

# Enhancing Temporal Planning by Sequential Macro-actions (Extended Version)

Marco De Bortoli<sup>1</sup>, Lukáš Chrpa<sup>2</sup>, Martin Gebser<sup>1,3</sup>, Gerald Steinbauer-Wagner<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Graz University of Technology

<sup>2</sup>Czech Technical University in Prague

<sup>3</sup>University of Klagenfurt

{mbortoli, mgebser, steinbauer}@ist.tugraz.at, chrpaluk@cvut.cz

## Abstract

Temporal planning is an extension of classical planning involving concurrent execution of actions and alignment with temporal constraints. Durative actions along with invariants allow for modeling domains in which multiple agents operate in parallel on shared resources. Hence, it is often important to avoid resource conflicts, where temporal constraints establish the consistency of concurrent actions and events. Unfortunately, the performance of temporal planning engines tends to sharply deteriorate when the number of agents and objects in a domain gets large. A possible remedy is to use macro-actions that are well-studied in the context of classical planning. In temporal planning settings, however, introducing macro-actions is significantly more challenging when the concurrent execution of actions and shared use of resources, provided the compliance to temporal constraints, should not be suppressed entirely. Our work contributes a general concept of sequential temporal macro-actions that guarantees the applicability of obtained plans, i.e., the sequence of original actions encapsulated by a macro-action is always executable. We apply our approach to several temporal planners and domains, stemming from the International Planning Competition and RoboCup Logistics League. Our experiments yield improvements in terms of obtained satisficing plans as well as plan quality for the majority of tested planners and domains.

## 1 Introduction

Temporal planning is a framework capable of dealing with concurrent actions and timing requirements, providing an intuitive syntax for representing planning domains, such as PDDL 2.1 (Fox and Long 2003), together with off-the-shelf planners, e.g., Optic (Benton, Coles, and Coles 2012), to generate plans. As an extension of classical planning, temporal planning offers modeling support for durative actions, their concurrent execution, and the management of temporal constraints. Logistics domains are prominent examples in which such timing information matters, e.g., for planning on-demand transport and delivery, cargo shipment, shuttle services, or just-in-time production, to mention some application areas. However, with larger numbers of tasks and/or resources to operate and synchronize, the performance of (temporal) planning engines tends to sharply deteriorate, which limits their usability for practical problem solving.

As a possible remedy for the scalability issue, in this paper, we develop a general approach to introduce macro-

actions that encapsulate sequences of ordinary actions. Macro-actions are widely studied in classical planning (Botea et al. 2005; Coles and Smith 2007; Chrpa, Vallati, and McCluskey 2014), capable of expressing composite behaviors, e.g., frequent activities like *load-move-unload* sequences in transport domains, and proved to enable considerable speed-ups of classical planning engines (Chrpa, Vallati, and McCluskey 2014; Chrpa and Vallati 2022). In temporal planning settings, however, the conception of macro-actions is significantly more challenging. Specifically, PDDL 2.1 limits the points in time to which preconditions and effects of durative actions can be linked to an action’s start, end, or invariants over the entire duration. Hence, a macro-action encapsulating a sequence of durative actions cannot exactly specify the times at which preconditions and effects associated with its constituent actions take place, which puts either the plan validity or concurrency into question. To give an example, for a *load-move-unload* macro-action, PDDL 2.1 does not permit to accurately capture when an agent leaves the “loading” location and arrives at the “unloading” location, so that other agents risk collisions or need to avoid both locations for the entire duration.

In this paper, we provide a general concept of sequential temporal macro-actions (Section 3), i.e., macros encapsulating sequences of durative actions, where preconditions, invariants, and effects are assembled in a fine-grained way to enable concurrent execution when it does not compromise the macro-action applicability. Sequential temporal macro-actions can be particularly advantageous in logistics domains, where transport and delivery tasks are often accomplished by specific sequences of actions like, e.g., *load-move-unload*. We thus apply and evaluate our approach using three state-of-the-art planners on four domains (three of which are logistics-related) from the International Planning Competition as well as the RoboCup Logistics League (Section 4), obtaining improvements in terms of coverage and in some cases also the quality of plans computed in the same time limit with or without macro-actions, respectively. Finally, we discuss related work (Section 5) and provide conclusions along with directions for future work (Section 6).

## 2 Background

In temporal planning, states of the environment are represented by sets of propositions (or atoms). In contrast to

classical planning, states of the environment are modified by events that are triggered by application of durative actions. A durative action  $a$  is defined by a duration  $dur(a) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , the sets  $pre^+(a)$ ,  $pre^H(a)$ , and  $pre^-(a)$  of atoms specifying *preconditions* that must hold at the start, as invariants during, or at the end of the action  $a$ , respectively, as well as the sets  $eff^+(a)$  and  $eff^-(a)$  of literals determining *effects* that apply at the start or at the end of  $a$ . Let  $add^+(a)$  (or  $add^-(a)$ ) and  $del^+(a)$  (or  $del^-(a)$ ) denote the sets of atoms occurring as positive or negative literals, respectively, in  $eff^+(a)$  (or  $eff^-(a)$ ). W.l.o.g. we assume that  $del^+(a) \cap (add^+(a) \cup pre^H(a)) = \emptyset$  and  $del^-(a) \cap add^-(a) = \emptyset$ , given that the action  $a$  would be inapplicable otherwise. Note that positive effects  $add^+(a)$  and  $add^-(a)$  enable preconditions required by actions, while  $del^+(a)$  and  $del^-(a)$  inhibit actions.

A temporal *planning task*  $\mathcal{T} = (V, A, s_0, s_*)$  consists of a set  $V$  of atoms, a set  $A$  of actions such that  $pre^+(a) \cup pre^H(a) \cup pre^-(a) \cup add^+(a) \cup del^+(a) \cup add^-(a) \cup del^-(a) \subseteq V$  for each  $a \in A$ , a (total) *initial state*  $s_0 \subseteq V$  represented by the atoms that hold, and a (partial) *goal*  $s_* \subseteq V$  inducing the goal states  $\{s \subseteq V \mid s_* \subseteq s\}$ . A *plan*  $\mathcal{P}$  for  $\mathcal{T}$  is a finite set of *time-stamped actions*  $(t, a)$ , where  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$  is a starting time for the action  $a \in A$ , such that  $t_1 \neq t_2$ ,  $t_1 + dur(a_1) \neq t_2$ , and  $t_1 + dur(a_1) \neq t_2 + dur(a_2)$  for any distinct time-stamped actions  $(t_1, a_1) \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $(t_2, a_2) \in \mathcal{P}$ . The condition of mutually disjoint starting and ending times is in line with the “no moving targets” requirement of PDDL 2.1 and also adopted by Temporal Fast Downward (Eyerich, Mattmüller, and Röger 2009) for enabling a sequential processing of action effects and state updates. That is, a plan  $\mathcal{P}$  corresponds to a sequence  $P$  with  $2|\mathcal{P}| + 1$  *time-stamped states* of the form  $P[i] = (t[i], s[i], E[i])$ , where  $P[0] = (0, s_0, \emptyset)$  and successors are inductively defined as follows for  $1 \leq i \leq 2|\mathcal{P}|$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
t[i] &= \min \left( \{t \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}, t[i-1] < t\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \cup \{t \mid (t, pre^H(a), pre^-(a), eff^+(a)) \in E[i-1]\} \right); \\
s[i] &= \begin{cases} add^+(a) \cup (s[i-1] \setminus del^+(a)) \\ \text{if } (t[i], a) \in \mathcal{P}, \text{ or} \\ add^-(a) \cup (s[i-1] \setminus del^-(a)) \\ \text{if } (t[i], pre^H(a), pre^-(a), eff^-(a)) \in E[i-1]; \end{cases} \\
E[i] &= \begin{cases} E[i-1] \\ \cup \{(t[i] + dur(a), pre^H(a), pre^-(a), eff^+(a))\} \\ \text{if } (t[i], a) \in \mathcal{P}, \text{ or} \\ E[i-1] \setminus \{(t[i], pre^H(a), pre^-(a), eff^-(a))\} \\ \text{if } (t[i], pre^H(a), pre^-(a), eff^-(a)) \in E[i-1]. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

The sets  $E[i]$  gather *scheduled effects* for actions that already started but have not yet ended at time stamp  $t[i]$ . We call  $P[i]$  a *starting* or *ending event* for  $a$ , respectively, if  $(t[i], a) \in \mathcal{P}$  or  $(t[i], pre^H(a), pre^-(a), eff^-(a)) \in E[i-1]$ , and by  $\iota(t[i]) = i$  we refer to the sequence position associated with a time stamp  $t[i]$ .<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the plan  $\mathcal{P}$  is *consistent* if, for each  $1 \leq i \leq 2|\mathcal{P}|$ , we

have that  $\bigcup_{(t, pre^H(a), pre^-(a), eff^-(a)) \in E[i]} pre^H(a) \subseteq s[i]$  and  $pre^+(a) \subseteq s[i-1]$  or  $pre^-(a) \subseteq s[i-1]$  in case  $P[i]$  is a starting or ending event for  $a$ , respectively. If  $\mathcal{P}$  is consistent and  $s_* \subseteq s[2|\mathcal{P}|]$ , we call the plan  $\mathcal{P}$  a *solution* for  $\mathcal{T}$ .

