

Regression with respect to sensing actions and partial states

LE-CHI TUAN, CHITTA BARAL

Arizona State University

and

TRAN CAO SON

New Mexico State University

In this paper, we present a *state-based regression function* for planning domains where an agent does not have complete information and may have sensing actions. We consider binary domains and employ the 0-approximation [Son & Baral 2001] to define the regression function. In binary domains, the use of 0-approximation means using 3-valued states. Although planning using this approach is incomplete with respect to the full semantics, we adopt it to have a lower complexity. We prove the soundness and completeness of our regression formulation with respect to the definition of progression. More specifically, we show that (i) a plan obtained through regression for a planning problem is indeed a progression solution of that planning problem, and that (ii) for each plan found through progression, using regression one obtains that plan or an equivalent one. We then develop a conditional planner that utilizes our regression function. We prove the soundness and completeness of our planning algorithm and present experimental results with respect to several well known planning problems in the literature.

Categories and Subject Descriptors: I.2.4 [Artificial Intelligence]: Knowledge Representation Formalisms and Methods—*Representation Languages*; I.2.8 [Artificial Intelligence]: Problem Solving, Control Methods, and Search—*Plan execution, Formation, and Generation*

General Terms: Algorithms; Languages; Theory

Additional Key Words and Phrases: 0-Approximation, action language, completeness, incomplete domain, contingency planning, regression, sensing, soundness

1. INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

1.1 Introduction and Motivation

An important aspect in reasoning about actions and in characterizing the semantics of action description languages is to define a transition function encoding the transition between states due to actions. This transition function is often viewed as a

Author's address: Le-chi Tuan, Chitta Baral, Computer Science and Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287, USA. {lctuan,baral}@asu.edu

Tran Cao Son, Computer Science Department, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM 88003, USA. tson@cs.nmsu.edu

This is a revised and extended version of a paper accepted to The Nineteenth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI'04), San Jose, USA.

Permission to make digital/hard copy of all or part of this material without fee for personal or classroom use provided that the copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage, the ACM copyright/server notice, the title of the publication, and its date appear, and notice is given that copying is by permission of the ACM, Inc. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers, or to redistribute to lists requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

© 2018 ACM 1529-3785/2018/0700-0001 \$5.00

progression function in that it denotes the progression of the world by the execution of actions. The ‘opposite’ or ‘inverse’ of progression is referred to as *regression*.

Even for the simple case where we have only non-sensing actions and the progression transition function is deterministic, there are various formulations of regression. For example, consider the following. Let Φ be the progression transition function from actions and states to states. I.e., intuitively, $\Phi(a, s) = s'$ means that if the action a is executed in state s then the resulting state will be s' . One way to define a regression function Ψ_1 is to define it with respect to states. In that case $s \in \Psi_1(a, s')$ will mean that the state s' is reached if a is executed in s . Another way regression is defined is with respect to formulas. In that case $\Psi_2(a, f) = g$, where f and g are formulas, means that if a is executed in a state satisfying g then a state satisfying f will be reached.

For planning using heuristic search, often a different formulation of regression is given. Since most planning research is about goals that are conjunction of literals, regression is defined with respect to a set of literals and an action. In that case the conjunction of literals (often specifying the goal) denotes a set of states, one of which needs to be reached. This regression is slightly different from Ψ_2 as the intention is to regress to another set of literals (not an arbitrary formula), denoting a sub-goal.

With respect to the planning language STRIPS, where each action a has an add list $Add(a)$, a delete list $Del(a)$, and a precondition list $Prec(a)$, the progression function is defined as $Progress(s, a) = s + Add(a) - Del(a)$; and the regression function is defined as $Regress(conj, a) = conj + Prec(a) - Add(a)$, where $conj$ is a set of atoms. The relation between these two, formally proven in [Pednault 1986], shows the correctness of regression based planners; which in recent years through use of heuristics (e.g. [Bonet & Geffner 2001; Nguyen et al. 2002]) have done exceedingly well on planning competitions.

In this paper we are concerned with domains where the agent does not have complete information about the world, and may have sensing actions, which when executed do not change the world, but rather give certain information about the world to the agent. As a result, plans may now no longer be simply a sequence of (non-sensing) actions but may include sensing actions and conditionals. Various formalisms have been developed for such cases (e.g. [Lobo 1998; Son & Baral 2001]) and progression functions have been defined. Also, the complexity of planning in such cases has been analyzed in [Baral et al. 2000]. One approach to planning in the presence of incomplete information is conformant planning where no sensing action is used, and a plan is a sequence of actions leading to the goal from every possible initial situation. However, this approach proves inadequate for many planning problems [Son & Baral 2001], i.e., there are situations where sensing actions are necessary. In that case, one approach is to use belief states or Kripke models instead of states. It is shown that the total number of belief states is double exponential while the total number of 3-valued states is exponential in the number of fluents [Baral et al. 2000]. Here, we pursue a provably less complex formulation with sensing actions and use 3-valued states. In this approach, we will miss certain plans, but that is the price we are willing to pay for reduced complexity. This is consistent with and similar to the considerations behind conformant planning. With that tradeoff in

mind, *in this paper we consider the 0-approximation semantics defined in [Son & Baral 2001] and define regression with respect to that semantics.* We then formally relate our definition of regression with the earlier definition of progression in [Son & Baral 2001] and show that planning using our regression function will not only give us correct plans but also will not miss plans. We then use our regression function in planning with sensing actions and show that, even without using any heuristics, our planner produces very good results. To simplify our formulation, we only consider STRIPS like actions where no conditional effects are allowed.

In summary the main contributions of our paper are:

- A state-based regression function corresponding to the 0-approximation semantics in [Son & Baral 2001];
- A formal result showing the soundness of our regression function with respect to the progression transition function in [Son & Baral 2001];
- A formal result showing the completeness of our regression function with respect to the progression transition function in [Son & Baral 2001];
- An algorithm that uses these regression functions to construct conditional plans with sensing actions;
- Implementation of this algorithm; and
- Illustration of the performance of this algorithm with respect to several examples in the literature.

1.2 Related Work

Our work in this paper is related to different approaches to regression and planning in the presence of sensing actions and incomplete information. It differs from earlier notion of regression such as [Reiter 2001; Son & Baral 2001] in that our definition is with respect to states while the earlier definitions are with respect to formulas.

In the planning literature there has been a lot of work [Peot & Smith 1992; Cimatti et al. 1998; Etzioni et al. 1992; Lobo 1998; Son et al. 2004; Weld et al. 1998; Bonet & Geffner 2000; Pryor & Collins 1996; Rintanen 2000; 2002; Eiter et al. 2000] in developing planners that generate conditional plans in presence of incomplete information, some of which use sensing actions and the others do not. Unlike the conditional planners [Peot & Smith 1992; Cimatti et al. 1998], our planner can deal with sensing actions similar to the planners in [Etzioni et al. 1992; Lobo 1998; Son et al. 2004; Weld et al. 1998]. However, it does not deal with nondeterministic and probabilistic actions such as the planners in [Bonet & Geffner 2000; Pryor & Collins 1996; Rintanen 2000; 2002]. It is also not a conformant planner as in [Cimatti et al. 1998; Eiter et al. 2000]. For these reasons, we currently compare our planner with those of [Son et al. 2004; Weld et al. 1998].

2. BACKGROUND: 0-APPROXIMATION SEMANTICS FOR A STRIPS-LIKE LANGUAGE

2.1 Action and Plan Representation

We employ a STRIPS-like action representation [Fikes & Nilson 1971] and represent a planning problem by a tuple $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$ where A is a finite set of fluents, O

is a finite set of actions, and I and G are sets of fluent literals¹ made up of fluents in A . Intuitively, I encodes what is known about the initial state and G encodes what is desired of a goal state.

An action $a \in O$ is either a *non-sensing action* or a *sensing action* and is specified as follows:

- A non-sensing action a is specified by an expression of the form

action a :Pre Pre_a
 :Add Add_a
 :Del Del_a

where Pre_a is a set of fluent literals representing the precondition for a 's execution, Add_a and Del_a are two disjoint sets of positive fluents representing the positive and negative effects of a , respectively; and

- A sensing action a is specified by an expression of the form

action a :Pre Pre_a
 :Sense $Sens_a$

where Pre_a is a set of fluent literals and $Sens_a$ is a set of positive fluents that do not appear in Pre_a .

To illustrate the action representation and our search algorithm, we will use a small example, a version of the “Getting to Evanston” from [Weld et al. 1998]. Figure (1) shows the actions of this domain.

Non-sensing action: Name	:Pre	:Add	:Del
goto-western-at-belmont	{at-start}	{on-western, on-belmont}	{at-start}
take-belmont	{on-belmont, traffic-bad}	{on-ashland}	{on-western}
take-ashland	{on-ashland}	{at-evanston}	
take-western	{¬traffic-bad, on-western}	{at-evanston}	
Sensing action: Name	:Pre	:Sense	
check-traffic	\emptyset	{traffic-bad}	
check-on-western	\emptyset	{on-belmont}	

Fig. 1. Actions of the “Getting to Evanston” domain.

The notion of a plan in the presence of incomplete information and sensing actions has been extensively discussed in the literature [Scherl & Levesque 2003; Son & Baral 2001]. In this paper, we consider *conditional plans* that are formally defined as follows.

Definition 2.1 Conditional Plan.

- An empty sequence of actions, denoted by $[\]$, is a conditional plan.
- If a is a non-sensing action, then a is a conditional plan.
- If a is a sensing action, $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n$ are mutually exclusive conjunctions of fluent literals, and c_1, \dots, c_n are conditional plans, then

$$a; \text{case}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow c_1, \dots, \varphi_n \rightarrow c_n)$$

is a conditional plan².

¹A fluent literal is either a positive fluent $f \in A$ or its negation (negative fluent) $\neg f$.

²We often refer to this type of conditional plan as *case plan*.

- if c_1, c_2 are conditional plans, then $c_1; c_2$ is a conditional plan.
- Nothing else is a conditional plan.

Intuitively, to execute a plan $a; \text{case}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow c_1, \dots, \varphi_n \rightarrow c_n)$, first a is executed. φ_i 's are then evaluated. If one of φ_i is true then c_i is executed. If none of φ_i is true then the plan fails. To execute a plan $c_1; c_2$, first c_1 is executed then c_2 is executed. In Section 2.2, we formally define the progression function Φ that encodes this intuition.

EXAMPLE 1 GETTING TO EVANSTON. *The following is a conditional plan:*

```

check_traffic;
case(
  traffic_bad →
    goto_western_at_belmont;
    take_belmont;
    take_ashland
  ¬traffic_bad →
    goto_western_at_belmont;
    take_western
)

```

□

2.2 0-Approximation

The 0-approximation in [Son & Baral 2001] is defined by a transition function Φ that maps pairs of actions and approximate states into sets of approximate states. We now present the necessary notions and basic definitions of 0-approximation as follows.

Basic definitions and notations:

- A-state: An *approximate state* (or a-state) is a pair $\langle T, F \rangle$ where $T \subseteq A$ and $F \subseteq A$ are two disjoint sets of fluents.
- True, false, unknown: Given an a-state $\sigma = \langle T, F \rangle$, T (resp. F), denoted by $\sigma.T$ (resp. $\sigma.F$), is the set of fluents which are true (resp. false) in σ ; and $A \setminus (T \cup F)$ is the set of fluents which are unknown in σ . Given a fluent f , we say that f is true (resp. false) in σ if $f \in T$ (resp. $f \in F$). f (resp. $\neg f$) holds in σ if f is true (resp. false) in σ . f is known (resp. unknown) in σ if $f \in (T \cup F)$ (resp. $f \notin (T \cup F)$). A set L of fluent literals holds in an a-state $\sigma = \langle T, F \rangle$ if every member of L holds in σ . A set X of fluents is known in σ if every fluent in X is known in σ . An action a is *executable* in σ if Pre_a holds in σ .
- Notations: Let $\sigma_1 = \langle T_1, F_1 \rangle$ and $\sigma_2 = \langle T_2, F_2 \rangle$ be two a-states.
 - (1) $\sigma_1 \cap \sigma_2 = \langle T_1 \cap T_2, F_1 \cap F_2 \rangle$ is called the intersection of σ_1 and σ_2 .
 - (2) We say σ_1 extends σ_2 , denoted by $\sigma_2 \preceq \sigma_1$ if $T_2 \subseteq T_1$ and $F_2 \subseteq F_1$. $\sigma_1 \setminus \sigma_2$ denotes the set $(T_1 \setminus T_2) \cup (F_1 \setminus F_2)$.
 - (3) For a set of fluents X , we write $X \setminus \langle T, F \rangle$ to denote $X \setminus (T \cup F)$. To simplify the presentation, for a set of literals L , by L^+ and L^- we denote the set of fluents $\{f \mid f \in L, f \text{ is a fluent}\}$ and $\{f \mid \neg f \in L, f \text{ is a fluent}\}$.

The transition function (for progression) is defined next.

Definition 2.2 Transition Function. For an a-state $\sigma = \langle T, F \rangle$ and an action a , $\Phi(a, \sigma)$ is defined as follows:

- if a is not executable in σ then $\Phi(a, \sigma) = \{\perp\}$; otherwise
- if a is a non-sensing action: $\Phi(a, \sigma) = \{\langle T \setminus Del_a \cup Add_a, F \setminus Add_a \cup Del_a \rangle\}$;
- if a is a sensing action: $\Phi(a, \sigma) = \{\sigma' \mid \sigma \preceq \sigma' \text{ and } Sens_a \setminus \sigma = \sigma' \setminus \sigma\}$.

The next example illustrates the above definition.

EXAMPLE 2 GETTING TO EVANSTON. Consider an a-state

$$\sigma = \langle \{at\text{-start}\}, \{on\text{-western}, on\text{-belmont}, on\text{-ashland}, at\text{-evanston}\} \rangle.$$

We have that `check_traffic` is executable in σ and

$$\Phi(\text{check_traffic}, \sigma) = \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$$

where:

$$\sigma_1 = \langle \{at\text{-start}, traffic\text{-bad}\}, \{on\text{-western}, on\text{-belmont}, on\text{-ashland}, at\text{-evanston}\} \rangle,$$

$$\sigma_2 = \langle \{at\text{-start}\}, \{traffic\text{-bad}, on\text{-western}, on\text{-belmont}, on\text{-ashland}, at\text{-evanston}\} \rangle.$$

Similarly,

$$\Phi(\text{goto_western_at_belmont}, \sigma) = \{\sigma_3\}$$

where: $\sigma_3 = \langle \{on\text{-western}, on\text{-belmont}\}, \{at\text{-start}, on\text{-ashland}, at\text{-evanston}\} \rangle$. \square

The function Φ can be extended to define the function Φ^* that maps each pair of a conditional plan p and a-states σ into a set of a-states, denoted by $\Phi^*(p, \sigma)$. Φ^* is defined similarly to Φ in [Son & Baral 2001].

Definition 2.3 Extended Transition Function. The extended transition function Φ^* is defined as follows:

- For an empty sequence of actions and an a-state σ : $\Phi^*([], \sigma) = \{\sigma\}$.
- For a non-sensing action a and an a-state σ : $\Phi^*(a, \sigma) = \Phi(a, \sigma)$.
- For a case plan $c = a; \text{case}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1, \dots, \varphi_n \rightarrow p_n)$ where a is a sensing action:

$$\Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \bigcup_{\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma)} E(\text{case}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1, \dots, \varphi_n \rightarrow p_n), \sigma')$$

where

$$E(\text{case}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1, \dots, \varphi_n \rightarrow p_n), \gamma) = \begin{cases} \Phi^*(p_j, \gamma), & \text{if } \varphi_j \text{ holds in } \gamma \text{ (} 1 \leq j \leq n \text{);} \\ \{\perp\}, & \text{if none of } \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n \text{ holds in } \gamma. \end{cases}$$

- For two conditional plans c_1 and c_2 : $\Phi^*(c_1; c_2, \sigma) = \bigcup_{\sigma' \in \Phi^*(c_1, \sigma)} \Phi^*(c_2, \sigma')$.
- For any conditional plan c : $\Phi^*(c, \perp) = \{\perp\}$.

