function* and uses only their maximum to obtain a more compact LP that is easier to solve.

In addition, Dofri removes all abstractions with zerovalued *minimum saturated cost functions* as these are useless for SPhO to further simplify the LP structure.

### **Avoidance of Redundant LP Computations**

The second type of improvement is based on the observation that only the abstract goal distance, highlighted in red in Eq. (1), changes between calls of the SPhO-LP. The abstract goal distance for states will often be the same, and if two states have the same abstract goal distance for all  $h \in H$  their SPhO-LPs are the same and it is redundant to recompute this LP. Lazy SPhO therefore stores previously computed SPhO-LPs as a mapping of abstract goal distance tuple to heuristic value:  $\langle h_1(cost,s), \ldots, h_n(cost,s) \rangle \rightarrow h^{SPhO}(s)$  to avoid redundant LP computations.

## **Implementation Details**

We use the h<sup>2</sup> preprocessor from Alcázar and Torralba (2015) included in Scorpion to simplify planning tasks after grounding. For the abstractions we use the *Sys-SCP* pattern selection algorithm (Seipp 2019) and *Cartesian* abstractions (Seipp and Helmert 2018) with the batch refinement strategy from Speck and Seipp (2022). If the task is found to have conditional effects, we use only the *Sys-SCP* patterns with explicit abstractions. The actual search is an A\* search (Hart, Nilsson, and Raphael 1968) using the optimized Saturated Post-hoc Optimization heuristic described. We solve the SPhO-LP using CPLEX 22.11.

#### Conclusions

Dofri is a new classical optimal planner in the sense that it has never been part of a previous International Planning Competition, although the planners it is based on, Scorpion and Fast Downward, have participated with great success. The key idea of Dofri is to perform an A\* search with an optimized Saturated Post-hoc Optimization heuristic, which simplifies and avoids costly but redundant LP computations.

### References

Alcázar, V.; and Torralba, Á. 2015. A Reminder about the Importance of Computing and Exploiting Invariants in Planning. In *Proc. ICAPS* 2015, 2–6.

Hart, P. E.; Nilsson, N. J.; and Raphael, B. 1968. A Formal Basis for the Heuristic Determination of Minimum Cost Paths. *IEEE Transactions on Systems Science and Cybernetics*, 4(2): 100–107.

Haslum, P.; Botea, A.; Helmert, M.; Bonet, B.; and Koenig, S. 2007. Domain-Independent Construction of Pattern Database Heuristics for Cost-Optimal Planning. In *Proc. AAAI* 2007, 1007–1012.

Helmert, M. 2006. The Fast Downward Planning System. *JAIR*, 26: 191–246.

Karpas, E.; Katz, M.; and Markovitch, S. 2011. When Optimal Is Just Not Good Enough: Learning Fast Informative Action Cost Partitionings. In *Proc. ICAPS* 2011, 122–129.

Pommerening, F.; Helmert, M.; Röger, G.; and Seipp, J. 2015. From Non-Negative to General Operator Cost Partitioning. In *Proc. AAAI 2015*, 3335–3341.

Pommerening, F.; Röger, G.; and Helmert, M. 2013. Getting the Most Out of Pattern Databases for Classical Planning. In *Proc. IJCAI 2013*, 2357–2364.

Seipp, J. 2019. Pattern Selection for Optimal Classical Planning with Saturated Cost Partitioning. In *Proc. IJCAI 2019*, 5621–5627.

Seipp, J.; and Helmert, M. 2018. Counterexample-Guided Cartesian Abstraction Refinement for Classical Planning. *JAIR*, 62: 535–577.

Seipp, J.; Keller, T.; and Helmert, M. 2020. Saturated Cost Partitioning for Optimal Classical Planning. *JAIR*, 67: 129–167

Seipp, J.; Keller, T.; and Helmert, M. 2021. Saturated Posthoc Optimization for Classical Planning. In *Proc. AAAI* 2021, 11947–11953.

Speck, D.; and Seipp, J. 2022. New Refinement Strategies for Cartesian Abstractions. In *Proc. ICAPS* 2022, 348–352.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>https://www.ibm.com/products/ilog-cplex-optimization-studio/cplex-optimizer