### 3 Sequential Macro-actions

In contrast to classical planning, where actions are viewed as instantaneous events and modeling their sequential execution by a macro-action boils down to accumulating preconditions and effects independently of other actions, concurrent actions must be taken into account for temporal planning, which makes it non-trivial to guarantee the applicability of plans with macro-actions. For instance, when the sequence of a move and a delivery action with the mutually exclusive invariants that a robot must not deliver while moving, and vice versa, should be turned into a macro, simply adding up effects and invariants would render the macro-action inapplicable, as the processes of moving and delivering are both triggered but neither of them should be in progress according to the combined invariant. Then, it may appear tempting to dismiss invariants in favor of additional preconditions modeling mutex locks, thus ensuring that atoms affected by a macro-action are not accessed by other concurrent actions. While this approach rules out any interferences, it is also disruptive in the sense that plans get partitioned into episodes: a macro-action takes exclusive control of its mutex atoms, and only before starting or after ending the macro-action, other actions may again access the mutex atoms (in parallel). To see this, consider a macro-action of moving to the sink and washing plates, requiring some dirty plates to be on hold, and a second macro-action that consists of collecting dirty plates from the table and carrying them to the sink. Then, if the precondition or effect, respectively, on the availability of dirty plates were mutually exclusive, it would rule out that one robot brings dirty plates from the table while another is washing at the sink, which imposes a too severe restriction.

These considerations lead us to the question how a sequence of durative actions can be turned into a sequential macro to be used for temporal planning (in place of its constituent actions), so that the resulting plan guarantees the sequential applicability of the original actions but does not suppress other concurrent actions unnecessarily. Adhering to these design objectives, the principal steps of our construction of macro-actions are outlined in Figure 1:

1. Definition 1 specifies how the sequential execution of two actions,  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ , is mapped to a macro-action  $a = a_1 \circ a_2$ , where the internal structure incorporating the ending event for  $a_1$ , the starting event for  $a_2$ , as well as the invariants  $pre^H(a_1)$  and  $pre^H(a_2)$  requires particular attention. In case some literal  $\ell$  needs to be excluded from the effects of events taking place within the duration of the macro-action  $a$ , we introduce a mutex atom  $x_\ell$  in the set  $x(a)$  associated with  $a$ , which extends the corresponding set  $x(a_2)$  for  $a_2$ . This inductive accumulation of mutex atoms accommodates the right-associative

ways clear from the context, we skip annotations for  $\mathcal{P}$  when writing  $t[i]$ ,  $s[i]$ ,  $E[i]$ , and  $\iota(t)$  to refer to time stamps, states, scheduled effects, or sequence positions of time-stamped states  $P[i]$  for  $\mathcal{P}$ .

<sup>1</sup>For simplicity of notations and as the considered plan  $\mathcal{P}$  is al-




Figure 1: Outline of the composition and refinement of macro-actions, augmented with mutex atoms for sound temporal planning.

chaining of macro-action composition steps, starting from  $x(a_2) = \emptyset$  for an ordinary action  $a_2$ .

2. After composing macro-actions  $a$  and gathering their associated mutex atoms  $x(a)$ , Definition 2 incorporates mutex atoms into the preconditions and effects of effect-safe (macro-)actions  $a^x$ . The main idea is that the precondition of any event is augmented with  $x_\ell$  for corresponding effects  $\ell$  that must not apply during some macro-action  $a$ . Such an effect-safe macro-action  $a^x$  in turn falsifies  $x_\ell$  at the start and re-enables it at the end, thus suppressing undesired effects of events and also ruling out interferences with (other) macro-actions whose associated mutex atoms include  $x_v$  or  $x_{\neg v}$  for  $\ell \in \{v, \neg v\}$ . The latter restriction on the concurrent applicability of macro-actions guarantees that mutex atoms are neither manipulated in uncontrolled ways nor that unfolding macro-actions into their constituent actions risks the release of undesired effects.
3. Given a solution for a planning task built from effect-safe (macro-)actions, Definition 3 formalizes how a time-stamped macro-action  $(t, a)$  with  $a = a_1 \circ a_2$  is unfolded into the sequence of  $(t_1, a_1)$  and  $(t_2, a_2)$  to obtain a refined plan. The introduced time stamps  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are chosen such that  $t_1 < t$ ,  $t_1 + dur(a_1) < t_2$ , and  $t_2 + dur(a_2) < t + dur(a)$ , where no other starting or ending event takes place in-between  $t_1$  and  $t$ ,  $t_1 + dur(a_1)$  and  $t_2$ , or  $t_2 + dur(a_2)$  and  $t + dur(a)$ , respectively. That is, the starting event for  $a_1$  (or ending event for  $a_2$ ) replaces the starting event for  $a$  (or ending event for  $a$ ), and the start of  $a_2$  directly succeeds the end of  $a_1$  in the refined plan. The property that stepwise refinement preserves solutions is stated by Theorem 1, and Corollary 1 concludes that all possible orders of refinement steps lead to a similar solution in terms of ordinary (time-stamped) actions.

Our macro-action concept combines preconditions and effects at the start and end of composed actions as well as their invariants in a fine-grained way, based on the idea of incorporating invariants if they do not spoil the applicability of a macro-action, or to gather mutex atoms on literals otherwise.

**Definition 1.** For two actions  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ , let  $pre^1 = pre^{\text{H}}(a_1) \cup pre^{\neg}(a_1)$ ,  $pre^2 = pre^{\text{H}}(a_2) \cup pre^{\neg}(a_2)$ ,

$add^1 = add^{\text{H}}(a_1) \cup add^{\neg}(a_1)$ ,  $del^1 = del^{\text{H}}(a_1) \cup del^{\neg}(a_1)$ ,  $add^{12} = add^{\text{H}}(a_1) \cup add^{\text{H}}(a_2)$ ,  $del^{12} = del^{\text{H}}(a_1) \cup del^{\text{H}}(a_2)$ , and  $del^2 = del^{\text{H}}(a_2) \cup del^{\neg}(a_2)$  abbreviate particular unions of preconditions or positive and negative effects of  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ . We define the duration, preconditions, and effects of the right-associative composition of  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  into the macro-action  $a = a_1 \circ a_2$  by:

1.  $dur(a) = dur(a_1) + dur(a_2)$  is the sum of the durations of  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ ;
2. the preconditions  $pre^{\text{H}}(a)$  at the start of  $a$  are the union of the following sets of atoms:
  - (a) the original preconditions  $pre^{\text{H}}(a_1)$  at the start of  $a_1$ ,
  - (b) the set  $pre^1 \cap del^{12} \setminus add^{\text{H}}(a_1)$  of preconditions during or at the end of  $a_1$  that get falsified by effects  $del^{12}$  and are not readily enabled by the start effects  $add^{\text{H}}(a_1)$ , and
  - (c) the set  $pre^+(a_2) \cap del^{\text{H}}(a_2) \setminus add^1$  of preconditions at the start of  $a_2$  that get falsified by the start effects  $del^{\text{H}}(a_2)$  and are not enabled by effects  $add^1$  of  $a_1$ ;
3. the invariants  $pre^{\text{H}}(a)$  during the macro-action  $a$  are the union of the following sets of atoms:
  - (a) the set  $pre^1 \setminus (del^{12} \setminus del^{\text{H}}(a_1))$  of preconditions during or at the end of  $a_1$  that do not get falsified by effects  $del^{12}$  (and also not by  $del^{\text{H}}(a_1)$ , as  $del^{\text{H}}(a) \cap pre^{\text{H}}(a) \neq \emptyset$  leaves  $a = a_1 \circ a_2$  undefined otherwise),
  - (b) the set  $pre^+(a_2) \setminus (add^{\neg}(a_1) \cup (del^{\text{H}}(a_2) \setminus del^1))$  of preconditions at the start of  $a_2$  that are neither readily enabled by the end effects  $add^{\neg}(a_1)$  nor falsified by the start effects  $del^{\text{H}}(a_2)$  (but not by  $del^1$  as well, as such a situation yields  $del^{\text{H}}(a) \cap pre^{\text{H}}(a) \neq \emptyset$ , in which case  $a = a_1 \circ a_2$  is taken to be undefined), and
  - (c) the set  $pre^{\text{H}}(a_2) \setminus add^{12}$  of invariants during  $a_2$  that are not enabled by effects  $add^{12}$ ;
4.  $pre^{\neg}(a) = pre^{\neg}(a_2) \setminus add^{12}$  contains original preconditions  $pre^{\neg}(a_2)$  at the end of  $a_2$  that are not enabled by effects  $add^{12}$ ;
5. the start effects  $eff^{\text{H}}(a)$  of  $a$  are the union of the following sets of literals:
  - (a) the set  $eff^{\text{H}}(a_1) \setminus del^{12}$  of original start effects of  $a_1$  that do not get falsified by effects  $del^{12}$ , and
  - (b) the set  $\{\neg v \mid v \in del^{12}\}$  of negative literals anticipating the falsification of atoms by effects  $del^{12}$ ;
6. the end effects  $eff^{\neg}(a)$  of  $a$  are the union of the following sets of literals:
  - (a) the original end effects  $eff^{\neg}(a_2)$  of  $a_2$ , and
  - (b) the set  $add^{12} \setminus del^2$  of atoms that are enabled by effects  $add^{12}$  and do not get falsified by effects  $del^2$ ;

provided that  $del^{\text{H}}(a) \cap pre^{\text{H}}(a) = \emptyset$  and  $pre^{\neg}(a_2) \cap del^{12} \setminus add^{\text{H}}(a_2) = \emptyset$  hold, while  $a = a_1 \circ a_2$  is undefined otherwise.




Figure 2: Description of two actions and the resulting macro. Literals below each action represent effects, while the literals above them provide preconditions (at the start, end, or during an action, as indicated by their positions). The mutex atoms of the macro are omitted for better readability.

If the macro-action  $a$  is defined, by

$$\begin{aligned}
 x(a) = \{ & x_{\neg v} \mid v \in ((add^{12} \setminus (add^+(a_2) \cup del^2)) \\
 & \cup (pre^1 \cap del^{12}) \\
 & \cup (pre^+(a_2) \cap del^+(a_2) \setminus add^+(a_1)) \\
 & \cup (pre^2 \cap add^{12})) \setminus pre^H(a)\} \\
 & \cup \{x_v \mid v \in del^{12}\} \cup x(a_2),
 \end{aligned}$$

we denote a set of *mutex atoms*  $x_v$  and  $x_{\neg v}$  associated with (the complements of) literals  $v$  and  $\neg v$  occurring in effects and preconditions of  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ , where we take  $x(a_2) = \emptyset$  as base case if  $a_2$  is not itself a macro-action defined as the composition of two actions.  $\square$

**Example 1.** To illustrate the composition of macro-actions, Figure 2 visualizes how two actions from a simple temporal domain are composed into a macro-action. The actions at the top involve an agent  $r$  capable of moving from a location  $l1$  to  $l2$  for picking up an object at location  $l2$ . (The syntax used for literals is inspired by PDDL, where *not* represents the logical connective  $\neg$ .) First observe that the macro-action displayed at the bottom of Figure 2 pulls the delete effects applied at the end of the *move* or at the start of the *get* action, i.e.,  $(not (free l2))$  and  $(not (empty r))$ , together with the original start effects of the *move* action. The positive end effect  $(at r l2)$  of the *move* action, however, joins  $(holding r)$  at the end of the composed macro-action.

Preconditions at the start of the macro-action include the original  $(at r l1)$  atom from *move* together with  $(free l2)$  and  $(empty r)$  required at the end of *move* or at the start of *get*, respectively. The reason for not turning the latter two atoms into invariants required throughout the macro-action is that their negative literals occur as new start effects, so that invariants would render the macro-action inapplicable. Moreover, the precondition and invariant  $(at r l2)$  of *get* is not taken as a precondition or invariant of the macro-action since it is enabled by the end effect of *move*, which is now postponed to the end of the macro-action. Hence, it would

be overcautious to insist on the truth of  $(at r l2)$  at the start or during the entire macro-action. In fact, considering that any other actions in the domain will hardly admit  $(at r l1)$ , which is a precondition at the start, and  $(at r l2)$  to hold simultaneously, turning the latter into a precondition or invariant would most likely yield an (unnoticed) inapplicable macro-action.  $\square$

In general, the idea of Definition 1 is to forward delete effects  $del^-(a_1) \cup del^-(a_2)$  ( $(not (free l2))$  and  $(not (empty r))$  in Example 1) from the ending event for  $a_1$  or the starting event for  $a_2$  to the start of the composed macro-action  $a = a_1 \circ a_2$ . In this way, the preconditions of other actions can right from the start not build on atoms getting falsified in the course of the macro-action. Similarly, the add effects  $add^-(a_1) \cup add^-(a_2)$  ( $(at r l2)$  in Example 1), which may enable preconditions of other actions, are postponed to the end of the macro-action (unless they get canceled by subsequently occurring delete effects  $del^-(a_2)$  and  $del^-(a_1)$ ). Taken together, the early application of delete effects and postponement of add effects, which would originally arise at some point during the macro-action, prevent that other actions building on the volatile atoms are applied.

Concerning the preconditions of the macro-action  $a$ ,  $pre^-(a)$  at the end consists of the atoms in  $pre^-(a_2)$  that are not enabled by the add effects  $add^-(a_1) \cup add^-(a_2)$  during the macro-action. Note that atoms in  $add^-(a_2)$  may also belong to the delete effects  $del^-(a_1)$ , in which case they are included in  $del^-(a)$  at the start of  $a$  and listing them among the preconditions  $pre^-(a)$  at the end would render  $a$  inapplicable. For the same reason, atoms of the invariant  $pre^H(a_2)$  that get enabled by  $add^-(a_1) \cup add^-(a_2)$  during  $a$  are not required as invariants in  $pre^H(a)$  for not (unnecessarily) compromising the applicability of  $a$ . Atoms of the invariant  $pre^H(a_1)$  as well as the preconditions  $pre^-(a_1)$  and  $pre^-(a_2)$  during  $a$  are taken as invariants in  $pre^H(a)$  only if they are not falsified by subsequent delete effects in  $del^-(a_1)$  or  $del^-(a_2)$ . Otherwise, such atoms ( $(free l2)$  and  $(empty r)$  in Example 1) augment the original preconditions  $pre^-(a_1)$  at the start of  $a_1$  in  $pre^-(a)$  (unless they get readily enabled by add effects  $add^-(a_1)$  and  $add^-(a_1)$ , as with  $(at r l2)$  in Example 1). While the composition of  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  into  $a = a_1 \circ a_2$  aims at restricting the preconditions  $pre^-(a)$ ,  $pre^H(a)$ , and  $pre^-(a)$  to necessary parts, it can happen that  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are incompatible in the sense that delete effects undo required preconditions, and checking that  $del^-(a) \cap pre^H(a) = \emptyset$  as well as  $pre^-(a_2) \cap (del^-(a_1) \cup del^-(a_2)) \setminus add^-(a_2) = \emptyset$  in Definition 1 excludes the composition of incompatible actions.

Although the specific delete effects in Example 1 do not permit taking atoms as invariants of the composed macro-action  $a = a_1 \circ a_2$ , it would be the first choice for, e.g.,  $(empty r)$  from  $pre^-(a_2)$  if it were not also included in  $del^-(a_2)$ . If this choice cannot be made for an atom  $v$  of interest, as in Example 1, a mutex atom  $x_{\neg v}$  is collected in  $x(a)$  to express that any delete effects on  $v$  need to be rejected as long as the macro-action  $a$  is in progress.