Intuitively, $\Phi^*(c, \sigma)$ is the set of a-states resulting from the execution of c in σ .

Given a planning problem $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$, the a-state representing I is defined by $\sigma_I = \langle I^+, I^- \rangle$. $\Sigma_G = \{\sigma \mid \sigma_G \preceq \sigma\}$, where $\sigma_G = \langle G^+, G^- \rangle$, is the set of a-states satisfying the goal G . A *progression solution* to the planning problem P is a conditional plan c such that $\Phi^*(c, \sigma_I) \subseteq \Sigma_G$. Note that, since \perp is not a member of Σ_G , therefore $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma_I)$.

EXAMPLE 3 GETTING TO EVANSTON - CONT'D. Consider an initial state and goal states represented by the sets:

$$I = \{at_start, \neg on_western, \neg on_belmont, \neg on_ashland, \neg at_evanston\};$$

$$G = \{at_evanston\},$$

respectively. The following conditional plan (Example 1) is a progression solution:

```

check_traffic;
case(
  traffic_bad →
    goto_western_at_belmont;
    take_belmont;
    take_ashland
  ¬traffic_bad →
    goto_western_at_belmont;
    take_western
)

```

□

3. REGRESSION AND ITS RELATION WITH PROGRESSION

In this section, we will present our formalization of a regression function, denoted by *Regress*, and prove that it is both sound and complete with respect to the progression function Φ . *Regress* is a state based regression function that maps a pair of an action and a set of a-states into an a-state.

In our formulation, observe that given a plan p and an a-state σ , a goal G is satisfied after the execution of p in σ if G holds in *all* a-states belonging to $\Phi^*(p, \sigma)$, i.e., G holds in $\cap_{\sigma' \in \Phi^*(p, \sigma)} \sigma'$. This stipulates us to introduce the notion of a *partial state* (or p-state) as a pair $[T, F]$ where T and F are two disjoint sets of fluents. Intuitively, a p-state $\delta = [T, F]$ represents a collection of a-states which extends the a-state $\langle T, F \rangle$. We denote this set by $ext(\delta)$ and call it *the extension set* of δ . Formally, $ext(\delta) = \{\langle T', F' \rangle | T \subseteq T', F \subseteq F'\}$. A $\sigma' \in ext(\delta)$ is called an extension of δ . Given a p-state $\delta = [T, F]$, we say a partial state $\delta' = [T', F']$ is a partial extension of δ if $T \subseteq T', F \subseteq F'$.

The regression function will be defined separately for non-sensing actions and sensing actions. Since the application of a non-sensing action in an a-state results into a single a-state, the regression of a non-sensing action should be with respect to a p-state and result in a p-state. On the other hand, since the application of a sensing action in an a-state results in a set of a-states, the regression of a sensing action should be with respect to a set of p-states and result in a p-state. Besides the regression should be sound (i.e., plans obtained through regression must be plans based on the progression) and complete (i.e., for each plan based on progression, using regression one should obtain that plan or an equivalent one) with respect to progression. We will now formulate this notion precisely.

We adopt the use of the term “application” [Bonet & Geffner 2001] in formulating regression to distinguish from the use of “execution” in progression. To simplify the presentation, we define a partition of a set of fluents X as a pair (P, Q) such that $P \cap Q = \emptyset$ and $P \cup Q = X$. We begin with the applicability condition of non-sensing actions and then give the definition of the function *Regress* for non-sensing actions.

Definition 3.1 Applicability Condition - non-sensing action. Given a non-sensing action a and a p-state $\delta = [T, F]$. We say that a is *applicable* in δ if (i) $Add_a \cap T \neq \emptyset$ or $Del_a \cap F \neq \emptyset$, and (ii) $Add_a \cap F = \emptyset$, $Del_a \cap T = \emptyset$, $Pre_a^+ \cap F \subseteq Del_a$, and $Pre_a^- \cap T \subseteq Add_a$.

Intuitively, the applicability condition aforementioned is a *relevance* (item (i)) and *consistency* condition (item (ii)) for a . Item (i) is considered “relevant” as it makes sure that the effects of a will contribute to δ after execution. Item (ii) is considered “consistent” as it makes sure that the situation obtained by progressing a , from a situation yielded by regressing a from δ , will be consistent with δ .

The regression on a non-sensing action is defined next.

Definition 3.2 Regression - non-sensing action. Given a non-sensing action a and a p-state $\delta = [T, F]$,

- if a is not applicable in δ then $Regress(a, \delta) = \perp$;
- if a is applicable in δ then $Regress(a, \delta) = [T \setminus Add_a \cup Pre_a^+, F \setminus Del_a \cup Pre_a^-]$.

For later use, we extend the regression function $Regress$ for non-sensing actions over a set of p-states and define

$$Regress(a, \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}) = \{Regress(a, \delta_1), \dots, Regress(a, \delta_n)\}$$

where $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n$ are p-states and a is a non-sensing action.

EXAMPLE 4 GETTING TO EVANSTON - CON’T. *The actions `take_western` and `take_ashland` are applicable in $\delta = [\{at\text{-}evanston\}, \{\}].$*

$$Regress(\text{take_western}, \delta) = [\{on\text{-}western\}, \{traffic\text{-}bad\}], \text{ and}$$

$$Regress(\text{take_ashland}, \delta) = [\{on\text{-}ashland\}, \{\}]. \quad \square$$

We will now define $Regress$ for sensing actions. Recall that the execution of a sensing action a in an a-state σ requires that a is executable in σ and results in a set of a-states $\Phi(a, \sigma)$ whose member extends σ by the set of fluents in $s_a \subseteq Sens_a$ and every $f \in Sens_a \setminus s_a$ is known in σ . This leads to the following definitions.

Definition 3.3 Properness. Let a be a sensing action, $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}$ be a set of distinct p-states, and $\emptyset \neq X \subseteq Sens_a$ be a set of sensing fluents. We say that Δ is *proper* with respect to X if (i) $Sens_a$ is known in Δ ; (ii) $n = 2^{|X|}$; (iii) for every partition (P, Q) of X , there exists only one $\delta_i \in \Delta$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) such that $\delta_i.T \cap X = P$, $\delta_i.F \cap X = Q$; and (iv) for every $(1 \leq i \neq j \leq n)$, $\delta_i.T \setminus X = \delta_j.T \setminus X$, $\delta_i.F \setminus X = \delta_j.F \setminus X$. We call X as a *sensed set* of Δ with respect to a .

EXAMPLE 5 GETTING TO EVANSTON - CON’T. *Consider a set $\Delta_1 = \{\delta_1, \delta_2\}$ where $\delta_1 = [\{at\text{-}start, traffic\text{-}bad\}, \{on\text{-}western, on\text{-}belmont, on\text{-}ashland, at\text{-}evanston\}]$ and $\delta_2 = [\{at\text{-}start\}, \{traffic\text{-}bad, on\text{-}western, on\text{-}belmont, on\text{-}ashland, at\text{-}evanston\}].$*

We have that Δ_1 is proper with respect to $\{traffic\text{-}bad\}$. The set $\{traffic\text{-}bad\}$ is the sensed set of Δ_1 with respect to `check\text{-}traffic`.

Consider $\Delta_2 = \{\delta_1, \delta_3\}$ where $\delta_3 = [\{at\text{-}start\}, \{traffic\text{-}bad, at\text{-}evanston\}].$ We have that Δ_2 is not proper with respect to $\{traffic\text{-}bad\}$. \square

LEMMA 3.4 SENSED SET. *Consider a sensing action a and a set of p-states Δ . If there exists a sensed set of Δ with respect to a then it is unique.*

Proof: In Appendix.

Given a sensing action a and a set of p-states Δ , we denote $p(a, \Delta)$ as the unique sensed set of Δ with respect to a ; if there exists no sensed set with respect to a and Δ , we write $p(a, \Delta) = \perp$.

Definition 3.5 Strong Applicability Condition - sensing action. Let a be a sensing action and $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}$ be a set of p-states. We say that a is *strongly applicable* in Δ if (i) $p(a, \Delta) \neq \perp$; and (ii) $Pre_a^+ \cap \delta_i.F = \emptyset$ and $Pre_a^- \cap \delta_i.T = \emptyset$.

In the above definition, (i) corresponds to the fact that executing a sensing action a in an a-state σ results in a set of $2^{|p(a, \Delta)|}$ a-states that are represented by $2^{|p(a, \Delta)|}$ corresponding p-states of Δ where $p(a, \Delta)$ denotes the set of fluents that are not yet known, while $Sens_a \setminus p(a, \Delta)$ is already known when a is executed; (ii) guarantees that a must be executable prior to its execution.

Although this strong applicability condition guarantees the soundness of regression over sensing actions, it does not guarantee the completeness. We now provide a weaker applicability condition that guarantees both soundness and completeness of regression.

Definition 3.6. [Applicability Condition - sensing action] Let a be a sensing action and $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}$ be a set of p-states. We say that a is *applicable* in Δ if (i) there exists a set $\Delta' = \{\delta'_1, \dots, \delta'_n\}$, where δ'_i is a partial extension of δ_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$), such that a is strongly applicable in Δ' ; and (ii) $Sens_a$ is known in Δ .

LEMMA 3.7 UNIQUE SENSED SET. *Consider a sensing action a and a set of p-states Δ such that a is applicable in Δ . Let $\Delta' = \{\delta'_1, \dots, \delta'_n\}$, where δ'_i is a partial extension of δ_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$), $\Delta'' = \{\delta''_1, \dots, \delta''_n\}$, where δ''_i is a partial extension of δ_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$). If $p(a, \Delta') \neq \perp$ and $p(a, \Delta'') \neq \perp$ then $p(a, \Delta') = p(a, \Delta'')$.*

Proof: In Appendix.

Given a sensing action a and a set of p-states Δ . If there exists a $\Delta' = \{\delta'_1, \dots, \delta'_n\}$, where δ'_i is a partial extension of δ_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) such that $p(a, \Delta') \neq \perp$ then, by Lemma 3.7, $p(a, \Delta') = p(a, \Delta'')$ for all $\Delta'' = \{\delta''_1, \dots, \delta''_n\}$, where δ''_i is a partial extension of δ_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) and $p(a, \Delta'') \neq \perp$. We refer to the set $p(a, \Delta')$ by $S_{a, \Delta}$. If there exists no such $p(a, \Delta')$, we write $S_{a, \Delta} = \perp$. Note that, from Definition 3.6, if a is applicable in Δ then $S_{a, \Delta}$ is defined. In that case, we also often say that a is applicable in Δ with respect to $S_{a, \Delta}$ to make the applicability condition clearer from the context.

EXAMPLE 6 GETTING TO EVANSTON - CON'T. *Consider the set Δ_2 and the sensing action check-traffic in Example 5. We have that*

- (i) *check-traffic is not strongly applicable in Δ_2 (w.r.t traffic-bad), however,*
- (ii) *check-traffic is applicable in Δ_2 (w.r.t traffic-bad).*

Note that Δ_1 in Example 5 consists of partial extensions of p-states in Δ_2 , and check-traffic is strongly applicable in Δ_1 (with respect to traffic-bad). □

Definition 3.8 Regression - sensing action. Let a be a sensing action and $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}$ be a set of p-states.

- if a is not applicable in Δ then $Regress(a, \Delta) = \perp$; and

- if a is applicable in Δ

$$\text{Regress}(a, \Delta) = [(\bigcup_{i=1}^n \delta_i.T) \setminus S_{a,\Delta} \cup \text{Pre}_a^+, (\bigcup_{i=1}^n \delta_i.F) \setminus S_{a,\Delta} \cup \text{Pre}_a^-].$$

EXAMPLE 7 GETTING TO EVANSTON - CON'T. *check_traffic* is applicable in Δ_2 with respect to $\{\text{traffic_bad}\}$ (see Example 6) and we have

$$\text{Regress}(\text{check_traffic}, \Delta_2) = [\{\text{at_start}\}, \{\text{on_western}, \text{on_belmont}, \text{on_ashland}, \text{at_evanston}\}]. \quad \square$$

We now relate our regression function Regress with the progression function Φ .

3.1 Soundness Result




Fig. 2. Illustration of Proposition 3.9.

PROPOSITION 3.9 NON-SENSING ACTION. *Let δ and δ' be two p-states, and a be a non-sensing action. If $\text{Regress}(a, \delta) = \delta'$ and $\delta' \neq \perp$, then for every $\sigma'' \in \text{ext}(\delta')$ we have that (i) $\perp \notin \Phi(a, \sigma'')$, and (ii) $\Phi(a, \sigma'') \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$.*

Proof: In Appendix.

Intuitively, this proposition states that the regression of a non-sensing action in a p-state yields another p-state such that the execution of the action in any extension of the latter results in a subset of a-states belonging to the extension set of the former. This shows that Regress can be “reversed” for non-sensing actions.

PROPOSITION 3.10 SENSING ACTION. *Let $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}$ be a set of p-states, δ' be a p-state, and a be a sensing action. If $\text{Regress}(a, \Delta) = \delta'$ where $\delta' \neq \perp$, then for every $\sigma'' \in \text{ext}(\delta')$, we have that (i) $\perp \notin \Phi(a, \sigma'')$, and (ii) $\Phi(a, \sigma'') \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{ext}(\delta_n)$.*

Proof: In Appendix.

Similarly, this proposition states that the regression of a sensing action in a set of p-states yields a p-state such that the execution of the action in any extension of the latter results in a subset of a-states belonging to the union of the extension sets of the formers. This also shows that Regress can be “reversed” for sensing actions.




Fig. 3. Illustration of Proposition 3.10.

We next extend *Regress* to define *Regress** that allows us to perform regression with respect to conditional plans.

Definition 3.11 Extended Regression Function. Let δ and $\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}$ be a p-state and a set of p-states, respectively. The extended transition function *Regress** is defined as follows:

- $Regress^*([\], \delta) = \delta$.
- For a non-sensing action a , $Regress^*(a, \delta) = Regress(a, \delta)$.
- For a conditional plan $p = a; case(\varphi_1 \rightarrow c_1, \dots, \varphi_n \rightarrow c_n)$,
 - if $Regress^*(c_i, \delta) = \perp$ for some i , $Regress^*(p, \delta) = \perp$;
 - if $Regress^*(c_i, \delta) = [T_i, F_i]$ $i = 1, \dots, n$, then

$$Regress^*(p, \delta) = Regress(a, \{R(c_1, \delta), \dots, R(c_n, \delta)\})$$
 where $R(c_i, \delta) = [T_i \cup \varphi_i^+, F_i \cup \varphi_i^-]$ if $\varphi_i^+ \cap F_i = \emptyset$ and $\varphi_i^- \cap T_i = \emptyset$; otherwise, $R(c_i, \delta) = \perp$. Here, φ_i^+ and φ_i^- denote the sets of fluents occurring positively and negatively in φ_i , respectively.
- For $p = c_1; c_2$, where c_1, c_2 are conditional plans,

$$Regress^*(p, \delta) = Regress^*(c_1, Regress^*(c_2, \delta));$$
- $Regress^*(p, \perp) = \perp$ for every plan p .

For a planning problem $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$, let δ_G be the p-state $[G^+, G^-]$, and Δ_I is the set of p-states such that for every $\delta \in \Delta_I$, $\sigma_I \in ext(\delta)$. (Recall that σ_I is the a-state representing I and Σ_G is the set of a-states in which G holds). A *regression solution* to the planning problem P is a conditional plan c that upon applying from the p-state δ_G will result in one of the p-states in Δ_I . In other words, if $\delta = Regress^*(c, \delta_G)$ then δ is a p-state belonging to Δ_I .

We now formalize the following relationship between the regression function *Regress** with the progression transition function Φ^* .

THEOREM 3.12 SOUNDNESS OF REGRESSION. *Let $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$ be a planning problem and c be a regression solution of P . Then, c is also a progression solution of P , i.e., $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma_I)$ and $\Phi^*(c, \sigma_I) \subseteq ext(\delta_G)$.*

Proof: In Appendix.




Fig. 4. Illustration of Theorem 3.12.

3.2 Completeness Result

We now proceed towards a completeness result. Ideally, one would like to have a completeness result that expresses that for a given planning problem, any solution found through progression can also be found by regression. In our formulation, however, the definition of the progression function allows an action a to execute in any a-state σ if a is executable in σ , regardless whether a would add “new” information to σ or not. In contrary, our definition of the regression function requires that an action a can only be applied in a state (or a set of states) if a contributes effects to the applied state(s)³. Thus, given a planning problem $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$, a progression solution c of P may contains redundant actions or extra branches. As a result, we may not obtain c via our regression, i.e. $\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta_G) = \perp$. To illustrate the aforementioned points, let’s consider the following two examples. Example 8 shows conditional plans, each is a sequence of non-sensing actions, that contain redundant actions.

EXAMPLE 8 REDUNDANCY. Let $P = \langle \{f, g\}, \{a, b\}, \{f\}, \{g\} \rangle$ be a planning problem where a is a non-sensing action with $\text{Pre}_a = \{f\}$, $\text{Add}_a = \{g\}$, and $\text{Del}_a = \emptyset$; b is also a non-sensing action where $\text{Pre}_b = \{g\}$, $\text{Add}_b = \{f\}$, and $\text{Del}_b = \emptyset$. Clearly a , $a; b$, and $a; a$ are progression solutions achieving the goal $\{g\}$. However, we can see that b , and a copy (a.k.a an instance) of a in the second and third plans, respectively, are redundant.

We also have that $\text{Regress}^*(a; b, [\{g\}, \emptyset]) = \perp$ and $\text{Regress}^*(a; a, [\{g\}, \emptyset]) = \perp$. Note that $\text{Regress}^*(a, [\{g\}, \emptyset]) \neq \perp$. \square

³Note that this condition is also applied for regression planning systems such as [Bonet & Geffner 2001], [Nguyen et al. 2002].

Example 9 shows a conditional plan that contains redundant branches in a case plan.

EXAMPLE 9 REDUNDANCY. Let $P' = \langle \{f', g'\}, \{a', b'\}, \{f'\}, \{g'\} \rangle$ be a planning problem. Let a' be a sensing action where $Pre_{a'} = \emptyset$, $Sens_{a'} = \{f', g'\}$; b' is a non-sensing action where $Pre_{b'} = \{f', \neg g'\}$, $Add_{b'} = \{g'\}$, and $Del_{b'} = \emptyset$. A plan achieving g' is:

$$p' = a'; \text{case}(f' \wedge \neg g' \rightarrow b', f' \wedge g' \rightarrow [], \neg f' \wedge \neg g' \rightarrow [], \neg f' \wedge g' \rightarrow []).$$

Notice that, the two branches with conditions $\neg f' \wedge \neg g'$ and $\neg f' \wedge g'$ that are always evaluated to false when a get executed, and thus are never used to achieve g' .

We also have that $Regress^*(p', [\{g'\}, \emptyset]) = \perp$. Let p'' be the conditional plan obtained from p' by removing two branches with conditions $\neg f' \wedge \neg g'$ and $\neg f' \wedge g'$:

$$p'' = a'; \text{case}(f' \wedge \neg g' \rightarrow b', f' \wedge g' \rightarrow []).$$

Then, $Regress^*(p'', [\{g'\}, \emptyset]) \neq \perp$. □

The above discussion stipulates us to consider the following completeness result: if a conditional plan can be found through progression we can find an equivalent conditional plan through regression. The plan found through regression does not have redundancies, both in terms of extra actions and extra branches. We refer to these notions as “redundancy” and “plan equivalence”. We now formalize these notions. First we need the following notion. Given a sensing action a , a sub sensing action of a is a sensing action a' where $Pre_{a'} = Pre_a$ and $Sens_{a'} \subset Sens_a$.

Definition 3.13 Subplan. Let c be a conditional plan. A conditional plan c' is a subplan of c if

- c' can be obtained from c by (i) removing an instance of a non-sensing action from c ; or (ii) removing a case plan or a branch $\varphi_i \rightarrow c_i$ from a case plan in c ; or (iii) replacing a sensing action a with a sub sensing action $subSense(a)$ of a ; or
- c' is a subplan of c'' where c'' is a subplan of c .

Definition 3.14 Redundancy. Let c be a conditional plan, σ be an a-state, and δ be a p-state. We say that c contains redundancy (or is redundant) with respect to (σ, δ) if

- (i) $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$ and $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) \subseteq ext(\delta)$; and
- (ii) there exists a subplan c' of c such that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c', \sigma)$ and $\Phi^*(c', \sigma) \subseteq ext(\delta)$.

Note that, if c' is a subplan of a conditional plan c then $c' \neq c$. The equivalence of two conditional plans is defined formally as follows.

Definition 3.15 Equivalent Plan. Let σ be an a-state, δ be a p-state, and c be a conditional plan such that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$ and $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) \subseteq ext(\delta)$. We say a conditional plan c' is equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) if $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c', \sigma)$ and $\Phi^*(c', \sigma) \subseteq ext(\delta)$.

EXAMPLE 10 EQUIVALENCE. Consider the planning problem P in Example 8, we have that a is a subplan of $a; a$ and is equivalent to $a; a$ w.r.t $(\{f\}, \emptyset, [\{g\}, \emptyset])$. Similarly, for planning problem P' (Example 9), p'' is a subplan of p' and is equivalent to p' w.r.t $(\{f'\}, \emptyset, [\{g'\}, \emptyset])$. □

It's easy to see that if there exist conditional plans c' and c'' that are both equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) then c' and c'' are equivalent with respect to (σ, δ) .

We will continue with our formulation. Recall that our purpose is to use regression to find an equivalent conditional plan for a given progression solution. To do that, we will introduce a notion called *normalized conditional plans*. Such conditional plans can be generated by our planning algorithm which is introduced in Section 4. We will also need to provide conditions about when a conditional plan is regressible, i.e. when *Regression** function can be applied on it to produce a p-state. We refer to conditional plans with such conditions as *regressible conditional plans*. We will later show that, for a given progression solution of a planning problem P there always exists an equivalent normalized, regressible conditional plan that is also a regression solution of P . The definition of a normalized conditional plan is as follows.

Definition 3.16 Normalized Conditional Plan. A conditional plan c is a *normalized conditional plan* if $c = \alpha; c'$ where α is the empty plan or a sequence of non-sensing actions, $c' = []$ or $c' = a; case(\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1, \dots, \varphi_m \rightarrow p_m)$, a is a sensing action, and the p_i 's are normalized conditional plans.

EXAMPLE 11 NORMALIZED PLAN. Consider the planning problem P' in Example 9. Then both p' and p'' is a normalized conditional plan. Note that p'' is regressible whilst p' is not regressible. \square

For a plan $c = c_1; \dots; c_n$ where c_i is either a sequence of actions or a case plan, we define *normalized(c)*, a normalized conditional plan obtained from c , as follows.

- If $n = 1$ and c_1 is a sequence of non-sensing actions then *normalized(c)* = c .
- If $n = 1$ and c_1 is a case plan, $c_1 = a; case(\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1 \dots \varphi_m \rightarrow p_m)$, then *normalized(c)* = $a; case(\varphi_1 \rightarrow normalized(p_1) \dots \varphi_m \rightarrow normalized(p_m))$.
- If $n > 1$ and c_1 is a sequence of non-sensing actions then *normalized(c)* = $c_1; normalized(c')$ where $c' = c_2; \dots; c_n$.
- If $n > 1$ and c_1 is a case plan, $c_1 = a; case(\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1 \dots \varphi_m \rightarrow p_m)$, then *normalized(c)* = $a; case(\varphi_1 \rightarrow normalized(p_1; c') \dots \varphi_m \rightarrow normalized(p_m; c'))$ where $c' = c_2; \dots; c_n$.

The next lemma shows that for every conditional plan c there is an equivalent normalized conditional plan which is constructed by the method above.

LEMMA 3.17. For every conditional plan c ,

- *normalized(c)* is a normalized conditional plan;
- for every a-state σ , $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \Phi^*(normalized(c), \sigma)$.

Proof: In Appendix.

To define a regressible conditional plan, we begin with some additional notations. For a non-empty set of fluents $S = \{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$, a binary representation of S is a formula of the form $l_1 \wedge \dots \wedge l_k$ where $l_i \in \{f_i, \neg f_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$.

For a non-empty set of fluents S , let *BIN(S)* denote the set of all different binary representations of S . We say a conjunction ϕ of literals is consistent if there exists no

fluent f such that f and $\neg f$ appear in ϕ . A set of consistent conjunctions of literals $\chi = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ is said to span over S if there exists a consistent conjunction of literals $\varphi \notin \chi$, such that:

- (1) $S \cap (\varphi^+ \cup \varphi^-) = \emptyset$ where φ^+ and φ^- denote the sets of fluents occurring positive and negative in φ , respectively;
- (2) $\varphi_i = \varphi \wedge \psi_i$ where $BIN(S) = \{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n\}$.

Notice that given a non-empty set S , we can easily check whether the set $\chi = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ spans over S . We say that a set $\chi = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ is factorable if it spans over some non-empty set of fluents S .

EXAMPLE 12 GETTING TO EVANSTON - CON'T. Consider a set $S = \{\text{traffic-bad}\}$, a conjunction $\varphi = \text{on-ashland}$ and a set of literal conjunctions $\chi = \{\text{on-ashland} \wedge \text{traffic-bad}, \text{on-ashland} \wedge \neg \text{traffic-bad}\}$.

We have that $BIN(S) = \{\text{traffic-bad}, \neg \text{traffic-bad}\}$ and χ spans over S . \square

LEMMA 3.18. Let $\chi = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ be a non-empty set of consistent conjunctions of literals. If χ is factorable, then there exists a unique non-empty set of fluents S such that χ spans over S .

Proof: In Appendix.

Definition 3.19 *Possibly Regressable Case Plan.* Given a case plan $p = a; \text{case}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow c_1, \dots, \varphi_n \rightarrow c_n)$. We say that p is possibly regressable if (i) there exists a non-empty set $\emptyset \neq S_a \subseteq \text{Sens}_a$ and $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ spans over S_a , and (ii) for $1 \leq i \leq n$ $\text{Sens}_a \subseteq (\varphi_i^+ \cup \varphi_i^-)$.

Definition 3.20 *Regressable Conditional Plan.* Let c be a conditional plan, σ be an a-state, and δ be a p-state. We say c is regressable with respect to (σ, δ) if (i) every case plan occurring in c is possibly regressable, and (ii) $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$ and c is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ) .

LEMMA 3.21. Let σ be an a-state, δ be a p-state, and c is a normalized conditional plan that is regressable with respect to (σ, δ) . Then, $\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta) = \delta'$, $\delta' \neq \perp$, and $\sigma \in \text{ext}(\delta')$.

Proof: In Appendix.

The following lemma shows conditions for the existence of a normalized, regressable conditional plan that is equivalent to a given normalized conditional plan.

LEMMA 3.22. Let σ be an a-state, let δ be a p-state, and let c be a normalized conditional plan such that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$ and $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$. There exists a normalized plan c' such that c' is regressable with respect to (σ, δ) and c' is equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) .

Proof: In Appendix.

It follows from Lemma 3.17 and Lemma 3.22 that, for every conditional plan c there exists a normalized, regressable conditional plan that is equivalent to c under the conditions mentioned in Lemma 3.22. This provides a solid building block for our completeness result. This result is formally stated in the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.23 COMPLETENESS OF REGRESSION. *Given a planning problem $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$ and a progression solution c of P . There exists a normalized regression solution c' of P such that c' is equivalent to c with respect to (σ_I, δ_G) .*

Proof: In Appendix.




Fig. 5. Illustration of Theorem 3.23.

We now present an algorithm that uses our regression functions to construct conditional plans with sensing actions.

4. CONDITIONAL PLANNING USING REGRESSION

In this section, we present a regression search algorithm for constructing conditional plans with sensing actions that makes use of the *Regress* function described in the previous section. This algorithm, while doing the search, records the plans used to get to a p-state. For a conditional plan c and a p-state δ , we call the pair $\langle c, \delta \rangle$ a *plan-state* pair. For a set of plan-state pairs X , by X_s we denote the set of all the p-states occurring in X . The main idea of the algorithm is as follows. At any step, we will maintain a set N of plan-state pairs $\langle c, \delta \rangle$ such that $\delta = \text{Regress}^*(c, \delta_G)$. We print a solution if we find a plan-state pair $\langle c, \delta \rangle \in N$ such that $\sigma_I \in \text{ext}(\delta)$ since c would be one solution (Theorem 3.12). Otherwise, we regress from N_s (the set of all the p-states occurring in N). This process involves the regression using non-sensing actions and sensing actions which are applicable in N_s . The algorithm will stop with failure if (i) we cannot regress from N_s ; or (ii) no new p-state can be found. Below, we list the main steps of the algorithm:

ALGORITHM 4.1. Solve(P) where $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$

1. Let $N = \{\langle [], \delta_G \rangle\}$ ($N_s = \{\delta_G\}$).
2. **Repeat**
3. If there exists some $\langle c, \delta \rangle \in N$ such that. $\sigma_I \in \text{ext}(\delta)$ then prints c as a solution.
4. Do one of the following:
 - 4.1 Find a $\langle c, \delta \rangle \in N$, a non-sensing action a such that. a is applicable in δ and $\delta' = \text{Regress}(a, \delta) \notin N_s$. Add $\langle a; c, \delta' \rangle$ to N .

4.2 Find a set $\Delta = \{\langle c_1, \delta_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle c_n, \delta_n \rangle\} \subseteq N$, a sensing action a , and a set of formulas $\chi = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ such that (i) χ spans over some $\emptyset \neq S_a \subseteq \text{Sens}_a$, (ii) a is applicable in $\Gamma = \{\delta'_i \mid \delta'_i = [\delta_i.T \cup \varphi_i^+, \delta_i.F \cup \varphi_i^-]\}$, and that (iii) $\delta' = \text{Regress}(a, \Gamma) \notin N_s$. Add $\langle a; \text{case}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow c_1, \dots, \varphi_n \rightarrow c_n), \delta' \rangle$ to N .

5. Until N does not change.

6. Return NO SOLUTION.

The next theorem establishes the correctness of our algorithm.

THEOREM 4.1. For every $\langle c, \delta \rangle \in N$ where N denotes the set of plan-state pairs maintained by **Solve**(P), $\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta_G) = \delta$.

Proof: In Appendix.

Since the algorithm searches through all possible regression path, we have the following theorem.

THEOREM 4.2. For every planning problem $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$,

- (1) **Solve**(P) will always stop;
- (2) if P has a regression solution c then **Solve**(P) will return a conditional plan c' such that $\text{Regress}(c, \delta_G) = \text{Regress}(c', \delta_G)$; and
- (3) if P has no regression solution then **Solve**(P) will return NO SOLUTION.

Proof: In Appendix

In the next example, we demonstrate how our algorithm works.