The respective cases in Definition 1 cover all atoms from the preconditions  $pre^H(a_1)$ ,  $pre^-(a_1)$ , and  $pre^-(a_2)$  subject to subsequent delete effects, atoms from  $pre^H(a_2)$  and  $pre^-(a_2)$  getting enabled in the course of the macro-action  $a$ , as well as postponed effects from  $add^-(a_1)$  and  $add^-(a_2)$  that are not to be canceled before the ending event for  $a$  (unless any of these atoms belongs to the invariants of  $a$  by Definition 1). Additional mutex atoms of the form  $x_v$  are included in  $x(a)$  for delete effects  $del^-(a_1) \cup del^-(a_2)$  occurring during  $a$ . They signal that add effects on  $v$  must be rejected to prevent concurrent actions building on atoms that get falsified during  $a$ . The mutex atoms associated with macro-actions are then used to model mutex locks.

**Definition 2.** For a planning task  $\mathcal{T} = (V, A, s_0, s_*)$ , let  $X = \bigcup_{a \in A} x(a)$  such that  $X \cap V = \emptyset$  be the set of mutex atoms for (macro-)actions  $a \in A$ . We define the *effect-safe task*  $\mathcal{T}^x = (V^x, A^x, s_0^x, s_*)$  for  $\mathcal{T}$  by:

1.  $V^x = V \cup X$ ;
2.  $A^x = \{a^x \mid a \in A\}$  with
  - (a)  $dur(a^x) = dur(a)$ ,
  - (b)  $pre^-(a^x) = pre^-(a) \cup x(a)$   
 $\cup \{x_v \in X \mid x_{\neg v} \in x(a)\} \cup \{x_\ell \in X \mid \ell \in eff^+(a)\}$ ,
  - (c)  $pre^H(a^x) = pre^H(a)$ ,
  - (d)  $pre^-(a^x) = pre^-(a) \cup \{x_\ell \in X \setminus x(a) \mid \ell \in eff^-(a)\}$ ,
  - (e)  $eff^+(a^x) = eff^+(a) \cup \{\neg x_\ell \mid x_\ell \in x(a)\}$ , and
  - (f)  $eff^-(a^x) = eff^-(a) \cup x(a)$ ;
3.  $s_0^x = s_0 \cup X$ .

If  $\mathcal{P}^x$  is a solution for  $\mathcal{T}^x$ , we call  $\mathcal{P} = \{(t, a) \mid (t, a^x) \in \mathcal{P}^x\}$  the *base plan* of  $\mathcal{P}^x$ .  $\square$

**Example 2.** Continuing Example 1, the mutex atoms (omitted in Figure 2 for better readability) associated with the composed *move* and *get* macro-action are  $x_{(not\ (free\ l2))}$ ,  $x_{(not\ (empty\ r))}$ ,  $x_{(not\ (at\ r\ l2))}$ ,  $x_{(free\ l2)}$ , and  $x_{(empty\ r)}$ . In the *not* cases, they result from preconditions at the end of *move* and at the start of or during *get* that are canceled by subsequent delete effects or enabled during the macro-action, respectively. On the other hand,  $x_{(free\ l2)}$  and  $x_{(empty\ r)}$  stem from the delete effects at the end of *move* and at the start of *get*.

The effect-safe version of the macro-action includes the above mutex atoms as well as  $x_{(at\ r\ l2)}$ ,  $x_{(free\ l1)}$ , and  $x_{(not\ (at\ r\ l1))}$  as additional preconditions at the start (provided that the latter show up among the mutex atoms associated with other macro-actions composed for the domain) to rule out any interferences with other macro-actions on start effects or the original atoms  $v$  occurring as  $x_v$  or  $x_{\neg v}$  among mutex atoms. When the macro-action composed from *move* and *get* is applied, its associated mutex atoms are set to false at the start in order to reject undesired effects of other actions, i.e., effects falsifying some required precondition or enabling an atom falsified during the macro-action (too early). These mutex locks get released again at the end of the macro-action, where  $x_{(at\ r\ l2)}$  and  $x_{(holding\ r)}$  for the end effects (*at r l2*) and (*holding r*) constitute preconditions (in case any other macro-actions have them as associated mutex

atoms). Importantly, if either of these atoms were among the mutex atoms associated with the macro-action itself, it would not be taken as a precondition for the ending event; e.g., if  $(not\ (holding\ r))$  were an effect at the start of the *get* action,  $x_{(holding\ r)}$  would be included in the mutex atoms, so that  $x_{(holding\ r)}$  is certainly false until the end of the macro-action due to the modeled mutex lock.  $\square$

When several actions are to be chained into a composite macro-action, we suppose that Definition 1 is applied from right to left, i.e., that the macro-action is successively composed from the end. The reason is that the internal structure of a macro is hidden to the outside, and further precaution would be needed if a macro-action were extended on to later actions in a sequence. To see this, consider three actions  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ , and  $a_3$  such that an atom  $v$  belongs to the delete effects  $del^-(a_1)$  as well as the preconditions  $pre^-(a_3)$  at the end of  $a_3$ . Then, checking whether  $pre^-(a_3) \cap del^-(a_1) \setminus add^-(a_2 \circ a_3) = \emptyset$  according to Definition 1 discards the macro-action composition  $a_1 \circ (a_2 \circ a_3)$ , while  $v$  is forwarded to the delete effects  $del^-(a)$  at the start of  $a = a_1 \circ a_2$  otherwise. In this case, the applicability conditions in Definition 1 are too simplistic to detect that  $v$  cannot hold at the end of  $a \circ a_3$ , considering that effects enabling  $v$  are rejected by falsifying  $x_v$  at the start of  $a^x$ .

Since the preconditions and effects on the mutex atoms  $x(a)$  for macro-actions  $a$  put additional restrictions on their concurrent applicability, any solution for an effect-safe task is also guaranteed to yield a solution for the original planning task, while the converse does not hold in general.

**Proposition 1.** Let  $\mathcal{T} = (V, A, s_0, s_*)$  be a planning task, and  $\mathcal{P}^x$  be a solution for the effect-safe task  $\mathcal{T}^x = (V^x, A^x, s_0^x, s_*)$ . Then, the base plan  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  is a solution for  $\mathcal{T}$ .  $\square$

*Proof.* The preservation of plan consistency when turning  $\mathcal{P}^x$  into  $\mathcal{P} = \{(t, a) \mid (t, a^x) \in \mathcal{P}^x\}$  and the correspondence of time-stamped states on the atoms of  $V$  directly follow from Definition 2, given that  $s_0^x \cap V = s_0$  and  $pre^-(a^x) \cap V = pre^-(a)$ ,  $pre^H(a^x) = pre^H(a)$ ,  $pre^-(a^x) \cap V = pre^-(a)$ ,  $eff^+(a^x) \cap V = eff^+(a)$ , and  $eff^-(a^x) \cap V = eff^-(a)$  for each action  $a^x \in A^x$ .  $\square$

**Example 3.** Consider a macro-action  $a_0 = a_1 \circ a_2$  such that  $v_1 \in del^-(a_1) \cap pre^-(a_2)$ ,  $v_2 \in del^-(a_1)$ , and  $v_3 \in add^-(a_2)$ . Then, the mutex atom  $x_{v_2}$  is included in  $del^-(a_0^x)$  to reject volatile add effects on  $v_2$  during the effect-safe version of  $a_0$ . Hence, the starting (or ending) event for any action  $a$  with  $\{v_1, v_2\} \subseteq add^-(a)$  and  $x_{v_2} \in pre^-(a^x)$  (or  $\{v_1, v_2\} \subseteq add^-(a)$  and  $x_{v_2} \in pre^-(a^x)$ ) cannot take place in-between the start and end of  $a_0^x$ . As a consequence, there is no solution for the effect-safe task  $\mathcal{T}^x = (\{v_1, v_2, v_3\} \cup \{x_{v_2}\}, \{a_0^x, a^x\}, \{x_{v_2}\}, \{v_3\})$ , while  $\mathcal{T} = (\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}, \{a_0, a\}, \emptyset, \{v_3\})$  admits solutions such that  $a$  starts (or ends) within the duration of  $a_0$ .  $\square$

Example 3 shows that the replacement of ordinary actions by macro-actions, as performed in Section 4 to increase the scalability of temporal planning, needs to be done with care,

as it depends on the domain at hand whether a stricter effect-safe task suppresses interactions between concurrent actions that are crucial for the satisfiability of a planning task. However, if a solution for an effect-safe task exists, it can be refined by unfolding the contained macro-actions  $a = a_1 \circ a_2$  into sequential applications of  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  such that the ending event for  $a_1$  directly precedes the starting event for  $a_2$ , thus reproducing the sequence of events anticipated in the composition of  $a$ .