EXAMPLE 13 GETTING TO EVANSTON - CON'T. Let us apply the algorithm to the problem of getting to Evanston. Consider an initial condition $I = \{ \text{at-start}, \neg \text{on-western}, \neg \text{on-belmont}, \neg \text{on-ashland}, \neg \text{at-evanston}, \}$, and a goal condition $G = \{ \text{at-evanston} \}$. So, $\delta_G = [\{ \text{at-evanston} \}, \{\}]$. The algorithm goes through the following iterations:

#I	Action (a)	Regressed-from member of N
0		$\langle \{\}, \delta_G \rangle$
1	$a_1 = \text{take-ashland}$	$\langle \{\}, \delta_G \rangle$
2	$b_1 = \text{take-western}$	$\langle \{\}, \delta_G \rangle$
3	$a_2 = \text{take-belmont}$	$\langle a_1, \delta_{11} \rangle$
4	$b_2 = \text{goto-western-at-belmont}$	$\langle b_1, \delta_{21} \rangle$
5	$a_3 = \text{goto-western-at-belmont}$	$\langle a_2; a_1, \delta_{12} \rangle$
6	check-traffic	$\langle a_3; a_2; a_1, \delta_{13} \rangle, \langle b_2; b_1, \delta_{22} \rangle$
#I	$\text{Regress}(a, \delta) / \text{Regress}(a, \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\})$	New member of N
0		
1	$\delta_{11} = [\{\text{on-ashland}\}, \{\}]$	$\langle a_1, \delta_{11} \rangle$
2	$\delta_{21} = [\{\text{on-western}\}, \{\text{traffic-bad}\}]$	$\langle b_1, \delta_{21} \rangle$
3	$\delta_{12} = [\{\text{on-belmont}, \text{traffic-bad}\}, \{\}]$	$\langle a_2; a_1, \delta_{12} \rangle$
4	$\delta_{22} = [\{\text{at-start}\}, \{\text{traffic-bad}\}]$	$\langle b_2; b_1, \delta_{22} \rangle$
5	$\delta_{13} = [\{\text{at-start}, \text{traffic-bad}\}, \{\}]$	$\langle a_3; a_2; a_1, \delta_{13} \rangle$
6	$\delta_{14} = [\{\text{at-start}\}, \{\}]$	$\langle p, \delta_{14} \rangle$

where $p = \text{check-traffic}; \text{case}(\text{traffic-bad} \rightarrow a_3; a_2; a_1, \neg \text{traffic-bad} \rightarrow b_2; b_1)$.

Fig. 6. Algorithm illustration.

□

We now describe our initial experiments in the next section.

5. EXPERIMENTATION

We have experimentally compared our system with the two systems [Weld et al. 1998; Son et al. 2004] in domains with *sensing actions and incomplete information* but did not compare our planner with [Pryor & Collins 1996] since the planner in [Weld et al. 1998] is significantly better than that of [Pryor & Collins 1996]. We also did not compare our system with others that deal with nondeterministic or probabilistic actions as our action representation does not have this capability.

We run our Java-based planner with three well known *domains with sensing actions: Cassandra, Bomb in the toilet, and Sickness domain*. These domains are obtained from the SGP distribution [Weld et al. 1998]. All experiments are run on a Compaq laptop 1.8Ghz CPU with 512 MbRAM. The experimental result (obtained without using heuristics) is presented in Figure (7). It is necessary to note that, Figure (7) is a crude comparison as the other two use static causal laws and boolean sensing fluents (e.g. in Bomb in the toilet domain) while ours uses multi-valued sensing fluents; and the Logic Programming based planner ($\pi(P)$) uses conditional effects but ours does not.

Domains/ Problem	Planners (time in milliseconds)				
	aSense			$\pi(P)$	SGP
	preprocessing	search	total		
Cassandra					
a1-prob	50	10	60	510	130
a2-prob	50	10	60	891	60
a3-prob	70	0	70	119	70
a4-prob	60	220	280	1030	431
a5-prob	30	10	40	130	20
a6-prob	200	1392	1592	18036	NA ⁴
a7-prob	40	10	50	150	110
Bomb					
bt-1sa	40	0	40	15812	751
bt-2sa	40	10	50	18676	1161
bt-3sa	40	10	50	18445	1512
bt-4sa	200	10	210	22391	1892

Fig. 7. Running time for the Cassandra and Bomb In The Toilet domains.

6. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we used the 0-approximation semantics [Son & Baral 2001] and defined regression with respect to that semantics. We considered domains where an agent does not have complete information about the world, and may have sensing actions. We first started with domains having only Boolean fluents and formally related our definition of regression with the earlier definition of progression in [Son & Baral 2001]. We showed that planning using our regression function would not only give us correct plans but also would not miss plans. We then presented a search algorithm for generating conditional plans. Lastly, we presented preliminary experimental results and discussed difficulties we faced as well as future enhancements. To simplify our formulation, we used the STRIPS-like action representation and considered fluents with finite domains.

Our planner is sound, however the use of the computationally less complex 0-approximation leads to incompleteness with respect to the full semantics. This is a trade-off to counter the higher complexity thus leading to the efficiency in search for plans. Other limitations due to state space regression are difficulties in handling static causal laws and conditional effects. To further improve the search efficiency, we plan to develop necessary heuristics by extending the work of [Bonet & Geffner 2001] to handle sensing actions. We also plan to extend our results to non-binary domains. Lastly, we need to directly consider actions with conditional effects, nondeterministic actions, and static causal laws and develop regression operators for these cases.

APPENDIX

LEMMA 3.4 SENSED SET. *Consider a sensing action a and a set of p -states Δ . If there exists a sensed set of Δ with respect to a then it is unique.*

PROOF LEMMA 3.4. Assume that X and X' are two different sensed sets of Δ with respect to a . Since $X \neq \emptyset$, let's consider a fluent $f \in X$. By Definition 3.3, for two partitions $(\{f\}, X \setminus \{f\})$ and $(X \setminus \{f\}, \{f\})$ of X , there exist $\delta_i \in \Delta$ and $\delta_j \in \Delta$ ($1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$) such that $\{f\} = \delta_i.T \cap X$ and $\{f\} = \delta_j.F \cap X$, i.e. f is true in δ_i and false in δ_j [*].

Suppose that $f \notin X'$. By Definition 3.3, we must have that: either $f \in \delta_k.T \setminus X'$ or $f \in \delta_k.F \setminus X'$ for all k , $1 \leq k \leq n$, i.e f is either true or false in every $\delta_k \in \Delta$. In either case, this contradicts with [*]. Therefore, $f \in X'$.

Similarly, we can argue that, if $f \in X'$ then $f \in X$. Thus, $f \in X$ iff $f \in X'$, i.e. $X = X'$. \square

LEMMA 3.7 UNIQUE SENSED SET. *Consider a sensing action a and a set of p -states Δ such that a is applicable in Δ . Let $\Delta' = \{\delta'_1, \dots, \delta'_n\}$, where δ'_i is a partial extension of δ_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$), $\Delta'' = \{\delta''_1, \dots, \delta''_n\}$, where δ''_i is a partial extension of δ_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$). If $p(a, \Delta') \neq \perp$ and $p(a, \Delta'') \neq \perp$ then $p(a, \Delta') = p(a, \Delta'')$.*

PROOF LEMMA 3.7. Assume that $p(a, \Delta') \neq p(a, \Delta'')$. Since $p(a, \Delta') \neq \perp$, there exists $f \in p(a, \Delta')$ where $f \notin p(a, \Delta'')$.

Since Δ'' is proper with respect to $p(a, \Delta'')$, $f \in Sens_a$, and f is known in Δ'' , by Definition 3.3, we must have that either (i) $f \in \delta''_i.T \setminus p(a, \Delta'')$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, or (ii) $f \in \delta''_i.F \setminus p(a, \Delta'')$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Consider case (i). We have that $f \in \delta''_i.T$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ [*].

Since $f \in p(a, \Delta')$, by Definition 3.3, for the partition $(p(a, \Delta') \setminus \{f\}, \{f\})$ of $p(a, \Delta')$, there exists $\delta'_j \in \Delta'$ ($1 \leq j \leq n$) such that $\delta'_j.F \cap p(a, \Delta') = \{f\}$, i.e. f is false in δ'_j . Since δ'_j is a partial extension of δ_j , we have that $\delta_j.F \subseteq \delta'_j.F$. Also, as $Sens_a$ is known in δ_j , we must have that $f \in \delta_j.F$. Since δ''_j is also a partial extension of δ_j , we have that $\delta_j.F \subseteq \delta''_j.F$, therefore $f \in \delta''_j.F$. From [*], we also have $f \in \delta''_j.T$. This is a contradiction.

Similarly, we can show a contradiction for case (ii). Therefore, we conclude that if $f \in p(a, \Delta')$ then $f \in p(a, \Delta'')$. Using similar arguments, we can also show that for any $f \in p(a, \Delta'')$, $f \in p(a, \Delta')$. Therefore, $p(a, \Delta') = p(a, \Delta'')$. \square

LEMMA 8.1. *Let σ' be an a-state and a be a sensing action executable in σ' . For any $S_a \subseteq \text{Sens}_a$ and $\sigma \in \Phi(a, \sigma')$, let $\sigma.T \cap S_a = S_\sigma^+$ and $\sigma.F \cap S_a = S_\sigma^-$, we have that $S_\sigma^+ \cup S_\sigma^- = S_a$ and $S_\sigma^+ \cap S_\sigma^- = \emptyset$.*

PROOF LEMMA 8.1. It is easy to see that the lemma is correct for the case $S_a = \emptyset$. Let's consider the case $S_a \neq \emptyset$. Since $S_\sigma^+ \subseteq \sigma.T$ and $S_\sigma^- \subseteq \sigma.F$, we have that $S_\sigma^+ \cap S_\sigma^- = \emptyset$.

Consider $f \in S_\sigma^+ \cup S_\sigma^-$, we have that $f \in S_\sigma^+$ or $f \in S_\sigma^-$. In both cases, we have $f \in S_a$.

Consider $f \in S_a$. Since $S_a \subseteq \text{Sens}_a$, we have that $f \in \text{Sens}_a$. By the definition of Φ , we have that $f \in \sigma.T$ or $f \in \sigma.F$. From this fact, it's easy to see that $f \in S_\sigma^+$ or $f \in S_\sigma^-$. \square

LEMMA 8.2. *Let δ be a p-state. An a-state σ is an extension of δ (i.e. $\sigma \in \text{ext}(\delta)$) iff σ is an a-state of the form $\langle \delta.T \cup X, \delta.F \cup Y \rangle$ where X, Y are two disjoint sets of fluents and $X \cap \delta.F = \emptyset$, $Y \cap \delta.T = \emptyset$.*

PROOF LEMMA 8.2. :

- Case “ \Rightarrow ”:
Let $\sigma \in \text{ext}(\delta)$ be an extension of δ . By the definition of an extension, σ is an a-state where $\delta.T \subseteq \sigma.T$ and $\delta.F \subseteq \sigma.F$. Denote $X = \sigma.T \setminus \delta.T$ and $Y = \sigma.F \setminus \delta.F$. Clearly, X and Y are two set of fluents where $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ and $X \cap \delta.F = \emptyset$, $Y \cap \delta.T = \emptyset$.
- Case “ \Leftarrow ”:
Let σ be an a-state of the form $\langle \delta.T \cup X, \delta.F \cup Y \rangle$ where X, Y are two disjoint sets of fluents and $X \cap \delta.F = \emptyset$, $Y \cap \delta.T = \emptyset$.
It's easy to see that $\sigma.T \cap \sigma.F = \emptyset$, i.e. σ is consistent. Furthermore, $\delta.T \subseteq \sigma.T$ and $\delta.F \subseteq \sigma.F$, i.e. by definition of an extension, σ is an extension of δ . \square

PROPOSITION 3.9 NON-SENSING ACTION. *Let δ and δ' be two p-states, and a be a non-sensing action. If $\text{Regress}(a, \delta) = \delta'$ and $\delta' \neq \perp$, then for every $\sigma'' \in \text{ext}(\delta')$ we have that (i) $\perp \notin \Phi(a, \sigma'')$, and (ii) $\Phi(a, \sigma'') \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$.*




Fig. 8. Illustration of Proposition 3.9.

PROOF PROPOSITION 3.9. Let $\delta = [T, F]$. From the fact that $\text{Regress}(a, \delta) = \delta' \neq \perp$, we have that a is applicable in δ .

By Definition 3.2,

$$\delta' = \text{Regress}(\delta, a) = [T \setminus \text{Add}_a \cup \text{Pre}_a^+, F \setminus \text{Del}_a \cup \text{Pre}_a^-].$$

Let $\sigma'' \in \text{ext}(\delta')$, we will show that (i) $\perp \notin \Phi(a, \sigma'')$ and (ii) $\Phi(\sigma'', a) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$.

Indeed, it follows from Lemma 8.2 that

$$\sigma'' = \langle (T \setminus \text{Add}_a) \cup \text{Pre}_a^+ \cup X, (F \setminus \text{Del}_a) \cup \text{Pre}_a^- \cup Y \rangle,$$

where X and Y are two sets of fluents such that $\sigma''.T \cap \sigma''.F = \emptyset$. We now prove (i) and (ii).

- Proof of (i):
Since $\text{Pre}_a^+ \subseteq \sigma''.T$ and $\text{Pre}_a^- \subseteq \sigma''.F$, we conclude that a is executable in σ'' , i.e. $\perp \notin \Phi(a, \sigma'')$.
- Proof of (ii):

By definition of the transition function Φ , we have that

$$\Phi(a, \sigma'') = \{ \langle ((T \setminus \text{Add}_a) \cup \text{Pre}_a^+ \cup X) \setminus \text{Del}_a \cup \text{Add}_a, ((F \setminus \text{Del}_a) \cup \text{Pre}_a^- \cup Y) \setminus \text{Add}_a \cup \text{Del}_a \rangle \}$$

Since a is applicable in δ , we have that $T \cap \text{Del}_a = \emptyset$, $F \cap \text{Add}_a = \emptyset$. Furthermore, $\text{Del}_a \cap \text{Add}_a = \emptyset$. Therefore, we have that $((T \setminus \text{Add}_a) \cup \text{Pre}_a^+ \cup X) \setminus \text{Del}_a \cup \text{Add}_a = (T \setminus \text{Add}_a) \cup ((\text{Pre}_a^+ \cup X) \setminus \text{Del}_a) \cup \text{Add}_a \supseteq T \cup ((\text{Pre}_a^+ \cup X) \setminus \text{Del}_a) \supseteq T$. This concludes that $T \subseteq \Phi(a, \sigma'').T$. Similarly, we have that $F \subseteq \Phi(a, \sigma'').F$. This shows that $\Phi(a, \sigma'') \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$. □

PROPOSITION 3.10 SENSING ACTION. Let $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}$ be a set of p -states, δ' be a p -state, and a be a sensing action. If $\text{Regress}(a, \Delta) = \delta'$, where $\delta' \neq \perp$, then for every $\sigma'' \in \text{ext}(\delta')$, we have that (i) $\perp \notin \Phi(a, \sigma'')$, and (ii) $\Phi(a, \sigma'') \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{ext}(\delta_n)$.




Fig. 9. Illustration of Proposition 3.10.

PROOF PROPOSITION 3.10. From the fact that $Regress(a, \Delta) = \delta' \neq \perp$, we have that a is applicable in Δ with respect to some set $S_{a, \Delta} \subseteq Sens_a$ ($S_{a, \Delta} \neq \emptyset$). By Definition 3.8 we have:

$$\delta' = Regress(a, \Delta) = [(\bigcup_{i=1}^n \delta_i.T \setminus S_{a, \Delta}) \cup Pre_a^+, (\bigcup_{i=1}^n \delta_i.F \setminus S_{a, \Delta}) \cup Pre_a^-].$$

Let $\sigma'' \in ext(\delta')$ be an arbitrary extension of δ' . We will show that (i) $\perp \notin \Phi(a, \sigma'')$ and (ii) $\Phi(a, \sigma'') \subseteq ext(\delta_1) \cup \dots \cup ext(\delta_n)$.

(1) Proof of (i):

It follows from Lemma 8.2 that:

$$\sigma'' = \langle (\bigcup_{i=1}^n \delta_i.T \setminus S_{a, \Delta}) \cup Pre_a^+ \cup X, (\bigcup_{i=1}^n \delta_i.F \setminus S_{a, \Delta}) \cup Pre_a^- \cup Y \rangle$$

where X and Y are two sets of fluents such that $\sigma''.T \cap \sigma''.F = \emptyset$.

From the fact that $Pre_a^+ \subseteq \sigma''.T$ and $Pre_a^- \subseteq \sigma''.F$, we conclude that a is executable in σ'' , i.e. $\perp \notin \Phi(a, \sigma'')$ [*].

(2) Proof of (ii):

We need to prove that: for every $\sigma \in \Phi(a, \sigma'')$, then there exists δ_i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) such that $\sigma \in ext(\delta_i)$.

Indeed, consider an arbitrary $\sigma \in \Phi(a, \sigma'')$. Let's denote $\sigma.T \cap S_{a, \Delta} = S_\sigma^+$ and $\sigma.F \cap S_{a, \Delta} = S_\sigma^-$. By Lemma 8.1, we have that $S_\sigma^+ \cup S_\sigma^- = S_{a, \Delta}$ and $S_\sigma^+ \cap S_\sigma^- = \emptyset$.

Since a is applicable in Δ with respect to $S_{a, \Delta}$, by Definition 3.6 and the definition of $S_{a, \Delta}$, there exists $\Delta' = \{\delta'_1, \dots, \delta'_n\}$ where δ'_i is a partial extension of δ_i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) such that a is strongly applicable in Δ' with respect to $S_{a, \Delta}$. By Definition 3.3, there exists δ'_i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) such that $\delta'_i.T \cap S_{a, \Delta} = S_\sigma^+$ and $\delta'_i.F \cap S_{a, \Delta} = S_\sigma^-$. We will now show that $\sigma \in ext(\delta_i)$ or in other word $\delta_i.T \subseteq \sigma.T$ and $\delta_i.F \subseteq \sigma.F$.

Since $\delta_i.T \subseteq \delta'_i.T$, we have that $\delta_i.T \cap S_{a, \Delta} \subseteq \delta'_i.T \cap S_{a, \Delta} = S_\sigma^+$. Therefore:

$$\delta_i.T = \delta_i.T \setminus (\delta_i.T \cap S_{a, \Delta}) \cup (\delta_i.T \cap S_{a, \Delta}) = (\delta_i.T \setminus S_{a, \Delta}) \cup (\delta_i.T \cap S_{a, \Delta}) \subseteq (\delta_i.T \setminus S_{a, \Delta}) \cup S_\sigma^+.$$

Similarly, we can show that $\delta_i.F \subseteq (\delta_i.F \setminus S_{a, \Delta}) \cup S_\sigma^-$.

Since $\sigma \in \Phi(a, \sigma'')$, by the definition of Φ , we have that $\sigma''.T \subseteq \sigma.T$. Let $\sigma.T \setminus \sigma''.T = \omega$, we have that

$$\sigma.T = \sigma''.T \cup \omega = (\bigcup_{j=1}^n \delta_j.T \setminus S_{a, \Delta}) \cup Pre_a^+ \cup X \cup \omega.$$

Since $\sigma.T \cap S_{a, \Delta} = S_\sigma^+$ and $((\bigcup_{j=1}^n \delta_j.T \setminus S_{a, \Delta}) \cup Pre_a^+) \cap S_{a, \Delta} = \emptyset$ (because $Sens_a \cap Pre_a^+ = \emptyset$), we must have that $(X \cup \omega) \cap S_{a, \Delta} = S_\sigma^+$, i.e. $S_\sigma^+ \subseteq X \cup \omega$. From the fact that $\delta_i.T \subseteq \delta_i.T \setminus S_{a, \Delta} \cup S_\sigma^+$ and $S_\sigma^+ \subseteq X \cup \omega$, it's easy to see that $\delta_i.T \subseteq \sigma.T$. Similarly, we can show that $\delta_i.F \subseteq \sigma.F$. From this fact, we conclude that $\sigma \in ext(\delta_i)$ [**].

From [*] and [**] the proposition is proved. \square

Definition 8.1 Branching Count. Let c be a conditional plan, we define the number of case plans of c , denoted by $\text{count}(c)$, inductively as follows:

- (1) if $c = []$ then $\text{count}(c) = 0$;
- (2) if $c = a$, a is a non-sensing action, then $\text{count}(c) = 0$;
- (3) if c_1 and c_2 are conditional plans then $\text{count}(c_1; c_2) = \text{count}(c_1) + \text{count}(c_2)$;
- (4) if c is a case plan of the form $a; \text{case}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow c_1, \dots, \varphi_n \rightarrow c_n)$ where a is a sensing action, then $\text{count}(c) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \text{count}(c_i)$.

OBSERVATION 8.1. *We have the following two observations:*

- (1) *by Definition 2.1, a conditional plan c is a sequence of conditional plans $c_1; \dots; c_n$ where (i) c_i is either a sequence of non-sensing actions, or a sensing action followed by a case statement; and (ii) for every $i < n$, if c_i is a sequence of non-sensing actions then c_{i+1} is a case plan.*
- (2) *let δ be a p -state, σ be an extension of δ , and φ be a fluent formula. Then, $\delta \models \varphi$ implies $\sigma \models \varphi$.*

LEMMA 8.3. *Let δ be a p -state and c be a conditional plan. Then, $\text{Regression}^*(c, \delta)$ is either a p -state or \perp .*

PROOF LEMMA 8.3. The proof is done inductively over $\text{count}(c)$. The base case, c is a sequence of non-sensing actions, follows immediately from items 1,2,4 of the Regression^* definition (Definition 3.11). The inductive step follows from inductive hypothesis and the items 2,3 of the Regression^* definition. \square

COROLLARY 8.4 SEQUENCE OF NON-SENSING ACTION. *For p -states δ and δ' , and a sequence of non-sensing actions $c = a_1; \dots; a_n$ ($n \geq 1$). $\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta) = \delta' \neq \perp$ implies that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma'')$ and $\Phi^*(c, \sigma'') \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$ for every $\sigma'' \in \text{ext}(\delta')$.*

PROOF COROLLARY 8.4. We prove the corollary by induction over $|c|$, the number of non-sensing actions of c .

- Base case: $|c| = 1$

This means that c has only one action a . Using the Proposition 3.9, and Definition 3.11 – item 2 – the based case is proved. Notice that for the case $|c| = 0$, i.e. $c = []$, the corollary follows directly from Definitions 3.11 and 2.3.

- Inductive Step:

Assume that the corollary is shown for $|c| \leq k$ ($k \geq 1$). We now prove the corollary for $|c| = k + 1$.

Let $c = a_1; \dots; a_{k+1}$, and $c' = a_2; \dots; a_{k+1}$ where a_i is a non-sensing action for ($1 \leq i \leq k + 1$). We have that $|c'| = k$. By Definition 3.11

$$\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta) = \text{Regress}(a_1, \text{Regress}^*(c', \delta)) = \delta'.$$

Denote $\text{Regress}^*(c', \delta) = \delta^*$. Since $\text{Regress}(a_1, \delta^*) = \delta' \neq \perp$, we have that $\delta^* \neq \perp$.

Let $\sigma'' \in \text{ext}(\delta')$. Since $\sigma'' \in \text{ext}(\delta')$, by Proposition 3.9, we have that $\perp \notin \Phi(a_1, \sigma'') = \{\sigma\} \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta^*)$, i.e. $\sigma \in \text{ext}(\delta^*)$.

By the definition of Φ^* , we also have that $\Phi^*(c, \sigma'') = \Phi^*(c', \Phi^*(a_1, \sigma''))$. Using the induction hypothesis for $|c'| = k$, where $\text{Regress}^*(c', \delta) = \delta^*$ and $\sigma \in \text{ext}(\delta^*)$, we have:

$$\perp \notin \Phi^*(c', \Phi^*(a_1, \sigma'')) = \Phi^*(c', \sigma) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta).$$

Therefore, $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma'')$ and $\Phi^*(c, \sigma'') \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$. □

LEMMA 8.5. *Let δ be a p-state and c be a conditional plan. If $\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta) = \delta'$ where $\delta' \neq \perp$, then for every $\sigma \in \text{ext}(\delta')$: (i) $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$ and (ii) $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$.*

PROOF LEMMA 8.5. We prove by induction on $\text{count}(c)$, the number of case plans in c .

- Base Case: $\text{count}(c) = 0$. Then c is a sequence of non-sensing actions. The base case follows from Corollary 8.4.
- Inductive Step: Assume that we have proved the lemma for $\text{count}(c) \leq k$ ($k \geq 0$). We need to prove the lemma for $\text{count}(c) = k + 1$. Indeed, from Observation 8.1, let $c = c_1; \dots; c_n$. By construction of c , we have two cases

- (1) c_n is a case plan:




Fig. 10. Illustration of the proof of Lemma 8.5 - case 1.

Let $c_n = a; p$ where a is a sensing action, $p = \text{case } (\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1 \dots \varphi_m \rightarrow p_m)$. Also, let us denote here $c_1; \dots; c_{n-1}$ by c' . By Definition 3.11, we have that

$$\perp \neq \delta' = \text{Regress}^*(c, \delta) = \text{Regress}^*(c', \text{Regress}^*(c_n, \delta)).$$

Denote $\text{Regress}^*(c_n, \delta) = \delta^*$. It follows from Lemma 8.3 that δ^* is a p-state. Since $\delta' \neq \perp$, we also have that $\delta^* \neq \perp$. We first show that for every $\sigma'' \in \text{ext}(\delta^*)$, we have that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c_n, \sigma'')$ and $\Phi^*(c_n, \sigma'') \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$.

Indeed, since $\text{count}(c_n) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^m \text{count}(p_j) \leq \text{count}(c) \leq k + 1$, we have that $\text{count}(p_i) \leq k$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. By Definition 3.11:

$$\perp \neq \delta^* = \text{Regress}^*(c_n, \delta) = \text{Regress}(a, \{R(p_1, \delta), \dots, R(p_m, \delta)\})$$

Let's denote $R(p_i, \delta)$ by δ_i and $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m\}$. We have that $\delta_i \models \varphi_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, and a is applicable in Δ .

From the proof of Proposition 3.10, we have $\perp \notin \Phi(a, \sigma'')$ and

$$\Phi(a, \sigma'') = \{\sigma_1'', \dots, \sigma_k''\} \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{ext}(\delta_m)$$

where for every $\sigma_i'' \in \Phi(a, \sigma'')$, there exists $1 \leq j \leq m$ such that $\sigma_i'' \in \text{ext}(\delta_j)$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$). It is easy to see that $k \leq m$. Indeed, since a is applicable in Δ , by Definitions 3.6 and 3.3 we have that Sens_a is known in Δ and that $m = 2^{|\text{Sens}_a, \Delta|}$. By Definition 3.8 we have that $S_{a, \Delta}$ is the maximal set of sensing fluents that is unknown in δ^* . Since $\sigma'' \in \text{ext}(\delta^*)$, i.e. $\delta^*.T \subseteq \text{sigma}'' .T$ and $\delta^*.F \subseteq \sigma'' .F$, by Definition 2.2 we have that $\text{Sens}_a \setminus \sigma'' \subseteq S_{a, \Delta}$. This implies that $k \leq m$. Using the Observation 8.1, item 2 we have that $\delta_j \models \varphi_i$ implies $\sigma_i'' \models \varphi_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$). As $\delta_i \models \varphi_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ and we can always arrange the order of elements of the set $\Phi(a, \sigma'')$, we can assume that $\sigma_i'' \models \varphi_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$).

From the definition of Φ^*

$$\Phi^*(c_n, \sigma'') = \bigcup_{\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma'')} E(p, \sigma') = \Phi^*(p_1, \sigma_1'') \cup \dots \cup \Phi^*(p_k, \sigma_k'').$$

As $\text{Regress}^*(p_i, \delta).T \subseteq R(p_i, \delta).T$ and $\text{Regress}^*(p_i, \delta).F \subseteq R(p_i, \delta).F$, $\sigma_i'' \in \text{ext}(\delta_i)$ implies $\sigma_i'' \in \text{ext}(\text{Regress}^*(p_i, \delta))$. Using inductive hypothesis for $\text{count}(p_i) \leq k$, we have $\perp \notin \Phi^*(p_i, \sigma_i'')$ and $\Phi^*(p_i, \sigma_i'') \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$ ($i = 1, \dots, k$). This means that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c_n, \sigma'')$ and $\Phi^*(c_n, \sigma'') \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$ [*].

We have that

$$\delta' = \text{Regress}^*(c, \delta) = \text{Regress}^*(c', \delta^*).$$

Consider an arbitrary $\sigma \in \text{ext}(\delta')$. Since $\text{count}(c_n) \geq 1$, we have that $\text{count}(c') \leq k$. Using the inductive hypothesis, we have that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c', \sigma)$ and $\Phi^*(c', \sigma) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta^*)$.

We will now continue with our proof. From the definition of Φ^* , we have $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \bigcup_{\sigma' \in \Phi^*(c', \sigma)} \Phi^*(c_n, \sigma')$. Since $\Phi^*(c', \sigma) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta^*)$, by using [*] we have that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$ and $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$.

- (2) c_n is a sequence of non-sensing actions:

Let $c' = c_1; \dots; c_{n-1}$. From Observation 8.1, item 1, c_{n-1} is a case plan. Since $\text{count}(c_n) = 0$, using case 1 above and Corollary 8.4, we can prove this second case.

From cases 1 and 2, the lemma is proved. □

THEOREM 3.12 SOUNDNESS OF REGRESSION. *Let $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$ be a planning problem and c be a regression solution of P . Then, $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma_I)$ and $\Phi^*(c, \sigma_I) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta_G)$.*

PROOF THEOREM 3.12. Let $\delta' = \text{Regress}^*(c, \delta_G)$. Since $\delta' \neq \perp$ and $\sigma_I \in \text{ext}(\delta')$ (from the definition of a regression solution), the conclusion of the theorem follows immediately from Lemma 8.5. □




Fig. 11. Illustration for Theorem 3.12.

LEMMA 3.17. For every conditional plan c ,

- $normalized(c)$ is a normalized conditional plan;
- for every a-state σ , $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \Phi^*(normalized(c), \sigma)$.

PROOF LEMMA 3.17. We prove by induction on $count(c)$. The base case is trivial since $count(c) = 0$ means that c is a sequence of non-sensing actions, which implies that $normalized(c) = c$ is a sequence of non-sensing actions, which is a normalized plan. This also implies that $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \Phi^*(normalized(c), \sigma)$ for every a-state σ .

Assume that we have proved the lemma for $count(c) \leq k$. Let c be a plan with $count(c) = k + 1$. As we can write $c = c_1; \dots; c_n$, we have two cases:

- c_1 is a case plan, $c_1 = a; case(\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1 \dots \varphi_m \rightarrow p_m)$. So, we have that $normalized(c) = a; case(\varphi_1 \rightarrow normalized(p_1; c') \dots \varphi_m \rightarrow normalized(p_m; c'))$ where $c' = c_2; \dots; c_n$. Let $c'_i = p_i; c'$, we have that $count(c'_i) \leq k$. So, $normalized(p_i; c')$ is a normalized plan. By construction of $normalized(c)$, we conclude that it is indeed a normalized plan.