**Definition 3.** For a solution  $\mathcal{P}^x$  for an effect-safe task  $\mathcal{T}^x = (V^x, A^x, s_0^x, s_*^x)$ , we define the base plan  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  as a *refined plan* of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  for the planning task  $\mathcal{T} = (V, \{a \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}\}, s_0, s_*)$ . If  $\mathcal{P}^0$  with  $(t_0, a_0) \in \mathcal{P}^0$  for a macro-action  $a_0 = a_1 \circ a_2$  is a refined plan of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  for the planning task  $\mathcal{T}^0 = (V, \{a \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}^0\}, s_0, s_*)$ , then we define  $\mathcal{P} = \{(t_1, a_1), (t_2, a_2)\} \cup \mathcal{P}^0 \setminus \{(t_0, a_0)\}$  such that

$$\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}^0}(t_0, a_0) = \min \left( \bigcup_{0 \leq i < 2|\mathcal{P}^0|} (\{t_0 - t[i] \mid t[i] < t_0\} \cup \{t_0 + dur(a_1) - t[i] \mid t[i] < t_0 + dur(a_1)\} \cup \{t_0 + dur(a_0) - t[i] \mid t[i] < t_0 + dur(a_0)\}) \right),$$

$t_0 - \varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}^0}(t_0, a_0) < t_1 < t_0$ , and  $t_1 + dur(a_1) < t_2 < t_0 + dur(a_1)$  as a *refined plan* of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  for the planning task  $\mathcal{T} = (V, \{a \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}\}, s_0, s_*)$ .  $\square$

Our main result on refined plans, obtained by unfolding macro-actions into sequences of their constituents, is that they are guaranteed to be solutions. Hence, an effect-safe task allows for performing temporal planning at the level of macro-actions, and then the original actions can be put back without revising and possibly discarding the resulting plan.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $\mathcal{P}^x$  be a solution for an effect-safe task  $\mathcal{T}^x = (V^x, A^x, s_0^x, s_*^x)$ . Then, any refined plan  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  for  $\mathcal{T} = (V, \{a \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}\}, s_0, s_*)$  is a solution for  $\mathcal{T}$ .  $\square$

*Proof.* For any refined plan  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  for the planning task  $\mathcal{T} = (V, \{a \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}\}, s_0, s_*)$ , an atom  $v \in V$ , and time stamps  $\{t_1, t_2\} \subseteq \{t[i] \mid 1 \leq i \leq 2|\mathcal{P}|\}$  with  $t_1 \leq t_2$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{\mathcal{P}}^v(t_1, t_2) = & \min \left( \{t[2|\mathcal{P}|\}\right) \\ & \cup \{t + dur(a) \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}, t + dur(a) < t_1, \\ & \quad v \in add^-(a) \cap \bigcap_{\iota(t+dur(a)) \leq i < \iota(t_2)} s[i], \\ & \quad \{(t_0, a_0) \in \mathcal{P} \mid x_v \in x(a_0), t_0 < t_2, \\ & \quad \quad t + dur(a) < t_0 + dur(a_0)\} = \emptyset\} \\ & \cup \{t \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}, t < t_1, \\ & \quad v \in add^+(a) \cap \bigcap_{\iota(t) \leq i < \iota(t_2)} s[i], \\ & \quad \{(t_0, a_0) \in \mathcal{P} \mid x_v \in x(a_0), t_0 < t_2, \\ & \quad \quad t < t_0 + dur(a_0)\} = \emptyset\} \\ & \cup \{0 \mid v \in \bigcap_{0 \leq i < \iota(t_2)} s[i], \\ & \quad \{(t_0, a_0) \in \mathcal{P} \mid x_v \in x(a_0), t_0 < t_2\} = \emptyset\} \end{aligned}$$

denote the least time stamp  $t$  smaller than  $t_1$  such that  $v$  remains true from  $s[\iota(t)]$  until  $s[\iota(t_2) - 1]$  and no macro-action  $a_0$  with  $x_v \in x(a_0)$  is in progress at any of these states (or the maximal time stamp at which some time-stamped action in  $\mathcal{P}$  ends in case no such time stamp  $t$  exists).

By Proposition 1, we have that the base plan  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  is a solution for the planning task  $\mathcal{T} = (V, A, s_0, s_*)$ . Moreover, for any time-stamped action  $(t, a) \in \mathcal{P}$ , the condition 5(b) in Definition 1 as well as 2(b), 2(d), and 2(e) in Definition 2 yield that

1.  $\theta_{\mathcal{P}}^v(t, t) < t$  for each  $v \in pre^+(a)$ ,
2.  $\theta_{\mathcal{P}}^v(t[\iota(t) + 1], t + dur(a)) \leq t$  for each  $v \in pre^{\text{H}}(a)$ , and
3.  $\theta_{\mathcal{P}}^v(t + dur(a), t + dur(a)) < t + dur(a)$  for each  $v \in pre^-(a)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{P}^0$  be a refined plan of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  for the planning task  $\mathcal{T}^0 = (V, \{a \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}^0\}, s_0, s_*)$  such that  $\mathcal{P}^0$  is a solution for  $\mathcal{T}^0$  with  $(t_0, a_0) \in \mathcal{P}^0$  for a macro-action  $a_0 = a_1 \circ a_2$ . Assume that, for any time-stamped action  $(t, a) \in \mathcal{P}^0$ , we have that

1.  $\theta_{\mathcal{P}^0}^v(t, t) < t$  for each  $v \in pre^+(a)$ ,
2.  $\theta_{\mathcal{P}^0}^v(t[\iota(t) + 1], t + dur(a)) \leq t$  for each  $v \in pre^{\text{H}}(a)$ , and
3.  $\theta_{\mathcal{P}^0}^v(t + dur(a), t + dur(a)) < t + dur(a)$  for each  $v \in pre^-(a)$ .

Pick some time stamps  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  such that  $t_0 - \varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}^0}(t_0, a_0) < t_1 < t_0$  and  $t_1 + dur(a_1) < t_2 < t_0 + dur(a_1)$ , and consider the refined plan  $\mathcal{P} = \{(t_1, a_1), (t_2, a_2)\} \cup \mathcal{P}^0 \setminus \{(t_0, a_0)\}$  of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  for the planning task  $\mathcal{T} = (V, \{a \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}\}, s_0, s_*)$ .

Then, for any time-stamped action  $(t, a) \in \mathcal{P}^0 \setminus \{(t_0, a_0)\}$ ,  $x(a_0) \supseteq x(a_2)$  by Definition 1 implies that

1.  $\theta_{\mathcal{P}}^v(t, t) \leq \theta_{\mathcal{P}^0}^v(t, t) < t$  for each  $v \in pre^+(a)$ ,
2.  $\theta_{\mathcal{P}}^v(t[\iota(t) + 1], t + dur(a)) \leq \theta_{\mathcal{P}^0}^v(t[\iota(t) + 1], t + dur(a)) \leq t$  for each  $v \in pre^{\text{H}}(a)$ , and
3.  $\theta_{\mathcal{P}}^v(t + dur(a), t + dur(a)) \leq \theta_{\mathcal{P}^0}^v(t + dur(a), t + dur(a)) < t + dur(a)$  for each  $v \in pre^-(a)$ .

Moreover, the condition 2(a) in Definition 1 guarantees that

$$\theta_{\mathcal{P}}^v(t_1, t_1) = \theta_{\mathcal{P}^0}^v(t_0, t_0) < t_1 \quad (1)$$

for each  $v \in pre^+(a_1)$ . By the conditions 3(a) and 3(b) in Definition 1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & (pre^{\text{H}}(a_1) \cup pre^-(a_1) \cup \\ & (pre^+(a_2) \setminus add^-(a_1))) \setminus pre^{\text{H}}(a_0) \subseteq \\ & (pre^+(a_0) \cup add^+(a_1)) \cap \{v \in V \mid x_{-v} \in x(a_0)\}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta_{\mathcal{P}}^v(t[\iota(t_1) + 1], t_1 + dur(a_1)) \in \\ & \{\theta_{\mathcal{P}^0}^v(t[\iota(t_0) + 1], t_0 + dur(a_0)), \theta_{\mathcal{P}^0}^v(t_0, t_0), t_1\} \setminus \\ & \{t[2|\mathcal{P}^0|\}\} \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

for each  $v \in pre^{\text{H}}(a_1) \cup pre^-(a_1) \cup (pre^+(a_2) \setminus add^-(a_1))$ , and

$$\theta_{\mathcal{P}}^v(t_2, t_2) \in \{\theta_{\mathcal{P}^0}^v(t, t), t_1, t_1 + dur(a_1)\} \setminus \{t[2|\mathcal{P}^0|\}\} \quad (3)$$

for

$$t = t[\min(\{1 \leq i \leq 2|\mathcal{P}^0|\mid t_0 + dur(a_1) \leq t[i]\})] \quad (4)$$

and each  $v \in pre^+(a_2)$ . Finally, the conditions 3(c) and 4 in Definition 1 yield that

$$\begin{aligned} & (pre^{\text{H}}(a_2) \cup (pre^-(a_2) \setminus pre^-(a_0))) \setminus pre^{\text{H}}(a_0) \subseteq \\ & (add^+(a_2) \cup add^-(a_1) \setminus del^+(a_2)) \cap \\ & \{v \in V \mid x_{-v} \in x(a_0)\}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta_{\mathcal{P}}^v(t[\iota(t_2) + 1], t_2 + dur(a_2)) \in \\ & \{\theta_{\mathcal{P}^0}^v(t[\min(\{1 \leq i \leq 2|\mathcal{P}^0| \mid t_0 + dur(a_1) \leq t[i]\})], \\ & \quad t_0 + dur(a_0)), t_2, t_1 + dur(a_1)\} \setminus \{t[2|\mathcal{P}^0|]\} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for each  $v \in pre^H(a_2) \cup (pre^{-1}(a_2) \setminus pre^{-1}(a_0))$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta_{\mathcal{P}}^v(t_2 + dur(a_2), t_2 + dur(a_2)) \in \\ & \{\theta_{\mathcal{P}^0}^v(t_0 + dur(a_0), t_0 + dur(a_0)), t_2, t_1 + dur(a_1)\} \setminus \\ & \quad \{t[2|\mathcal{P}^0|]\} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

for each  $v \in pre^{-1}(a_2)$ .

The conditions (1)–(6) show that  $\mathcal{P}$  is consistent and establish that the induction hypothesis holds for the refined plan  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\mathcal{P}^x$ . Moreover,  $s_* \subseteq s[\iota(\max(\{t + dur(a) \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}\}))]$  holds because  $s[\iota(t^x + dur(a^x))] \subseteq s[\iota(t' + dur(a'))]$  for each  $(t^x, a^x) \in \mathcal{P}^x$  and  $(t', a') \in \mathcal{P}$  such that  $t' = \max(\{t \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}, t + dur(a) \leq t^x + dur(a^x)\})$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** Let  $\mathcal{P}^x$  be a solution for an effect-safe task  $\mathcal{T}^x = (V^x, A^x, s_0^x, s_*^x)$ . Then, there is some refined plan  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  for  $\mathcal{T} = (V, \{a \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}\}, s_0, s_*)$  such that  $\mathcal{P}$  is a solution for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\{a \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}\}$  does not include any macro-action. Moreover, for any refined plan  $\mathcal{P}'$  of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  such that  $\{a \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}'\} \subseteq \{a \mid (t, a) \in \mathcal{P}\}$ , we have that  $|\mathcal{P}'| = |\mathcal{P}|$ , and for each  $1 \leq i \leq 2|\mathcal{P}|$ ,  $\mathcal{P}'[i]$  is a starting (or ending) event for  $a$  iff  $\mathcal{P}[i]$  is a starting (or ending) event for  $a$ .  $\square$

*Proof.* All refined plans  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  obtained from the base plan of  $\mathcal{P}^x$  by iteratively splitting time-stamped (macro-)actions  $(t_0, a_0)$  with  $a_0 = a_1 \circ a_2$  into  $(t_1, a_1)$  and  $(t_2, a_2)$  according to Definition 3 yield up to concrete time stamps identical sequences of time-stamped states and are by Theorem 1 solutions for  $\mathcal{T}$ .  $\square$

The crucial property guaranteed by solutions for an effect-safe task is that volatile preconditions and effects signaled by mutex atoms  $x_{\rightarrow v}$  or  $x_v$ , respectively, in  $x(a)$  cannot be manipulated in uncontrolled ways during a macro-action  $a$ . In particular, preconditions of concurrent actions must not rely on  $v$  when  $x_v$  indicates that the atom  $v$  gets falsified at some point within the duration of  $a$ . This does not necessitate  $v$  to stay excluded from add effects applying when macro-actions are unfolded, yet any such effect is not exploited to build and refine a baseline solution for the effect-safe task.

**Example 4.** Let  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  be macro-actions such that  $x_v \in x(a_1)$  and  $v \in add^{-1}(a_2)$ . Then, the ending event for  $a_2^x$  cannot be placed in-between the start and end of  $a_1^x$  in order to prevent that other actions build on the volatile atom  $v$ . However, when  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are unfolded into their constituent actions,  $v$  may well be included in add effects falling within the duration of  $a_1$ , where temporarily enabling  $v$  does not compromise the preconditions of any concurrent action.  $\square$

## 4 Evaluation

We evaluate the impact of sequential macro-actions on planning performance by applying three state-of-the-art planners to solve instances from four domains. The first domain consists of a PDDL encoding of the RoboCup Logistics League

(RCLL) along with the instance collection used by De Bortoli and Steinbauer-Wagner (2023) for assessing and comparing domain models with manually defined macros. In the RCLL domain, a team of three autonomous mobile robots cooperatively assembles products by interacting with production stations in a real-world environment. A characteristic property of the RCLL is that a robot can only perform one specific action at its current location before it has to move on. This makes the domain well-suited for macro-actions, as *move* actions can be merged with 17 different types of *interaction* actions (to accomplish some production subtask at a given location). The other three domains originate from the International Planning Competition (IPC) (Vallati, Chrupa, and McCluskey 2018): Road Traffic Accident Management (RTAM), Driverlog, and Satellite.

The RTAM domain (unlike RCLL and Driverlog) associates specific tasks with separate types of agents: ambulances, police cars, and tow trucks. Since some of these agents may have to perform more than one task at a given location, we opted for a different approach to compose macro-actions than used for RCLL. Instead of creating macro-actions by merging a *move* with an *interaction* action, some of the latter actions are taken together. More specifically, *first\_aid* and *load\_victim* (to an ambulance) form a macro-action, and a second one is constructed by combining *unload\_victim* and *deliver\_victim* (to a hospital).

In Driverlog, a number of drivers need to walk to the positions of trucks, get on board, and drive them between different locations in order to load and unload packages. Differently from RCLL, in this domain it may not be possible to reach every target location by performing a single *move* action. As a consequence, merging *move* with *interaction* actions and planning with the constructable macro-actions only risks to discard routes available in the original domain and may make problem instances infeasible. However, this issue can be resolved by connecting each pair of locations by a *move* action whose duration corresponds to a shortest path determined in a pre-processing step, so that every target location becomes reachable by means of a single *move*. Note that, for each plan based on this new domain, a corresponding plan for the original domain exists, and vice versa. For comparability, we perform our Driverlog experiments with the pre-processed domain incorporating shortest paths, which is also taken as basis for introducing macro-actions. The macro-action composition is, however, still more sophisticated than for RCLL because the possibility of performing several *load* and *unload* actions at the same location would induce an imbalance when merging them with *move* actions. Unlike that, the *walk* action of a driver can readily be merged with *board* as well as *disembark*, leading to the two macro-actions *walk\_board* and *disembark\_walk*, where the second one may be needed once at the end of a plan in order to bring drivers to their goal locations.<sup>2</sup>

The Satellite domain is rather simple by containing 5 ac-

<sup>2</sup>We encountered the imbalance between *move* actions for trucks and possible tasks to perform at a location, arising due to the specific packages included in instances, in our preliminary investigations, and did then only make limited use of shortest paths to build macros from *walk* actions. However, other ideas to compose

tions only: *turn\_to*, *calibrate*, *take\_image*, *switch\_on*, and *switch\_off*. The goals consist of taking pictures towards specific directions, after activating and calibrating the corresponding instruments. We here opt to use *turn\_to\_calibrate* and *turn\_to\_take\_image* as two macro-actions, considering that plans for the original domain frequently include these action pairs in sequence.