Let σ be an arbitrary a-state. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^*(c, \sigma) &= \Phi^*(c', \Phi^*(c_1, \sigma)) \\ &= \bigcup_{\sigma'' \in \bigcup_{\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma)} E(case(\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1) \dots \varphi_m \rightarrow p_m), \sigma')} \Phi^*(c', \sigma'') \\ &= \bigcup_{\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma)} E(case(\varphi_1 \rightarrow (p_1; c') \dots \varphi_m \rightarrow (p_m; c')), \sigma') \\ &= \Phi^*(normalized(c), \sigma). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the last equation follows from the inductive hypothesis that $\Phi^*(p_i; c', \sigma) = \Phi^*(normalized(p_i; c'), \sigma)$ for every a-state σ' .

- c_1 is a sequence of non-sensing actions. Then, c_2 is a case plan. Similar arguments as in the previous case allow us to conclude that $normalized(c')$, where $c' = c_2; \dots; c_n$, is a normalized plan and is a case plan. Furthermore, for every a-state σ , $\Phi^*(c', \sigma) = \Phi^*(normalized(c'), \sigma)$. Thus, $normalized(c) = c_1; normalized(c')$ is a normalized plan and $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \Phi^*(c_1; c', \sigma) = \Phi^*(c_1; normalized(c), \sigma) = \Phi^*(normalized(c), \sigma)$.

□

LEMMA 3.18. *Let $\chi = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ be a non-empty set of consistent conjunctions of literals. If χ is factorable, then there exists a unique non-empty set of fluents S such that χ spans over S .*

PROOF LEMMA 3.18. Since χ is factorable, there exists a non-empty set of fluents S such that χ spans over S , i.e. there exists φ such that $\varphi_i = \varphi \wedge \psi_i$ where $\psi_i \in \text{BIN}(S)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Assume that S is not unique. As a result, there exists a non-empty set $S' \neq S$ such that χ spans over S' , i.e. there exists φ' such that $\varphi_i = \varphi' \wedge \psi'_i$ where $\psi'_i \in \text{BIN}(S')$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Consider $f \in S \setminus S'$. For every $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have that $\varphi_i = \varphi' \wedge \psi'_i$. Since $f \notin S'$ and φ_i is consistent ($1 \leq i \leq n$), f must occur either positively or negatively in φ' . This means that f occurs either positively or negatively in all φ_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Consider the case that f occurs positively in all φ_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$ [*]. Since $f \in S$, there exists a binary representation $\psi_j \in \text{BIN}(S)$ ($1 \leq j \leq n$) such that f appears negatively in ψ_j i.e. f appears negatively in φ_j . This contradicts with [*]. Similarly we can show a contradiction in the case that f occurs negatively in all φ_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$. We conclude that S is unique. \square

LEMMA 8.6. *Let σ be an a -state, δ be a p -state, and $c = a_1; \dots; a_n$ ($n \geq 1$) be a sequence of non-sensing actions. Assume that c is regressive with respect to (σ, δ) . Then, $\text{Regress}^*(a_n, \delta) = \delta^*$, $\delta^* \neq \perp$, and a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} is regressive with respect to (σ, δ^*) .*

PROOF LEMMA 8.6. We prove by induction on $|c|$, the number of actions in c .

- Base Case: $|n| = 1$. Similar to the inductive step, we can show that a_1 is applicable in δ . Let $\delta^* = \text{Regress}(a_1, \delta)$ and $\Phi(a_1, \sigma) = \{\sigma'\}$. We have that, $\delta^*.T = \delta.T \setminus \text{Add}_a \cup \text{Pre}_a^+$ and $\sigma'.T = \sigma.T \setminus \text{Del}_a \cup \text{Add}_a$. Using the facts $\sigma' \in \text{ext}(\delta)$ and $\text{Add}_a \cap \text{Del}_a = \emptyset$ and the above equations, we can show that $\delta^*.T \subseteq \sigma.T$. Similarly, $\delta^*.F \subseteq \sigma.F$. Since $[\]$ is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ^*) , we have that $[\]$ is a plan that is regressive with respect to (σ, δ^*) .
- Inductive Step: Assume that we have proved the lemma for $0 < n \leq k$. We need to prove the lemma for $n = k + 1$.

Let $\Phi^*(a_1; \dots; a_k, \sigma) = \{\sigma_k\}$, we have that

$$\Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \Phi(a_{k+1}, \sigma_k) = \{\sigma'\} \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta).$$

We will prove that (1) a_{k+1} is applicable in δ , (2) $\sigma_k \in \text{ext}(\delta^*)$ where $\delta^* = \text{Regress}(a_{k+1}, \delta)$ and $\delta^* \neq \perp$, and (3) $c' = a_1, \dots, a_k$ is regressive with respect to (σ, δ^*) .

—Proof of (1): We first show that $\text{Add}_{a_{k+1}} \cap \delta.T \neq \emptyset$ or $\text{Del}_{a_{k+1}} \cap \delta.F \neq \emptyset$. Assume the contrary, $\text{Add}_{a_{k+1}} \cap \delta.T = \emptyset$ and $\text{Del}_{a_{k+1}} \cap \delta.F = \emptyset$. By Definition 2.2, we have that $\sigma'.T = \sigma_k.T \setminus \text{Del}_{a_{k+1}} \cup \text{Add}_{a_{k+1}}$ and $\sigma'.F = \sigma_k.F \setminus \text{Add}_{a_{k+1}} \cup \text{Del}_{a_{k+1}}$. Since $\sigma' \in \text{ext}(\delta)$, we have $\delta.T \subseteq \sigma'.T$. By our assumption, $\text{Add}_{a_{k+1}} \cap \delta.T = \emptyset$, we must have that $\delta.T = \delta.T \setminus \text{Add}_{a_{k+1}} \subseteq \sigma'.T \setminus \text{Add}_{a_{k+1}}$. Because for arbitrary sets X, Y , $(X \cup Y) \setminus Y = X \setminus (X \cap Y)$, we have that

$$\sigma'.T \setminus \text{Add}_{a_{k+1}} = ((\sigma_k.T \setminus \text{Del}_{a_{k+1}}) \cup \text{Add}_{a_{k+1}}) \setminus \text{Add}_{a_{k+1}} =$$

$$(\sigma_k.T \setminus \text{Del}_{a_{k+1}}) \setminus ((\sigma_k.T \setminus \text{Del}_{a_{k+1}}) \cap \text{Add}_{a_{k+1}}) \subseteq \sigma_k.T,$$

i.e. $\delta.T \subseteq \sigma_k.T \setminus Del_{a_{k+1}}$. This shows that $\delta.T \subseteq \sigma_k.T$. Similarly, we can show that $\delta.F \subseteq \sigma_k.F$. We conclude that $\sigma_k \in ext(\delta)$, i.e. c is redundant with respect to (σ, δ) . This is a contradiction. Therefore, $Add_{a_{k+1}} \cap \delta.T \neq \emptyset$ or $Del_{a_{k+1}} \cap \delta.F \neq \emptyset$ (i).

Secondly, as $\sigma' \in ext(\delta)$, we have $\delta.T \subseteq \sigma'.T$ and $\delta.F \subseteq \sigma'.F$. As a_{k+1} is executable in σ_k , we have $Add_{a_{k+1}} \cap \sigma'.F = \emptyset$ and $Del_{a_{k+1}} \cap \sigma'.T = \emptyset$. This concludes that $Add_{a_{k+1}} \cap \delta.F = \emptyset$ and $Del_{a_{k+1}} \cap \delta.T = \emptyset$ (ii).

Thirdly, assume that there exists $f \in Pre_{a_{k+1}}^+ \cap \delta.F$ and $f \notin Del_{a_{k+1}}$. By Definition 2.2, it's easy to see that $f \in \sigma'.T$ and $f \in \sigma'.F$. This is a contradiction, therefore $Pre_{a_{k+1}}^+ \cap \delta.F \subseteq Del_{a_{k+1}}$. Similarly, we can show that $Pre_{a_{k+1}}^- \cap \delta.T \subseteq Add_{a_{k+1}}$ (iii). From (i), (ii), and (iii) we conclude that a_{k+1} is applicable in δ .

—Proof of (2): Because a_{k+1} is applicable in δ , we have that $Regress(a_{k+1}, \delta) = \delta^*$ and $\delta^* \neq \perp$. We will show that $\sigma_k \in ext(\delta^*)$:

Indeed, as $\sigma' \in ext(\delta)$, by Definition 2.2 we have

$$\delta.T \subseteq \sigma'.T = \sigma_k.T \setminus Del_{a_{k+1}} \cup Add_{a_{k+1}}$$

and

$$\delta.F \subseteq \sigma'.F = \sigma_k.F \setminus Add_{a_{k+1}} \cup Del_{a_{k+1}}.$$

By Definition 3.2 we have

$$\delta^*.T = \delta.T \setminus Add_{a_{k+1}} \cup Pre_{a_{k+1}}^+$$

and

$$\delta^*.F = \delta.F \setminus Del_{a_{k+1}} \cup Pre_{a_{k+1}}^-.$$

Since a_{k+1} is executable in σ_k , we have that $Pre_{a_{k+1}}^+ \subseteq \sigma_k.T$ and $Pre_{a_{k+1}}^- \subseteq \sigma_k.F$. Therefore, to prove that $\delta^*.T = \delta.T \setminus Add_{a_{k+1}} \cup Pre_{a_{k+1}}^+ \subseteq \sigma_k.T$, we only need to show that $\delta.T \setminus Add_{a_{k+1}} \subseteq \sigma_k.T$. As $\delta.T \subseteq \sigma_k.T \setminus Del_{a_{k+1}} \cup Add_{a_{k+1}}$, we have

$$\delta.T \setminus Add_{a_{k+1}} \subseteq ((\sigma_k.T \setminus Del_{a_{k+1}}) \cup Add_{a_{k+1}}) \setminus Add_{a_{k+1}}.$$

From the proof of item (1) above, we have that $((\sigma_k.T \setminus Del_{a_{k+1}}) \cup Add_{a_{k+1}}) \setminus Add_{a_{k+1}} \subseteq \sigma_k.T$. This concludes that $\delta.T \setminus Add_{a_{k+1}} \subseteq \sigma_k.T$. Similarly, we can show that $\delta.F \setminus Del_{a_{k+1}} \subseteq \sigma_k.F$, i.e., $\sigma_k \in ext(\delta^*)$ or $\{\sigma_k\} \subseteq ext(\delta^*)$.

—Proof of (3): Suppose that c' is redundant with respect to (σ, δ^*) . By Definition 3.14, there exists a subplan c'' of c such that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c'', \sigma)$ and $\Phi^*(c'', \sigma) = \{\sigma''\} \subseteq ext(\delta^*)$. By Lemma 3.9, we have that $\perp \notin \Phi(a_{k+1}, \sigma'') \subseteq ext(\delta)$. Since

$$\Phi^*(c''; a_{k+1}, \sigma) = \Phi(a_{k+1}, \sigma'') \subseteq ext(\delta),$$

we have that c is redundant with respect to (σ, δ) . This contradicts with the assumption that c is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ) . Since c' has no case plan, this concludes that $c' = a_1, \dots, a_k$ is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ^*) . Since $\perp \notin \Phi^*(a_1; \dots; a_k, \sigma) = \{\sigma_k\} \subseteq ext(\delta^*)$ we have that c' is regressable with respect to (σ, δ^*) .

□

LEMMA 8.7. *Let σ be an a-state and δ be a p-state. Let $c = a_1; \dots; a_n$ be a sequence of non-sensing actions that is regressible with respect to (σ, δ) . Then, it holds that $\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta) = \delta^*$, $\delta^* \neq \perp$, and $\sigma \in \text{ext}(\delta^*)$.*

PROOF LEMMA 8.7. We prove by induction on $|c|$, the number of actions in c .

- Base Case: $|c| = 0$. Then c is an empty sequence of non-sensing actions. The base case follows from Definition 3.11 (with $\delta^* = \delta$. Note that $[\]$ is not a redundant action).
- Inductive Step: Assume that we have proved the lemma for $|c| = k \geq 0$. We need to prove the lemma for $|c| = k + 1$. It follows from Lemma 8.6 that $\delta' = \text{Regress}(a_{k+1}, \delta)$, $\delta' \neq \perp$, and $c' = a_1; \dots; a_k$ is a plan that is regressible with respect to (σ, δ') . By inductive hypothesis, we have that $\text{Regress}^*(c', \delta') = \delta^* \neq \perp$ and $\sigma \in \text{ext}(\delta^*)$. The inductive step follows from this and the fact $\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta) = \text{Regress}^*(c', \text{Regress}(a_{k+1}, \delta))$.

□

LEMMA 8.8. *Let σ be an a-state, a be a sensing action which is executable in σ . Let $S_a = \text{Sense}_a \setminus \sigma$. Then, we have that (1) $\Phi(a, \sigma) = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m\}$ where $m = 2^{|S_a|}$, (2) a is strongly applicable in $\Delta = \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m\}$ where $\delta_i = [\sigma_i.T, \sigma_i.F]$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, and (3) $\text{Regress}(a, \Delta) = [\sigma.T, \sigma.F]$.*

PROOF LEMMA 8.8. :

Proof of (1): From Definition 2.2, we have that

$$\perp \notin \Phi(a, \sigma) = \{\sigma' \mid \text{Sense}_a \setminus \sigma = \sigma' \setminus \sigma\}.$$

We have that, for every $\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma)$ then $\sigma' \setminus \sigma = (\sigma'.T \setminus \sigma.T) \cup (\sigma'.F \setminus \sigma.F)$. Denote $\sigma'.T \setminus \sigma.T$ by P and $\sigma'.F \setminus \sigma.F$ by Q , we have that (P, Q) is a partition of S_a . Since there are $2^{|S_a|}$ partitions of S_a , we have that $m \leq 2^{|S_a|}$. Furthermore, for a partition (P, Q) of S_a we have that there exists an a-state $\sigma' = \langle P \cup \sigma.T, Q \cup \sigma.F \rangle \in \Phi(a, \sigma)$ because $\sigma' \setminus \sigma = P \cup Q$. Therefore $2^{|S_a|} \leq m$. We conclude that $m = 2^{|S_a|}$.

Proof of (2): We first show that Δ is proper with respect to S_a , i.e. S_a is a sensed set of Δ with respect to a . Indeed, by Definition 2.2 and the proof of (1) above, we have that the conditions (i)-(iii) of Definition 3.3 are satisfied. The condition (iv) of Definition 3.3 is satisfied because we have that $\delta_i.T \setminus S_a = \sigma_i.T \setminus S_a = \sigma.T$ and $\delta_i.F \setminus S_a = \sigma_i.F \setminus S_a = \sigma.F$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$). Therefore, we conclude that Δ is proper with respect to S_a .

Since a is an action that is executable in σ we have that $(\text{Pre}_a^+ \cup \text{Pre}_a^-) \cap \text{Sense}_a = \emptyset$ and $\text{Pre}_a^+ \cap \sigma.F = \emptyset$, $\text{Pre}_a^- \cap \sigma.T = \emptyset$, therefore $\text{Pre}_a^+ \cap \delta_i.F = \emptyset$, $\text{Pre}_a^- \cap \delta_i.T = \emptyset$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$). By Definition 3.5, we conclude that a is strongly applicable in Δ .

Proof of (3): Since a is executable in σ , we have that $\text{Pre}_a^+ \subseteq \sigma.T$ and $\text{Pre}_a^- \subseteq \sigma.F$. From the proof of (2), $\delta_i.T \setminus S_a = \sigma.T$ and $\delta_i.F \setminus S_a = \sigma.F$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$). The proof follows from Definition 3.8 where we let $S_a = S_{a, \Delta}$. □

LEMMA 8.9. *Let σ be an a-state, δ be a p-state, and $c = \alpha; c'$ is a normalized conditional plan where α is a non-empty sequence of sensing actions and $c' = a; \text{case}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1, \dots, \varphi_m \rightarrow p_m)$. If c is regressible with respect to (σ, δ) . Then,*

- $\Phi^*(\alpha, \sigma) = \{\sigma_1\}$ and $\sigma_1 \neq \perp$;
- $m = 2^{|S_a|}$ where $S_a = Sens_a \setminus \sigma_1$;
- $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m\}$ spans over S_a ;
- For each i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, there exists a unique a -state $\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma_1)$ such that p_i is regressive with respect to (σ', δ) .