For each domain, the original actions composing the introduced macros are replaced by the macro-actions in order to improve the solving process, at the potential cost of losing optimality in case applying the ordinary actions off sequence permits plans to finish earlier. Our comparison includes three state-of-the-art planners: the popular Optic system (Benton, Coles, and Coles 2012), also serving as baseline planner at the IPC 2018 edition, as well as the Temporal Fast Downward (TFD) (Eyerich, Mattmüller, and Röger 2009) and YAHSP3 (Vidal 2014) planners, which achieved the runner-up and winner positions at the IPC 2014 edition (Vallati, Chrapa, and McCluskey 2018). The benchmark set consists of 50 instances for RCLL, 20 instances for both RTAM and Satellite, and 44 instances for Driverlog, where we run each planner for up to 15 minutes wall-clock time per instance on a PC equipped with an Intel Core i5 10300h CPU and 16 GB RAM under Ubuntu 18.04, using either the original or the macro-action domain. Notably, the composition of macro-actions as specified in Section 3 is automatically performed at the level of first-order PDDL domains by a Java tool we developed for this purpose.<sup>3</sup>

Figure 3 indicates the original domain by “Native” and the new one replacing some of the ordinary actions by “Macro”. The displayed metrics are Coverage, i.e., the ratio of instances for which some satisficing plan is obtained to the number of all instances in a domain, and average Relative Makespan, comparing the finishing time of best plans found in 15 minutes between the original domain and the one with macro-actions. That is, the Relative Makespan considers instances such that a planner found at least one solution for either version of the domain, where values greater than 1 express better plan quality for the domain with macros, or worse plan quality otherwise. In addition, we quantify the Relative Makespan deviance as an indicator of the plan quality differences due to the version of a domain, and greater values mean that the plan quality per instance varies significantly w.r.t. the (non-)use of macros.

As can be seen by surveying the 12 combinations of domains and planners in Figure 3, we achieve noticeable and relatively consistent improvements in the Coverage metric, as anticipated in view of the reduced combinatorics due to macro-actions. The Coverage improvements are particularly striking for Optic and TFD on the RCLL domain, where all ordinary actions of the native domain can be combined into macros that reduce the level of detail addressed in the planning process. With the YAHSP3 planner, some satisficing plan is obtained for each RCLL instance, regardless whether macros are used, and it is generally geared towards quickly finding some satisficing plan, which leads to a higher Cov-

erage than achieved by Optic and TFD. In four cases, concerning TFD on RTAM and Satellite as well as YAHSP3 on Satellite and Driverlog, the use of macro-actions yields lower Coverage. This observation shows that the effectiveness of introducing macros is relative to the planner as well as the domain under consideration, as replacing actions affects the planning process, e.g., pre-processing techniques and search heuristics. While TFD does not seem to benefit from replacing some but not all of the ordinary actions in a domain by macros, Optic consistently benefits and obtains plans for the same number of instances or more.

Although the introduction of macro-actions aims at improving the planning performance without taking the finishing time of (still) feasible plans into account, it can also be informative to check whether macro-actions allow planners to find better plans in the given time limit of 15 minutes per run. When inspecting the average Relative Makespan in Figure 3, where values greater than 1 indicate shorter finishing times for plans obtained with macro-actions, we observe that the plan quality improves for 3 combinations of domains and planners, and deteriorates for 8 of them, although they are often almost on par. Here it is apparent that all of the planners compute longer (or no) plans for the macro version of the RTAM domain, i.e., the average Relative Makespan lies below 1. Beyond that, TFD yields worse plan quality with macro-actions for the RCLL, Satellite and Driverlog domains, and the same applies to Optic on Satellite. We checked that, for TFD, such deterioration is mainly caused by the planner’s pre-processing phase, which becomes much more time-consuming when macro-actions are introduced. On the other hand, YAHSP3 manages to find plans of significantly better quality with macro-actions for two domains while being considerably worse in Driverlog, as also confirmed by the deviances taken over instances for which both the native and the macro domain lead to at least one solution. That is, in some cases the reduced combinatorics due to macro-actions yields not only more satisficing but also better quality of plans obtainable in limited solving time, while such outcomes can hardly be predicted and require experimentation with a specific planner and domain.

Our experiments have shown that enhancing domains with macro-actions can change the landscape of heuristic features, having an impact on the quality of solutions and how fast planners can find them. Summarizing the four investigated domains, the Coverage on the RTAM domain drops for TFD only, yet macro-actions deteriorate the Relative Makespan with YAHSP3 and Optic by a smaller or greater margin, respectively. We conjecture that the reason for this resides in a much larger number of ordinary actions that remain in comparison to those replaced by macros. As a consequence, performance gains due to reducing the number of actions may be outweighed by the overhead induced by the mutex atoms associated with macro-actions. The RCLL domain represents the opposite characteristic, as all ordinary actions of the native domain can be combined into macros, which simplifies the planning process. Hence, all compared planners benefit in terms of Coverage and find some solution for every instance, where YAHSP3 that obtains at least one solution per instance for either domain version also yields a

macro-actions may also take *move* actions for trucks into account.

<sup>3</sup><https://gitlab.com/mbortoli/temporalmacro>






Figure 3: For each combination of domain and planner, the chart displays the Coverage and average Relative Makespan over the instance set.

better Relative Makespan. The Satellite and Driverlog domains lie in-between the above two cases, and it depends on the particular planner and its solving techniques whether macros pay off (Optic) or the impact varies between domains (TFD and YAHSP3).

## 5 Related Work

Macro-actions are well-known in classical planning, starting with the STRIPS (Fikes and Nilsson 1971) and REFLECT (Dawson and Siklóssy 1977) systems in the 1970s. Classical planning systems may generate macro-actions in pre-processing or on the fly during the planning process. An example of the latter is the Marvin planner (Coles and Smith 2005; Coles and Smith 2007), which determines macro-actions in the course of a plateaux-escaping technique for the well-known FF planner (Hoffmann and Nebel 2001). The MACRO-FF planner (Botea et al. 2005) features two different pre-processing techniques to generate macros in classical planning, Component Abstraction (CA) and Solution (SOL): CA searches in the space of potential macros and identifies promising ones based on specific rules, while SOL extracts macros from sample plans by analyzing causal links between actions. Newton et al. (2007) propose a technique to learn planner-independent macro-actions by means of genetic algorithms. Hofmann, Niemueller, and Lakemeyer (2017) use Map Reduce to search through a plan database for macro-actions. Their work has recently been extended to support ADL features (Hofmann, Niemueller, and Lakemeyer 2020). Miura and Fukunaga (2017) present a technique to derive axioms reducing the number of (explicit) actions in the planning process. MUM (Chrupa, Vallati, and McCluskey 2014) is another system able to learn

macro-actions from sample plans such that the number of instances of learned macro-actions is minimized. Recent works (Chrupa and Vallati 2019; Chrupa and Vallati 2022) concern the generation of macro-actions by observing “critical sections” over “lockable” resources in action sequences.