PROOF LEMMA 8.9. :

- By Definition 2.3, we have that

$$\Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \bigcup_{\sigma' \in \Phi^*(\alpha, \sigma)} \Phi^*(c', \sigma').$$

Since c is regressive with respect to (σ, δ) we have that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$. This implies that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(\alpha, \sigma)$. Furthermore, because α is a sequence of non-sensing actions, we conclude that $\Phi^*(\alpha, \sigma)$ is a singleton, i.e., $\Phi^*(\alpha, \sigma) = \{\sigma_1\}$ for some a -state σ_1 . From $\perp \notin \Phi^*(\alpha, \sigma)$, we have that $\sigma_1 \neq \perp$.

- By definition of S_a we conclude that S_a is the set of fluents that belong to $Sens_a$ which are unknown in σ_1 . By Definition 2.2 we conclude that $\Phi(a, \sigma_1)$ consists of $2^{|S_a|}$ elements where for each $\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma_1)$, $\sigma' \setminus \sigma_1 = S_a$. Because

$$\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \bigcup_{\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma_1)} E(case(\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1, \dots, \varphi_m \rightarrow p_m), \sigma')$$

we conclude that for each $\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma_1)$ there exists one j , $1 \leq j \leq m$, such that φ_j is satisfied in σ' . Since φ 's are mutual exclusive we conclude that for each j , $1 \leq j \leq m$, there exists at most one $\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma_1)$ such that φ_j is satisfied in σ' . This implies that $m = 2^{|S_a|}$.

- Since c is regressive with respect to (σ, δ) we have that $a; (case(\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1, \dots, \varphi_m \rightarrow p_m))$ is possibly regressive. This implies that $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m\}$ spans over a set of fluents $S \subseteq Sens_a$ and there exists a φ such that for every i , $\varphi_i = \psi_i \wedge \varphi$ where $\psi_i \in BIN(S)$ and $S \cap (\varphi^+ \cup \varphi^-) = \emptyset$. From Lemma 3.18 we know that S is unique. We will show now that $S = S_a$. Assume the contrary, $S \neq S_a$. We consider two cases:

- $S \setminus S_a \neq \emptyset$. Consider a fluent $f \in S \setminus S_a$. Because $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m\}$ spans over S , there exists some i such that f occurs positively in φ_i . From the proof of the previous item and the fact that $f \notin S_a$, we conclude that f must be true in σ_1 (otherwise, we have that the subplan c' of c , obtained by removing the branch $\varphi_i \rightarrow p_i$, satisfies $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c', \sigma) \subseteq ext(\delta)$, which implies that c is redundant with respect to (σ, δ)). Similarly, there exists some j such that f occurs negatively in φ_j , and hence, f must be false in σ_1 . This is a contradiction. Thus, this case cannot happen.
- $S_a \setminus S \neq \emptyset$. Consider a fluent $f \in S_a \setminus S$. Again, from the fact that c is regressive with respect to (σ, δ) , we conclude that f occurs either positively or negatively in φ_i . Because $f \notin S$, we have that f occurs in φ , and hence, f occurs positively or negatively in all φ_i . In other words, f is true or false in every $\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma_1)$. Thus, f is true or false in σ_1 . This contradicts the fact that $f \in S_a = Sens_a \setminus \sigma_1$. Thus, this case cannot happen too.

The above two cases imply that $S_a = S$. This means that $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m\}$ spans over S_a .

- Consider an arbitrary i , $1 \leq i \leq m$. From the proof of the second item, we know that there exists a unique $\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma_1)$ such that φ_i is satisfied by σ' . We will show now that p_i is regressive with respect to (σ', δ) . From the fact that c is regressive, we conclude that every case plan in p_i is possibly regressive. Furthermore, because $\Phi^*(p_i, \sigma') \subseteq \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$, we have that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(p_i, \sigma') \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$. Thus, to complete the proof, we need to show that p_i is not redundant with respect to (σ', δ) . Assume the contrary, there exists a subplan p' of p_i such that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(p', \sigma') \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$. This implies that the subplan c' of c , obtained by replacing p_i with p' , will satisfy that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c', \sigma) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$, i.e., c is redundant with respect to (σ, δ) . This contradicts the condition of the lemma, i.e., our assumption is incorrect. Thus, p_i is not redundant with respect to (σ', δ) , and hence, p_i is regressive with respect to (σ', δ) . □

LEMMA 3.21. *Let σ be an a -state, δ be a p -state, and c is a normalized conditional plan that is regressive with respect to (σ, δ) . Then, $\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta) = \delta'$, $\delta' \neq \perp$, and $\sigma \in \text{ext}(\delta')$.*




Fig. 12. Illustration of Lemma 3.21.

PROOF LEMMA 3.21. We will prove by induction on $\text{count}(c)$, the number of case plans in c .

- Base Case: $\text{count}(c) = 0$. Then c is a sequence of non-sensing actions. The base case follows from Lemma 8.7.
- Inductive Step: Assume that we have proved the lemma for $\text{count}(c) \leq k$. We need to prove the lemma for $\text{count}(c) = k + 1$. Since c is a normalized conditional plan, by Definition 3.16, we have that $c = \alpha; c'$ where α is a sequence of non-sensing actions and $c' = a; p$ and $p = \text{case } (\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1 \dots \varphi_m \rightarrow p_m)$. Because α is a sequence of non-sensing actions we have that $\Phi^*(\alpha, \sigma)$ is a singleton. Let $\Phi^*(\alpha, \sigma) = \{\sigma_1\}$.

Let $S_a = \text{Sens}_a \setminus \sigma_1$. Since c is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ) we conclude that $S_a \neq \emptyset$.

It follows from the fact that c is regressable with respect to (σ, δ) and Lemma 8.9 that $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ spans over S_a and for every i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, there exists a unique $\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma_1)$ such that p_i is regressable with respect to (σ', δ) . By inductive hypothesis for p_i , we conclude that $\text{Regress}^*(p_i, \delta) = \delta_i \neq \perp$ and $\sigma' \in \text{ext}(\delta_i)$. Because φ_i is satisfied by σ' we have that $R(p_i, \delta) = [\delta_i.T \cup \varphi_i^+, \delta_i.F \cup \varphi_i^-]$ is consistent and hence $R(p_i, \delta) \neq \perp$. This also implies that $\sigma' \in \text{ext}(R(p_i, \delta))$ and $R(p_i, \delta) \neq R(p_j, \delta)$ for $i \neq j$.

Let $\Delta = \{R(p_i, \delta) \mid i = 1, \dots, m\}$. We will show next that a is applicable in Δ . Consider $\Delta' = \Phi(a, \sigma_1)$, we have that for each i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, there exists one $\sigma' \in \Delta'$ and $\sigma' \in \text{ext}(R(p_i, \delta))$. It follows from Lemma 8.8 that a is strong applicable in Δ' . Thus, a is applicable in Δ .

By definition of *Regress*, we have that

$$\text{Regress}(a, \Delta) = \left[\bigcup_{i=1}^m R(p_i, \delta).T \setminus S_a \cup \text{Pre}_a^+, \bigcup_{i=1}^m R(p_i, \delta).F \setminus S_a \cup \text{Pre}_a^- \right] = \delta^* \neq \perp.$$

Since a is executable in σ_1 , from Lemma 8.8, and the fact that for each $\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma_1)$ there exists an i such that $\sigma' \in \text{ext}(R(p_i, \delta))$, we can conclude $\sigma_1 \in \text{ext}(\delta^*)$.

To continue our proof, we will now show that $q = \alpha$ is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ^*) . Assume the contrary, there exists a subplan q' of q such that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(q, \sigma) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta^*)$. This, together with the fact that $\text{Regress}^*(c', \delta) = \delta^*$ and the soundness theorem 3.12 implies that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c', \sigma) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$ for $c'' = q'$; c' , i.e., c is redundant with respect to (σ, δ) . This contradicts the assumption of the lemma, i.e., we have proved that q is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ^*) .

Applying the inductive hypothesis for the plan q and (σ, δ^*) , we have that $\text{Regress}^*(q, \delta^*) = \delta' \neq \perp$ and $\sigma \in \text{ext}(\delta')$. The inductive hypothesis is proved because $\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta) = \text{Regress}^*(q, \delta^*)$.

□

LEMMA 8.10. *Let σ be an a -state, δ be a p -state, and c be a sequence of non-sensing actions such that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$ and $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$. Then, there exists a subplan c' of c that is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ) and c' is equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) .*

PROOF LEMMA 8.10. Notice that the length of c is finite. Consider two cases:

- Case (i): c is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ) .
It's easy to see that $c' = c$ satisfies the condition of the lemma.
- Case (ii): c is redundant with respect to (σ, δ) .
By definition of redundancy, there exists a subplan of c which are equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) . Let c' be a subplan of c which are equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) whose length is minimal among all subplans which are equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) . To prove the lemma, it is enough to show that c' is

not redundant with respect to (σ, δ) . Assume the contrary, there exists a subplan c'' of c' which is equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) . Trivially, the number of actions in c'' is smaller than the number of actions in c' . By definition, we have that c'' is also a subplan of c which equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) . This contradicts the fact that c' has the minimal length among all subplans of c which are equivalent to c . So, we conclude that c' is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ) . The lemma is proved. \square

LEMMA 8.11. *Let σ be an a -state and c be a case plan $c = a; \text{case } (\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1 \dots \varphi_m \rightarrow p_m)$ such that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$. Then, if $\text{Sens}_a \setminus \sigma \neq \emptyset$, there exists a possibly regressive plan $c' = a; \text{case } (\varphi'_1 \rightarrow p'_1 \dots \varphi'_n \rightarrow p'_n)$ such that $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \Phi^*(c', \sigma)$.*

PROOF LEMMA 8.11. We prove the lemma by constructing c' . Let $S = \{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m\}$ and $S_a = \text{Sens}_a \setminus \sigma$. Let $L = \{f \mid f \in S_a\} \cup \{\neg f \mid f \in S_a\}$. First, observe that because of $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$ we have that a is executable in σ and for each $\sigma' \in \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$ there exists one $\varphi_i \in S$ such that φ_i is satisfied in σ' . Furthermore, without the lost of generality, we can assume that for each $\varphi_i \in S$, there exists (at least) one $\sigma' \in \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$ such that φ_i is satisfied in σ' .

It is easy to see that for each i , we can write $\varphi_i = \psi_i \wedge \chi_i$ where ψ_i is the conjunction of literals occurring in φ_i and belonging to L and χ_i is the conjunction of literals that do not belong to L . From the above observation, we have that χ_i is satisfied by σ . So, $\varphi = \bigwedge_{i=1}^m \chi_i$ holds in σ . Thus, the conditional plan $c_1 = a; \text{case } (\varphi'_1 \rightarrow p_1 \dots \varphi'_m \rightarrow p_m)$ where $\varphi'_i = \psi_i \wedge \varphi$ satisfies that $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \Phi^*(c_1, \sigma)$.

Since ψ_i is a consistent conjunction of literals from L and ψ_i 's are mutual exclusive, there exists a partition (S_1, \dots, S_m) of $\text{BIN}(S_a)$ such that for every $\eta \in S_i$, $\eta = \psi_i \wedge \eta'$. Let

$$c_2 = a; \text{case } \begin{array}{l} (\gamma_1^1 \rightarrow p_1 \dots \gamma_1^{|S_1|} \rightarrow p_1 \\ \gamma_2^1 \rightarrow p_1 \dots \gamma_2^{|S_2|} \rightarrow p_2 \\ \dots \\ \gamma_m^1 \rightarrow p_1 \dots \gamma_m^{|S_m|} \rightarrow p_m) \end{array}$$

where $\gamma_i^j = \eta_i^j \wedge \varphi \wedge \gamma$, $S_i = \{\eta_i^1, \dots, \eta_i^{|S_i|}\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and $\gamma = \bigwedge_{f \in \text{Sens}_a \cap \sigma} T f \wedge \bigwedge_{f \in \text{Sens}_a \cap \sigma} F \neg f$. We have that $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \Phi^*(c_2, \sigma)$. It is easy to see that the set $\{\gamma_1^1, \dots, \gamma_m^{|S_m|}\}$ spans over S_a and $\text{Sens}_a \subseteq (\gamma_i^j)^+ \cup (\gamma_i^j)^-$. Thus, c_2 is possibly regressive. The lemma is proved with $c' = c_2$. \square

LEMMA 3.22. *Let σ be an a -state, let δ be a p -state, and let c be a normalized conditional plan such that $\perp \notin \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$ and $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta)$. There exists a normalized plan c' such that c' is regressive with respect to (σ, δ) and c' is equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) .*

PROOF LEMMA 3.22. We will prove the lemma using induction on $\text{count}(c)$, the number of case plans in c .

- Base case: $\text{count}(c) = 0$
This follows from Lemma 8.10.

- Inductive Step: Assume that we have proved the lemma for $count(c) \leq k$. We need to prove the lemma for $count(c) = k + 1$.

By construction of c , we have two cases

- (1) $c = a; p$ where $p = case (\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1 \dots \varphi_m \rightarrow p_m)$. Here, we have two cases.
 - (a) $Sens_a \setminus \sigma = \emptyset$. In this case, we have that there exists some j such that φ_j is satisfied by σ and $\Phi^*(c, \sigma) = \Phi^*(p_j, \sigma)$. Thus, c is equivalent to p_j with respect to (σ, δ) . Since $count(p_j) < count(c)$, by inductive hypothesis and the transitivity of the equivalence relation, we conclude that there exists a normalized plan c' such that c' is regressive with respect to (σ, δ) and c' is equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) .
 - (b) $Sens_a \setminus \sigma \neq \emptyset$. Using Lemma 8.11, we can construct a normalized plan $c_1 = a; case (\varphi'_1 \rightarrow p'_1 \dots \varphi'_n \rightarrow p'_n)$ which is possibly regressive and $\Phi^*(c_1, \sigma) = \Phi^*(c, \sigma)$. From the construction of c_1 , we know that for each $\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma)$ there exists one and only one j , $1 \leq j \leq n$, such that φ'_j is satisfied in σ' . Applying the inductive hypothesis for (σ', δ) and the plan p'_j , we know that there exists normalized regressive plan q_j which is equivalent to p'_j with respect to (σ', δ) . This implies that $c' = a; case (\varphi'_1 \rightarrow q_1 \dots \varphi'_n \rightarrow q_n)$ is equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) . Furthermore, every case plan in c_2 is possibly regressive and each q_i is regressive with respect to (σ', δ) . To complete the proof, we will show that c' is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ) . From the assumption that $Sens_a \setminus \sigma \neq \emptyset$ and the construction of c' , we know that we cannot replace a with some $SubSense(a)$. Furthermore, because for each $\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma)$ there exists at most one j such that φ'_j is satisfied in σ' , none of the branches can be removed. This, together with the fact that q_j is not redundant with respect to (σ', δ) , implies that c' is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ) . The inductive hypothesis is proved for this case as well.
- (2) $c = \alpha; c_1$ where α is a sequence of non-sensing actions and c_1 is a case plan. Let $P_\alpha = \{\alpha' \mid \alpha' \text{ is a subplan of } \alpha \text{ and } \alpha'; c_1 \text{ is equivalent to } c \text{ with respect to } (\sigma, \delta)\}$. Let β be a member of P_α such that $|\beta| = \min\{|\alpha'| \mid \alpha' \in P_\alpha\}$. We have that β is a sequence of non-sensing actions, and so, there exists only one a-state in $\Phi^*(\beta, \sigma)$. Let us denote the unique a-state in $\Phi^*(\beta, \sigma)$ by σ_1 . It follows from the above case and the inductive hypothesis that there exists a normalized, regressive plan c'_1 which is equivalent to c_1 with respect to (σ_1, δ) . Consider the plan $c' = \beta; c'_1$. We have that c' is a normalized, possibly regressive conditional plan. To complete the proof, we will show that c' is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ) . Assume the contrary, we will have three cases:
 - (a) There exists a subplan β' of β such that $q = \beta'; c'_1$ is equivalent to c' with respect to (σ, δ) . This implies that $\beta'; c_1$ is equivalent to c' with respect to (σ, δ) which contradicts the construction of β' .
 - (b) There exists a subplan c'' of c'_1 such that $q = \beta; c''$ is equivalent to c' with respect to (σ, δ) . This implies that c'' is equivalent to c'_1 with respect to (σ_1, δ) which contradicts the construction of c'_1 .
 - (c) There exists a subplan β' of β and a subplan c'' of c'_1 such that $q = \beta'; c''$

is equivalent to c' with respect to (σ, δ) . Similar arguments as in the above cases allow us to conclude that this case cannot happen as well. This shows that c' is not redundant with respect to (σ, δ) . So, we have proved that c' is normalized, regressive, and equivalent to c with respect to (σ, δ) . The inductive step is proved for this case. \square

THEOREM 3.23 COMPLETENESS OF REGRESSION. *Given a planning problem $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$ and a progression solution c of P . There exists a normalized regression solution c' of P such that c' is equivalent to c with respect to (σ_I, δ_G) .*

PROOF THEOREM 3.23. Let $c' = \text{normalized}(c)$. It follows from Lemma 3.17 that $\Phi^*(c', \sigma_I) = \Phi^*(c, \sigma_I)$. Lemma 3.22 implies that there exists a normalized regressive plan c'' with respect to (σ_I, δ_G) which is equivalent to c with respect to (σ_I, δ_G) . The conclusion of the theorem follows directly from Lemma 3.21 and Theorem 3.12. \square

THEOREM 4.1. *For every $\langle c, \delta \rangle \in N$ where N denotes the set of plan-state pairs maintained by $\text{Solve}(P)$, $\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta_G) = \delta$.*

PROOF THEOREM 4.1. Observe that $\text{Solve}(P)$ adds one plan-state pair to N per iteration (Steps 2-5). Thus, for each element $\langle c, \delta \rangle$ of N there exists a number l such that $\langle c, \delta \rangle$ is added to N during the l^{th} iteration of $\text{Solve}(P)$. We refer to l as the *iteration number of $\langle c, \delta \rangle$* and denote it by $l_{\langle c, \delta \rangle}$. We prove the theorem by induction on $l_{\langle c, \delta \rangle}$ that $\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta_G) = \delta$.

- Base case: $|l_{\langle c, \delta \rangle}| = 0$. This implies that $c = []$ and $\delta = \delta_G$. Clearly, $\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta_G) = \delta_G$. The base case is proved.
- Inductive Step: Assume that we have proved the theorem for every plan-state pair $\langle c, \delta \rangle$ with $|l_{\langle c, \delta \rangle}| \leq k$. We now show that the theorem is correct for $\langle c, \delta \rangle$ with $|l_{\langle c, \delta \rangle}| = k + 1$. We have two cases:
 - (1) There exists a plan-state pair $\langle c', \delta' \rangle \in N$ such that $l_{\langle c', \delta' \rangle} \leq k$, $c = a; c'$, a is a non-sensing action and $\text{Regress}(a, \delta') = \delta$. It follows from the inductive hypothesis that $\text{Regress}^*(c', \delta_G) = \delta'$. The conclusion of the inductive step for this case follows from

$$\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta_G) = \text{Regress}^*(a, \text{Regress}^*(c', \delta_G)) = \text{Regress}(a, \delta') = \delta.$$

- (2) There exists a set of plan-state pairs $\Delta = \{\langle c_1, \delta_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle c_n, \delta_n \rangle\} \subseteq N$, a set of formulas $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ and a sensing action a such that $l_{\langle c_i, \delta_i \rangle} \leq k$ for every i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, a , φ 's and Δ satisfy the conditions specified in Step 4.2 of $\text{Solve}(P)$, $\text{Regress}(a, \{[\delta_i.T \cup \varphi_i^+, \delta_i.F \cup \varphi_i^-] \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}) = \delta$. Let

$$c = a; \text{case}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow c_1, \dots, \varphi_n \rightarrow c_n).$$

By inductive hypothesis, we have that $\text{Regress}^*(c_i, \delta_G) = \delta_i$. Thus, the conclusion of the inductive step for this case follows from

$$\text{Regress}^*(c, \delta_G) = \text{Regress}(a, \{R(c_1, \delta_G), \dots, R(c_n, \delta_G)\}) = \delta.$$

\square

LEMMA 8.12. *Given a planning problem $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$ and a plan-state pair $\langle c_1, \delta_1 \rangle$ belonging to N , the set of plan-state pairs maintained by $\mathbf{Solve}(P)$. Let c_2 be a sequence of non-sensing actions and δ_2 be a p -state such that $\text{Regress}^*(c_2, \delta_1) = \delta_2 \neq \perp$. Then, N contains a plan-state pair $\langle c, \delta_2 \rangle$.*

PROOF LEMMA 8.12. We prove by induction on the length of c_2 , $|c_2|$.

- Base Case: $|c_2| = 0$. Obvious since $\delta_2 = \delta_1$ and $\langle c_1, \delta_1 \rangle \in N$.
- Inductive step: Assume that we have proved the lemma for $|c_2| \leq k$. We need to prove it for $|c_2| = k + 1$. Let $c_2 = \beta; a$ where $|\beta| = k$. Let $\text{Regress}(a, \delta_1) = \delta_3$. By Definition 3.2, we have that $\text{Regress}^*(c_2, \delta_1) = \text{Regress}^*(\beta, \text{Regress}(a, \delta_1))$. Because $\delta_2 \neq \perp$, we have that $\delta_3 \neq \perp$. Since $\mathbf{Solve}(P)$ repeats Steps 2-5 until N_s does not change, we conclude that either $\langle c'_1, \delta_3 \rangle \in N$ where $c'_1 = c_1; a$ or there exists some node $\langle c''_1, \delta_3 \rangle \in N$. Applying the inductive hypothesis for this plan-state pair and the sequence β with $\text{Regress}^*(\beta, \delta_3) = \delta_2$ we have that there exists a node $\langle c, \delta_2 \rangle$ in N . The inductive step is proved. \square

LEMMA 8.13. *Given a planning problem $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$ and a plan-state pair $\langle c_1, \delta_1 \rangle$ belonging to N , the set of plan-state pairs maintained by $\mathbf{Solve}(P)$. Let c_2 be a normalized plan and δ_2 be a p -state such that $\text{Regress}^*(c_2, \delta_1) = \delta_2 \neq \perp$. If there exists an a -state $\sigma \in \text{ext}(\delta_2)$ and c_2 is regressive with respect to (σ, δ_1) , then N contains a plan-state pair $\langle c, \delta_2 \rangle$.*

PROOF LEMMA 8.13. We prove the lemma by induction on $\text{count}(c_2)$.

- Base Case: $\text{count}(c_2) = 0$. This follows immediately from Lemma 8.12.
- Inductive Step: Assume that we have proved the lemma for $|\text{count}(c_2)| \leq k$. We need to prove it for $|\text{count}(c_2)| = k + 1$. It is easy to see that we can assume that $c_2 = \alpha; p$ where $p = a; \text{case}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow p_1, \dots, \varphi_n \rightarrow p_n)$ where α is a sequence of non-sensing actions, p_i are normalized plans, and $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ spans over a set $\emptyset \neq S_a \subseteq \text{Sens}_a$. We have that $\text{count}(p_i) \leq k$.

Let $\gamma_i = \text{Regress}^*(p_i, \delta_1)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since $\text{Regress}^*(c_2, \delta_1) = \delta_2 \neq \perp$, we have that $\gamma_i \neq \perp$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$). Let $\Phi^*(\alpha, \sigma) = \{\sigma_1\}$, it follows from the fact that c_2 is regressive with respect to (σ, δ_1) and Lemma 8.9 that for each p_i ($1 \leq i \leq n$), there exists a unique $\sigma' \in \Phi(a, \sigma_1)$ such that p_i is regressive with respect to (σ', δ_1) ; and by Lemma 3.21 we have that $\sigma' \in \text{ext}(\gamma_i)$. From the inductive hypothesis, we conclude that there exist conditional plans q_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, such that $\langle q_i, \gamma_i \rangle$ belong to N where $\gamma_i = \text{Regress}^*(q_i, \delta_G)$ (by Theorem 4.1).

Since $\text{Regress}^*(c_2, \delta_1) \neq \perp$ we conclude that

$$\text{Regress}(a, \{R(p_1, \delta_1), \dots, R(p_n, \delta_1)\}) = \delta' \neq \perp.$$

Because c_2 is a regressive plan with respect to (σ, δ_1) , we know that $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n\}$ spans over a set S_a , $\emptyset \neq S_a \subseteq \text{Sens}_a$. Since $\delta' \neq \perp$ we have that a is applicable in $\Delta = \{R(p_1, \delta_1), \dots, R(p_n, \delta_1)\}$. Now, consider the case plan $p' = a; \text{case}(\varphi_1 \rightarrow q_1, \dots, \varphi_n \rightarrow q_n)$. We have that $\gamma_i = \text{Regress}^*(q_i, \delta_G)$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) and a is applicable in Δ , it follows from Step 4.2 of $\mathbf{Solve}(P)$, there exists a plan-state pair $\langle c', \delta' \rangle$ in N . Because $\text{Regress}^*(\alpha, \delta') = \delta_2$ and α is a sequence of non-sensing actions, Lemma 8.12 implies that N contains some plan-state pair $\langle c, \delta_2 \rangle$.

□

THEOREM 4.2. For every planning problem $P = \langle A, O, I, G \rangle$,

- (1) **Solve**(P) will always stop;
- (2) if P has a regression solution c then **Solve**(P) will return a conditional plan c' such that $\text{Regress}(c, \delta_G) = \text{Regress}(c', \delta_G)$; and
- (3) if P has no regression solution then **Solve**(P) will return NO SOLUTION.

PROOF THEOREM 4.2. We will prove (2) using Lemma 8.13 and (3) using (2).

- (1) Since we only consider domains with finite number of actions and fluents, the set of p-states is finite. Given a set of plan-state pairs N , **Solve**(P) either adds a new plan-state pair $\langle c, \delta \rangle$ to N in the step 4, where $\delta \notin N_s$ or stop. Because the set of p-states is finite, we can conclude that **Solve**(P) will eventually terminate.
- (2) If P has a regression solution: let c be a regression solution of P . We have that $\Phi^*(c, \sigma_I) \subseteq \text{ext}(\delta_G)$. It follows from Lemmas 3.17 and 3.22 that there exists a normalized plan c' that is equivalent to c and regressive with respect to (σ_I, δ_G) . Applying Lemma 8.13 for the plan-state pair $\langle [], \delta_G \rangle$, the plan c' , and the p-state $\delta = \text{Regress}^*(c', \delta_G)$ (we have $\sigma_I \in \text{ext}(\delta)$ by Lemma 3.21), we can conclude that there exists a plan-state pair $\langle p, \delta \rangle$ in N , the set of plan-state pairs maintained by **Solve**(P). It follows from Theorem 4.1 that $\text{Regress}^*(p, \delta_G) = \delta$. Since $\sigma_I \in \text{ext}(\delta)$, the step 3 of the algorithm will return p as a regression solution.
- (3) If P has no a regression solution: From (1), we have that N is finite and the algorithm will eventually stop. If P has a solution then it will return one at step 3. Since P has no solution and N is finite, the algorithm will eventually go to step 6, i.e. it will return NO SOLUTION.

From cases (1), (2), and (3), the theorem is proved.

□

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to the anonymous referees whose useful comments helped us to improve this paper. This work was supported by NSF grant number 0070463 and NASA grant number NCC2-1232. Tran Cao Son was supported by EIA-0220590.

REFERENCES

- BARAL, C., KREINOVICH, V., AND TREJO, R. 2000. Computational complexity of planning and approximate planning in the presence of incompleteness. *AI-00* 122:241–267.
- B. BONET AND H. GEFFNER. 2000. Planning with Incomplete Information as Heuristic Search in Belief Space. *AIPS-00*, 52–61, 2000.
- BONET, B., AND GEFFNER, H. 2001. Planning As Heuristic Search. *Artificial Intelligence* 129:5–33.
- CIMATTI, A., ROVERI, M., AND TRAVERSO, P. 1998. Automatic OBDD-based Generation of Universal Plans in Non-Deterministic. *AAAI-98*, 875–891.
- T. EITER, W. FABER, N. LEONE, G. PFEIFER, AND A. POLLERES 2000. Planning under incomplete information. *CL-2000*, 807–821.
- ETZIONI, O., HANKS, S., WELD, D., DRAPER, D., LESH, N., AND WILLIAMSON, M. 1992. An approach to planning with incomplete information. *KR-92*, 115–125.

- FIKES, R., AND NILSON, N. 1971. STRIPS: A new approach to the application of theorem proving to problem solving. *AI-71*.
- GOLDMAN, R., AND BODDY, M. 1994. Conditional linear planning. AIPS-94.
- LEVESQUE, H. 1996. What is planning in the presence of sensing. AAAI-96.
- LOBO, J. 1998. COPLAS: a COnditional PLAnner with Sensing actions. Technical Report FS-98-02, AAAI.
- NGUYEN, X.L., KAMBHAMPATI, S., AND NIGENDA, R. 2002. Planning graph as the basis for deriving heuristics for plan synthesis by state space and CSP search. *AIJ*, 135(1-2):73–123.
- PEDNAULT, E. 1986 *Toward a Mathematical Theory of Plan Synthesis*. Ph.D. Dissertation.
- PEOT, M., AND SMITH, D. 1992. Conditional Nonlinear Planning. AIPS-92, 189–197.
- PRYOR, L., AND COLLINS, G. 1996. Planning for contingencies: A decision-based approach. *JAIR-96*, 4:287–339.
- REITER, R. 2001. *KNOWLEDGE IN ACTION: Logical Foundations for Describing and Implementing Dynamical Systems*. MIT Press.
- RINTANEN, J. 2000. Constructing conditional plans by a theorem prover. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 10:323–352.
- RINTANEN, J. 2002. Backward Plan Construction for Planning with Partial Observability. AIPS’02.
- SCHERL, R., AND LEVESQUE, H. 1993. The frame problem and knowledge producing actions. AAAI-93, 689–695.
- SCHERL, R., AND LEVESQUE, H. 2003. Knowledge, Action, and the Frame Problem. *Artificial Intelligence* 144(1-2).
- SON, T., AND BARAL, C. 2001. Formalizing sensing actions - a transition function based approach. *AIJ*, 125(1-2):19–91.
- SON, T., TU, P., AND BARAL, C. 2004. Planning with Sensing Actions and Incomplete Information using Logic Programming. LPNMR’04, 261–274.
- TUAN, L., BARAL, C., AND SON, T. 2004. Regression With Respect To Sensing Actions and Partial States. Technical report, ASU, 2004.
- WELD, D., ANDERSON, C., AND SMITH, D. 1998. Extending graphplan to handle uncertainty and sensing actions. In *Proceedings of AAAI 98*.

Received Month Year;

revised Month Year; accepted Month Year