In contrast to classical planning, very few works consider macro-actions in the context of temporal planning. Wullinger, Schmid, and Scholz (2008) present a technique to generate macro-actions out of partially overlapping temporal actions. Their macro-actions are, however, not guaranteed to be executable and must be filtered through a separate consistency check. To our knowledge, the most recent approach to define temporal macro-actions stems from a master thesis (Hansson 2018), where procedures for the construction of sequential and parallel macro-actions, with support for numeric fluents, are provided. The used model of durative actions deviates from PDDL 2.1 (Fox and Long 2003) by swapping the order of evaluating preconditions and applying effects at the end of actions. Concerning the (informally presented) macro-action construction, mutex locks are introduced in virtually all cases where internal events may change the values of fluents during a macro-action. This is different from our, less restrictive macro-action concept, which permits compatible effects of concurrent actions to fall within the duration of a macro-action. To illustrate the diverging ideas, consider the composition of two actions  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  with  $v_1 \in add^+(a_1)$ ,  $v_2 \in add^-(a_1) \cup add^+(a_2)$ , and  $v_3 \in pre^-(a_2)$  into a macro-action  $a_0 = a_1 \circ a_2$ , along with an ordinary action  $a$  such that  $v_1 \in pre^+(a)$ ,  $v_2 \in add^+(a) \cup add^-(a)$ , and  $v_3 \in add^-(a)$ . Then,  $a_0$  needs to start before  $a$  to enable the precondition  $v_1$ , while the end event for  $a$  in turn enables the precondition  $v_3$  re-

quired at the end of  $a_0$ . Such concurrent execution is admitted by our macro-action concept, as  $x_{\rightarrow v_2} \in x(a_0)$  only rejects a cancellation of the internal add effect on  $v_2$ . Unlike that, locking  $v_2$  by a mutex according to Hansson (2018) rules out that  $a_0$  and  $a$  are executed in parallel, so that neither the macro-action  $a_0$  nor the ordinary action  $a$  is applicable.

Macro-actions and abstractions also find application in languages and paradigms beyond PDDL. The Modular Action Description language (Lifschitz and Ren 2006) aims to create a database of general-purpose knowledge about actions, which can be referred to for defining a new specific action. Fadel (2002) presented a method to use complex actions as planning operators in the situation calculus, together with a compiler to generate the corresponding PDDL code. Gabaldon (2002) introduced the concept of Hierarchical Task Networks in the situation calculus by defining hierarchical complex actions in GonGolog. Moreover, Banihashemi, De Giacomo, and Lespérance (2017) define a general framework for agent abstraction, where high-level domains described in the situation calculus are mapped to ConGolog programs and low-level formulas.

## 6 Conclusion and Future Work

Temporal planning, which involves concurrent execution of actions and sharing of resources, allows for modeling and solving a variety of planning and scheduling tasks. However, the high computational complexity of temporal planning remains a notorious obstacle for its successful application to challenging target domains. A popular approach in classical planning to reduce combinatorics and boost the performance of the planning process is the introduction of macro-actions.

In this paper, we propose a general concept of sequential macro-actions for temporal planning that guarantees the applicability of plans. Sequential macro-actions are particularly advantageous in logistics domains, where it is common that the activities of agents follow specific patterns. Our experiments investigate the performance of three state-of-the-art planners on four domains (out of which three are logistics-related). For the majority of tested planners and domains, more satisficing plans and in some cases also better plan quality are obtained when frequent sequences of ordinary actions are encapsulated and replaced by a macro. In fact, while native domains always admit solutions that are at least as good as a plan with macro-actions, enhancing temporal domains by macro-actions can sometimes help to guide planners to suitable solutions in shorter solving time. This is particularly the case when the macro-actions subsume and replace a large portion of ordinary actions, which is not unlikely for logistics domains. However, our macro-action concept is not exclusive to logistics domains and can be applied to any temporal planning task, yet the substitution of ordinary actions by macro-actions needs to be done with care to preserve satisficing or optimal plans, respectively.

As a part of future work, we want to investigate methods to automatically detect suitable candidates for macro-actions in a given domain. Moreover, the formalization of further kinds of macro-actions in temporal planning, like parallel or, more generally, overlapping macro-actions and support for numeric fluents, constitutes an interesting future direction.

## Acknowledgements

M. De Bortoli and M. Gebser were funded by Kärntner Wirtschaftsförderungs Fonds (project no. 28472), cms electronics GmbH, FunderMax GmbH, Hirsch Armbänder GmbH, incubed IT GmbH, Infineon Technologies Austria AG, Isovolta AG, Kostwein Holding GmbH, and Privatstiftung Kärntner Sparkasse. L. Chrpa was funded by the Czech Science Foundation (project no. 23-05575S). M. De Bortoli’s and M. Gebser’s visit to CTU in Prague was funded by the OP VVV project no. EF15\_003/0000470 “Robotics 4 Industry 4.0” and by the Czech Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports under the Czech-Austrian Mobility programme (project no. 8J22AT003), respectively. L. Chrpa’s visits to University of Klagenfurt were funded by OeAD, Austria’s Agency for Education and Internationalisation (project no. CZ 15/2022).

## References

- Banihashemi, B.; De Giacomo, G.; and Lespérance, Y. 2017. Abstraction in situation calculus action theories. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 1048–1055. AAAI Press.
- Benton, J.; Coles, A.; and Coles, A. 2012. Temporal planning with preferences and time-dependent continuous costs. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 2–10. AAAI Press.
- Botea, A.; Enzenberger, M.; Müller, M.; and Schaeffer, J. 2005. Macro-FF: Improving AI planning with automatically learned macro-operators. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 24:581–621.
- Chrpa, L., and Vallati, M. 2019. Improving domain-independent planning via critical section macro-operators. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 7546–7553. AAAI Press.
- Chrpa, L., and Vallati, M. 2022. Planning with critical section macros: Theory and practice. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 74:691–732.
- Chrpa, L.; Vallati, M.; and McCluskey, T. L. 2014. MUM: A technique for maximising the utility of macro-operators by constrained generation and use. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 65–73. AAAI Press.
- Coles, A., and Smith, A. 2005. On the inference and management of macro-actions in forward-chaining planning. In *Proceedings of the UK Planning and Scheduling SIG*. University of Strathclyde.
- Coles, A., and Smith, A. 2007. Marvin: A heuristic search planner with online macro-action learning. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 28:119–156.
- Dawson, C., and Siklóssy, L. 1977. The role of preprocessing in problem solving systems. In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 465–471. William Kaufmann.
- De Bortoli, M., and Steinbauer-Wagner, G. 2023. Evaluating action-based temporal planners performance in the RoboCup logistics league. In *Proceedings of the RoboCup 2022*, 87–99. Springer.

- Eyerich, P.; Mattmüller, R.; and Röger, G. 2009. Using the context-enhanced additive heuristic for temporal and numeric planning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 130–137. AAAI Press.
- Fadel, R. 2002. Planning with complex actions. Master's thesis, Stanford University.
- Fikes, R., and Nilsson, N. 1971. STRIPS: A new approach to the application of theorem proving to problem solving. *Artificial Intelligence* 2(3/4):189–208.
- Fox, M., and Long, D. 2003. PDDL2.1: An extension to PDDL for expressing temporal planning domains. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 20:61–124.
- Gabalton, A. 2002. Programming hierarchical task networks in the situation calculus. In *Proceedings of the AIPS'02 Workshop on On-line Planning and Scheduling*.
- Hansson, E. 2018. Temporal task and motion plans: Planning and plan repair—Repairing temporal task and motion plans using replanning with temporal macro operators. Master's thesis, Linköping University.
- Hoffmann, J., and Nebel, B. 2001. The FF planning system: Fast plan generation through heuristic search. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 14:253–302.
- Hofmann, T.; Niemueller, T.; and Lakemeyer, G. 2017. Initial results on generating macro actions from a plan database for planning on autonomous mobile robots. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 498–503. AAAI Press.
- Hofmann, T.; Niemueller, T.; and Lakemeyer, G. 2020. Macro operator synthesis for ADL domains. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 761–768. IOS Press.
- Lifschitz, V., and Ren, W. 2006. A modular action description language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 853–859. AAAI Press.
- Miura, S., and Fukunaga, A. 2017. Automatic extraction of axioms for planning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 218–227. AAAI Press.
- Newton, M.; Levine, J.; Fox, M.; and Long, D. 2007. Learning macro-actions for arbitrary planners and domains. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, 256–263. AAAI Press.
- Vallati, M.; Chrapa, L.; and McCluskey, T. 2018. What you always wanted to know about the deterministic part of the international planning competition (IPC) 2014 (but were too afraid to ask). *The Knowledge Engineering Review* 33:e3.
- Vidal, V. 2014. YAHSP3 and YAHSP3-MT in the 8th International Planning Competition. In *Proceedings of the International Planning Competition*, 64–65.
- Wullinger, P.; Schmid, U.; and Scholz, U. 2008. Spanning the middle ground between classical and temporal planning. In *Workshop Planen und Konfigurieren*.